

**APPENDIX D**  
**SCOPING MEETING MINUTES**

---

---

MINUTES

---

# City of Yucaipa Freeway Corridor Specific Plan

Scoping Meeting  
Tuesday, May 2, 2006  
6:00 P.M.

City Council Chambers, City Hall

---

---

The City of Yucaipa held a scoping meeting for the Freeway Corridor Specific Plan (Specific Plan) to discuss and record comments on potential environmental impacts due to the implementation of the Specific Plan. Two handouts were made available to the public.

- The Meeting Agenda
- The Initial Study for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Project Manager from EDAW, Inc., Sam Gennawey opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and provided an overview of the meeting agenda and objectives:

- **Presentation:** The Balanced Scorecard: What is the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
- **Presentation:** Environmental Study Timeline and Feedback Opportunities
- **Presentation:** Yucaipa Freeway Corridor Specific Plan Project Description
- **Discussion:** Community Input for the Environmental Impact Report

Prior to commencing with the agenda, comments from the public were made regarding the lack of notification of this meeting for the adjacent residential neighborhoods. John McMains, Director of Community Development, replied that the City had notified the public through postings on the website and the local newspaper, and asked the public to email him at [jmcmains@yucaipa.org](mailto:jmcmains@yucaipa.org) regarding further comments on the notification process or any questions about the Freeway Corridor Specific Plan. The Project Team pledged to expand the notification process when important milestones have been reached.

Mr. Gennawey explained that the following mandated areas will be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report but the study is not limited to these items:

- |                                   |                               |                          |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| - Aesthetics                      | - Agriculture Resources       | - Air Quality            |
| - Biological Resources            | - Cultural Resources          | - Geology and Soils      |
| - Hazards and Hazardous Materials | - Hydrology and Water Quality | - Land Use and Planning  |
| - Mineral Resources               | - Noise                       | - Population and Housing |
| - Public Services                 | - Recreation                  | - Transportation/Traffic |
| - Utilities and Service Systems   | - Other Environmental Issues  |                          |

Mr. Gennawey explained the following process:

- Release of the Draft Specific Plan
- Release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report
- 45-Day Public Review (*the City must respond in WRITING*)
- City Council considers a Statement of Overriding Consideration

Mr. Gennawey described the project and the following components of the Specific Plan:

- Proposed Land Uses
  - Open Space 570 acres
  - Non-Residential 270 acres
  - Residential 370 acres
  - Total Acreage 1,210 acres
  - Dwelling Units 1,409 units
- Development Regulations
- Design Standards
- Natural Resources Plan
- Roadway improvements:
  - Intersection adjacent to I-10 interchange at Live Oak Canyon Road/Oak Glen Road
  - Interchange at County Line Road
- Connectivity:
  - Visual and physical connectivity among neighborhoods, open space, schools, and parks
  - Link Live Oak Canyon Road and County Line Road
- Drainage improvements:
  - Construction of stormwater management and flood control facilities
  - Possible stream bank preservation and re-vegetation
- Traffic calming measures
- Implementation

Mr. Gennawey proceeded to describe the City Council-approved plan. He described that the City Council has reviewed and approved the plan that combines various parts of the three plans created with the Advisory Committee's direction. Mr. McMains explained that the Council wants property owners to comply with the Hillside Ordinance, and two acres have been added to accommodate this. Mr. McMains also explained that in addition to the Plan, two other alternative plans (one with lower density and another plan with higher density) will also be considered in the EIR process. Mr. Gennawey commented that the Council Generated Plan will be analyzed in detail, but the environmental impacts of the other two plans will be analyzed as alternatives during the process.

Mr. Gennawey commenced the discussion on environmental impacts. Helen Choi of EDAW, Inc. recorded comments on a wallgraphic. During the discussion regarding environmental impacts, the following public comments were made, followed by responses from Mr. Gennawey:

**Comment) Open Area. Hard to tell where hills are, hard to tell how open area will be impacted.**

Response) Mr. Gennawey: Please give me conditions and expectations for the Specific Plan. Issue – roadway and trail connectivity

**C) Sometimes open areas aren't usable. I want open area to be usable.**

**C) Red area – north of I-10 along Oak Glen Road, will it be flat?**

R) Mr. Gennawey: So your concern is what happens to the hill, what will it look like?

**C) Light pollution from retail center and other uses.**

**C) Traffic – how far out from the project site do they go?**

R) Mr. Gennawey: We will be studying many intersections including those that are not directly adjacent to the study area.

**C) I live on Colorado Street. Will it go back to what it was before? (congested) What about cut-thru traffic?**

**C) Stop signs are ignored, lots of traffic from other residential projects going on. Concerns - hydrology issues under the highway. Traffic calming. The need for only 1 school on south side?**

R) Mr. Gennawey: Yes, that is what the school district says. So the concern is will it be enough having only 1 school?

**C) If there is an average of 1.5 cars per unit – that's 2,100 cars. We already have people stacked up at freeway now. The overpass will be absolute mess. Chapman Project – We need to know # of cars. There is bad traffic at Live Oak Canyon/Oak Glen. Traffic is not as bad at County Line and highway.**

**Big drainage problem cutting into the hills.**

**Air Quality – emissions made by cars.**

**Ratio of retail versus housing is it sufficient? We want enough retail for a good tax base.**

**Show tax revenues generated by project.**

**R) Financial impact on existing retail – will the existing retail be cannibalized?**

**C) Biological concerns – corridors for animals. We will be taking away their homes. Can animals use the trails under freeways?**

R) Mr. Gennawey: We have documented existing conditions.

**C) Tribal reserves –have they been notified?**

R) We have contacted the 6 tribes with interest in this region. We have done a literature search. Our Cultural Resources team has walked the entire property 10 feet apart and identified fragments of cultural resources. Two structures may be considered historic resources. They will need to be fully documented before removal. We will take advantage of the recommendation to contact Claire Teeters of the Historic Society for additional information.

**C) I bought my home to see the hills not houses. What about low income housing?**

R) Mr. Gennawey: We have been given no direction by the City Council to require low income housing and only market rate housing has been proposed by the development community.

**C) How do horses get across freeway?**

**C) Concerned about stability of hillside.**

**Noise. Breathing dust as project is built. Don't make me smell or hear anything.**

**Really concerned about what kind of people will be able to access my property from the retail center north of highway.**

R) Mr. Gennawey: So the expectation is – top of hill ridge is important. Right now you see light and hear noise from freeway. So you don't want additional light and noise?

**C) Indians involved – can we put in casino?**

R) No tribe is laying claim to land in the project area.

**C) Ridgeline Preservation – At beginning of meeting Mr. Gennawey said developers would be encouraged to follow design standard. Won't they be required?**

R) Mr. McMains: Two property owners may get projects approved before the Specific Plan is approved. Developers will be required to follow design standards.

**C) What about economics? Property values?**

R) Mr. Gennawey: We can see if we can add a sentence about property values. Property value assessment is not a required element of an EIR.

**C) Water Quality and supply: Are there adequate water available?**

**C) Construction impacts including stormwater runoff is hardly ever policed. How will that be handled?**

- R) It will be addressed in EIR. We will also look at dust issues.
- R) City Council and Planning Commission will review everything.
- C) **Drainage – big issue. Who pays for drainage?**
- R) Not sure if public money would be used for drainage or who shares burden of infrastructure cost.
- C) **I think there will be impacts on recreation, lots of kids.**
- R) We will look at active and passive recreation.
- C) **What is the legal requirement for notifying people?**
- R) City would have met the standards for notification. Mr. Gennawey will work with Mr. McMains on making notification better.
- C) **Who pays for infrastructure costs?**
- R) Mr. Gennawey: The specific plan will look at it.
- C) **Colorado Street on 10<sup>th</sup> – 46 homes. What about access from the business park?**
- R) There will not be direct access from the business park. No truck traffic thru Colorado Street neighborhood.
- C) **What is the difference between residential commercial and regional commercial?**
- R) Mr. Gennawey: Regional has larger businesses & intensity.
- C) **Are we (Yucaipa) tying in with City of Redlands for water lines?**
- R) No. The project area will be serviced by the Yucaipa Valley Water District.
- C) **Protect water quality. Pipelines are invasive and could be a problem with stability of hills.**
- C) **What about police and fire protection? Existing services are far north of the project site.**
- C) **At entry to San Bernardino there is odor from a waste treatment plant. Will the waste treatment odor be contained on site? Will people be able to smell it?**
- C) **Will there be another tax increase for ambulance service (there was a tax increase before).**
- C) **Live Oak Canyon, will it be widened?**

R) Mr. Gennawey: The General Plan addresses area wide circulation issues and many of the surrounding roadways are planned to be expanded as outlined in the General Plan.

**C) Do design standards include design standards for freeway on-ramp and off-ramp areas?**

R) Mr. McMains: Caltrans determines landscaping. City has a grant, but Caltrans determines what landscaping goes in.

**C) Would we have a way to request the kind of landscaping that the City of Upland has?**

R) Mr. McMains: No. Caltrans has to maintain the landscaping and they will determine what goes in.

R) Mr. Gennawey: We will have design standards for road right-of-way landscaping in the Specific Plan.

**C) Does City or State require a certain number of acres of parks for people?**

R) Mr. McMains: The General Plan has a goal (not requirement) of 3 acres per 1,000 people.

**C) Who do we talk to about getting a ballot measure to buy the business park north of the freeway and use it for recreation?**

R) Mr. McMains: Contact City Council. We collect park fees from developers to buy land for parks.

**C) Some of these comments don't appear to be environmental. How is that handled?**

R) Mr. Gennawey: We will note that at the scoping meeting we heard these comments. They are not part of CEQA. We advised the City of the comments

**C) Will 10<sup>th</sup> Street turn into a thoroughfare to get to E Street?**

R) Mr. McMains: No, it will be 1 road to serve 46 houses. It will dead end at 10<sup>th</sup>.

R) Mr. Gennawey: We will look at this specifically in the EIR.

Mr. Gennawey asked Anne Pietro, P&D Consultants and Project Manager of the EIR for additional information or corrections.

Mr. Gennawey concluded the meeting by summarizing key points of the discussion and comments, and commented that the next City Council meeting will be sometime in June. He informed the public that the EIR will be posted on the City's website. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45P.M.

### AGENDA

- Introductions
- Review Meeting Objectives
- Presentation: The Process
- Expectations: Project & Process
- Issues and Opportunities
- Public Comment
- Next Steps
- Adjourn

PUBLIC COMMENT

— Involve affected neighbors on SPAC

### EXPECTATIONS

Yucaipa: Family Community

↓

INTRODUCTIONS

↓

Interests of SPAC

- Maintain impressions of Yucaipa
- Corridor supports needs, provides tax dollars
- Financial

PROCESS

- Process leads to economically feasible development
- All interests heard/considered
- Reduce community friction; bring community together
- Property owners maintain control over development on their properties

PROJECT

- Build something beautiful
- High end uses/development
- Appealing/safe to passers-by
- Traffic patterns invite people to exit I-10
- Avoids traffic impacts on neighborhoods
- Accommodates non-vehicular use/access
- Adequate freeway ramps
- Unified design; sense of place
- Flexible land use
- Address infrastructure deficiencies

### ISSUES/OPPORTUNITIES

- Fire & police protection
- Be mindful of densities
- Places for Yucaipans
- Need to involve affected neighbors
- Drainage; natural areas
- Infrastructure reqs./costs → balanced burden
- Noise → Avoid sound walls (if possible)
- Interchange configuration
- Faults, slopes, hills
- Oak trees
- Bugs & bunnies & owls
- Managing light pollution
- Impacts on local businesses
- Impact on historic agricultural uses
- Signage
- Extending infrastructure: who pays?
- Sensitivity to bldg height, views
- Water availability/costs

BLUE SKY DREAMING

- ✓ Movie theatres, bowling, recreation for the youngsters
- ✓ Hotels (★★★★)
- ✓ Fine dining
- ✓ Outdoor parks, open space
- ✓ Higher intensity along I-10
- ✓ Residential, including affordable
- ✓ Leave some areas alone
- ✓ Business/office park
- ✓ Trails, including equestrian
- ✓ Highlight agricultural heritage
- ✓ Emphasis on gateway
- ✓ Estak: homes      ✓ Community education, museums
- ✓ Industrial parks