

Appendix A
Response Letters to Commenting Agencies
Letter from State Clearinghouse

Stantec Consulting Inc.
22690 Cactus Avenue Suite 300
Moreno Valley CA 92553-9024
Tel: (951) 697-8300 Fax: (951) 653-5308
stantec.com



Stantec

December 7, 2006
File: 2052204400

Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
1995 Market Street
Riverside, CA 92501
Fax: (951) 788-9965

Attention: Teresa Tung
Senior Civil Engineer

Dear Ms. Tung:

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
SCH 2005071109

On behalf of the City of Ontario (City), Stantec is responding to comments made on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Avenue Specific Plan by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD) in its letter to Mr. Richard Ayala dated November 13, 2006.

Comment 1

This letter is written in response to the Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for The Avenue Specific Plan. The proposed project is part of the City of Ontario's New Model Colony and will generate up to 2,321 dwelling units and up to 30 acres of commercial/retail development. The project site is located north of Edison Avenue, south of Schaefer Avenue, east of Vineyard Avenue, and west of Haven Avenue in the city of Ontario, San Bernardino County.

Response to Comment 1

The RCFCWCD's characterization of the Project is accurate for the most part. In addition to The Avenue Specific Plan, which proposes 2,326 dwelling units, commercial development, parks, and school sites, the Project analyzed in the DEIR also includes the cancellation of Williamson Act contracts, the relocation of certain above ground electrical facilities owned by Southern California Edison Company, the approval of various development agreements, and tentative tract maps.

December 5, 2006
Teresa Tung
Senior Civil Engineer
Page 2 of 2

**Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
SCH 2005071109**

Comment 2

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District has no comment at this time.

Response to Comment 2

The City acknowledges RCFCWCD has no comments at this time and appreciates RCFCWCD taking the time to acknowledge its review of the Project.

Comment 3

Thank you for the opportunity to review the DEIR. Please forward any subsequent environmental documents regarding the project to my attention at this office. Any further questions concerning this letter may be referred to Steve Horn at 951.955.5418 or me at 951.955.1233.

Response to Comment 3

The City acknowledges RCFCWCD's review of the DEIR.

Sincerely,

STANTEC CONSULTING INC.



Cheryl DeGano
Associate, Environmental Planning
Tel: (951) 697-8269
Fax: (951) 653-2214
cheryl.degano@stantec.com

Attachment: November 13, 2006 letter from RCFCWCD

c. Richard Ayala, City of Ontario Planning Department

*** TX REPORT ***

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO	0760	
CONNECTION TEL		7889965
SUBADDRESS		
CONNECTION ID		
ST. TIME	12/07 17:36	
USAGE T	00'32	
PGS. SENT	3	
RESULT	OK	

Stantec Consulting Inc.
22690 Cactus Avenue Suite 300
Moreno Valley CA 92553-9024
Tel: (951) 697-8300 Fax: (951) 653-5308
stantec.com



Stantec

December 7, 2006
File: 2052204400

Omnitrans
1700 West Fifth Street
San Bernardino, CA 92411
Fax: (909) 889-5779

Attention: Mervin Acebo
Associate Planner

Dear Mr. Acebo:

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
SCH 2005071109

On behalf of the City of Ontario (City), Stantec is responding to comments made on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Avenue Specific Plan by Omnitrans in its letter to Mr. Richard Ayala dated December 1, 2006.

Comment 1

Thank you for providing a copy of the above-stated document. As the public transportation service provider for the San Bernardino Valley, it is important that Omnitrans continues to provide quality public transportation service for the residents and businesses of Ontario.

Currently, Omnitrans does not operate fixed route service or Access service (ADA mandated demand response service for persons with disabilities) in the specific plan area. Several studies have been undertaken to identify future routes in this area which include "The Chino Ontario Community Based Transportation Plan," July 2005 and the "System –Wide Transit Corridor Plan for the San Bernardino Valley," September 2004. Both documents identify Edison Avenue as a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor. In addition, Haven Avenue will have transit service in the future. Maps from both documents have been enclosed for your review.

Response to Comment 1

The City acknowledges Omnitrans as the public transportation provider and thanks Omnitrans for the information regarding future transit service in the New Model Colony.

December 7, 2006
Mervin Acebo
Associate Planner
Page 2 of 2

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
SCH 2005071109

Comment 2

Omnitrans has completed its Bus Stop Design Guidelines which is available on our website at www.omnitrans.org. This document outlines the design parameters for transit stops. It is important that pedestrian connections be provided to and from future stop locations along Edison Avenue and Haven Avenue. This will ensure that a safe, convenient, and accessible path of travel is available for people wishing to use public transit. Omnitrans staff is available to assist in the selection and placement of bus stop locations.

Response to Comment 2

The City will consult with Omnitrans regarding the design guidelines when the improvement plans are being designed and approved for Edison Avenue and Haven Avenue.

Comment 3

Thank you again for allowing us to review the document. If you have any questions, please call me at 909.379.7256 or email mervin.acebo@omnitrans.org.

Response to Comment 3

The City acknowledges Omnitrans' review of the DEIR.

Sincerely,

STANTEC CONSULTING INC.



Cheryl DeGano
Associate, Environmental Planning
Tel: (951) 697-8269
Fax: (951) 653-2214
cheryl.degano@stantec.com

c. Richard Ayala, City of Ontario Planning Department

Fax



Stantec

Stantec Consulting Inc.
22690 Cactus Avenue Suite 300
Moreno Valley CA 92553-9024
Tel: (951) 697-8300 Fax: (951) 653-5308

To:	Marvin Acebo	From:	Cheryl DeGano
Company:	Omnitrans	Phone:	(951) 697-8269
Fax:	(909) 889-5779	Fax:	(951) 653-2214
Date:	December 7, 2006		
File:	20522204400		3 page(s) total includes cover sheet. Original will NOT follow by mail.

The content of this fax is confidential. If the reader is not the intended recipient or its agent, be advised that any dissemination, distribution or copying of the content of this fax is prohibited. If you have received this fax in error, please notify us immediately and return the original fax to us by mail at our expense. Thank you.

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR

Mr. Acebo,

Transmitted on behalf of the City of Ontario are responses to Omnitrans' comments on the Draft EIR for The Avenue Specific Plan.

Thank you for reviewing the document.

STANTEC CONSULTING INC.

Cheryl DeGano
Associate, Environmental Planning
cheryl.degano@stantec.com

Attachment: Letter in response to Omnitrans' comments on the Draft EIR

C.

*** TX REPORT ***

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO	0758	
CONNECTION TEL		19098895779
SUBADDRESS		
CONNECTION ID	OMNITRANS	
ST. TIME	12/07 16:43	
USAGE T	00'33	
PGS. SENT	3	
RESULT	OK	

Stantec Consulting Inc.
22690 Cactus Avenue Suite 300
Moreno Valley CA 92553-9024
Tel: (951) 697-8300 Fax: (951) 653-5308
stantec.com



Stantec

December 9, 2006
File: 2052204400

City of Chino
13220 Central Avenue
Chino, CA 91710
Fax (909) 591-6829

Attention: Kim Le

Dear Ms. Le:

**Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
SCH 2005071109**

On behalf of the City of Ontario (City), Stantec is responding to comments made on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Avenue Specific Plan by the City of Chino in its letter to Mr. Richard Ayala dated December 8, 2006.

Comment 1

Thank-you for providing the City of Chino an opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for The Avenue Specific Plan.

Based upon staff's review of the project, the City of Chino has the following comments:

Transportation

Provide a list of intersections within the City of Chino (including CalTrans Ramps) identifying the mitigation measures required and fair share contribution specifically for "The Avenue" traffic impacts, consistent with the approved New Model Colony CMP Traffic Impact Analysis.

Response to Comment 1

The following table identifies City of Chino intersections analyzed in the New Model Colony CMP Traffic Impact Analysis. The intersection lane needs, total improvement costs, and fair share contribution for these lanes are presented in Table 7 of "Ontario New Model Colony Transportation Program Implementation Program" prepared for the City by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. in February 2001. A copy of said Table 7 is included as an attachment to this letter.

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
SCH 2005071109

Intersections within the City of Chino Analyzed in the NMC CMP Traffic Impact Analysis

No.	NAME	
1	Reservoir St.	Riverside Dr.
2	Chino Av.	SR-71 SB Ramps
3	Chino Av.	SR-71 NB Ramps
4	Edison / Grand Av.	SR-71 SB Ramps
5	Edison / Grand Av.	SR-71 NB Ramps
6	Chino Hills Pkwy.	SR-71 SB Ramps
7	Chino Hills Pkwy.	SR-71 NB Ramps
8	Ramona Av.	SR-60 WB Ramps
9	Ramona Av.	SR-60 EB Ramps
10	Ramona Av.	Riverside Dr.
11	Central Av.	SR-60 WB Ramps
12	Central Av.	SR-60 EB Ramps
13	Central Av.	Walnut Av.
14	Central Av.	Riverside Dr.
15	Central Av.	Edison Av.
16	Central Av.	Chino Hills Pkwy.
21	Mountain Av.	SR-60 WB Ramps
22	Mountain Av.	SR-60 EB Ramps
23	Mountain Av.	Walnut Av.
24	Mountain Av.	Riverside Dr.
25	Mountain Av.	Edison Av.
34	Euclid Av.	Riverside Dr.
35	Euclid Av.	Edison Av.
36	Euclid Av.	SR-71 NB Ramps
37	Euclid Av.	SR-71 SB Ramps

Comment 2

If additional lanes are required, include the cost of receiving lanes consistent with the CMP guidelines.

Response to Comment 2

As stated in the Response to Comment 1, the intersection lane needs, total improvement costs, and fair share contribution for these lanes are presented in Table 7 of "Ontario New Model Colony Transportation Program Implementation Program" prepared for the City by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. in February 2001. A copy of said Table 7 is included as an attachment to this letter. The costs presented in Table 7 were accepted by the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG).

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
SCH 2005071109

Comment 3

Collect D.I.F. fees for intersections within the City of Chino per approved New Model Colony CMP Traffic Impact Analysis.

Response to Comment 3

The fair contribution for the facilities identified in the CMP study is incorporated into the City's development impact fee (DIF) program. The DIF fees will be collected by the City.

Comment 4

Section 5.08 (pages 37-38, Impacts Related to Alterations of Existing Drainage Patterns, Streams, or Increases to Rate or Amount of Surface Runoff) should describe the geomorphic problem area identified in the Chino Creek Integrated Plan (prepared by IEUA and OCSD, September 2006). The Chino Creek Integrated Plan indicates that high flows from Cucamonga Creek are causing erosion and incision immediately downstream of Chino-Corona Road.

Response to Comment 4

A discussion of the erosion area referenced in Comment 4 is not needed in the EIR as runoff generated by development per The Avenue Specific Plan will discharge into the Bellegrave County Line Channel and the Cucamonga Creek Channel, which are both fully improved concrete lined channels with adequate capacity to serve drainage generated by the entire New Model Colony at build-out as discussed on page 5.8-9 of the Draft EIR. With respect to erosion and siltation impacts resulting from project implementation, page 5.8-37 of the Draft EIR states that cumulative increases in flows within Cucamonga Creek Channel due to upstream urban development may cause erosion of the of unimproved (that is, unlined) downstream facilities, however those downstream facilities are under the jurisdiction, which includes responsibility for maintenance, of the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). The Draft EIR further states that the flows at the Cucamonga Creek and Mill Creek confluence (below Hellman Avenue for the 100-year storm event (Q_{100}) are approximately 32,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). Implementation of the project will result in a Q_{100} increase of 142.5 cfs which represents approximately 0.45 percent of the flows at the Mill Creek/Cucamonga Creek confluence (142.5 cfs/32,000 cfs) and as such constitutes a negligible impact to unimproved downstream facilities.

Comment 5

In Section 5.08 (pages 37-38, Impacts Related to Alterations of Existing Drainage Patterns, Streams, or Increases to Rate or Amount of Surface Runoff), please clarify how future Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE) modifications to Prado Dam's capacity would minimize the project's impacts to drainage patterns.

Response to Comment 5

Modifications to Prado Dam's capacity will not alter drainage patterns or any project's impacts to drainage patterns. The projected increases to the capacity of Prado Dam referenced in the Draft EIR are discussed in the context of quantity of storm flows not alteration to drainage patterns. Development of The Avenue Specific Plan will not change the global drainage patterns in the area since, this project will discharge into the Bellegrave County Line Channel and the

December 9, 2006

Kim Le

Page 4 of 4

**Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
SCH 2005071109**

Cucamonga Creek Channel as discussed in the Response to Comment 4. As discussed in the Response to Comment 4, the ACOE is responsible for the maintenance of downstream facilities.

Comment 6

Thank you again for providing the City of Chino the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Report for The Avenue Specific Plan.

Should you have any question please feel free to contact me at (909) 591-9893.

Response to Comment 6

The City acknowledges the City of Chino's review of the Draft EIR.

Sincerely,

STANTEC CONSULTING INC.



Cheryl DeGano
Associate, Environmental Planning
Tel: (951) 697-8269
Fax: (951) 653-2214
cheryl.degano@stantec.com

Attachment: Table 7 from the "Ontario New Model Colony Transportation Program Implementation Program" Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. February 2001.

c. Richard Ayala, City of Ontario

Table 7
Intersection Lane Needs
and Mitigation Costs

Intersection	Additional Lane Needs												Total Imp. Cost	Project Contribution	Project \$ Share
	Northbound			Southbound			Eastbound			Westbound					
	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R			
1 Reservoir/Riverside Dr.												1	\$35,000	9.7%	\$3,395
3 SR-71 NB Ramps/Chino Ave.												1	\$70,000	10.8%	\$13,860
10 Ramona Ave./Riverside Dr.						1						1	\$140,000	21.8%	\$30,520
11 Central Ave./SR-60 WB Ramps												1	\$70,000	4.9%	\$3,430
12 Central Ave./SR-60 EB Ramps			1		1	1				1		1	\$245,000	4.0%	\$9,800
13 Central Ave./Walnut Ave.			1									1	\$140,000	8.4%	\$11,700
16 Central Ave./Chino Hills Pkwy.												1	\$35,000	8.5%	\$2,975
19 Mountain Ave./Mission Blvd.			1										\$70,000	10.7%	\$7,490
22 Mountain Ave./SR-60 EB Ramps			1										\$70,000	10.6%	\$7,420
24 Mountain Ave./Riverside Dr.												1	\$105,000	13.5%	\$14,175
25 Mountain Ave./Edison Ave.												1	\$140,000	48.9%	\$68,160
27 Euclid Ave./I-10 EB Ramps						1							\$35,000	44.0%	\$15,400
30 Euclid Ave./Mission Blvd.			1										\$70,000	24.6%	\$17,220
32 Euclid Ave./SR-60 EB Ramps												1	\$35,000	59.0%	\$20,650
33 Euclid Ave./Walnut Ave.			1									1	\$140,000	60.0%	\$84,000
34 Euclid Ave./Riverside Dr.												1	\$210,000	44.9%	\$94,290
39 Grove Ave./4th St.												1	\$35,000	19.1%	\$6,685
39 Grove Ave./Holt Blvd.												1	\$35,000	38.2%	\$13,370
42 Grove Ave./SR-60 EB Ramps			1		1								\$70,000	68.4%	\$47,880
53 Archibald Ave./Riverside Dr.						1							\$35,000	76.2%	\$26,670
54 Archibald Ave./Cloverdale Rd.			1									1	\$70,000	70.8%	\$49,560
55 Haven Ave./4th St.												1	\$35,000	5.9%	\$2,065
56 Haven Ave./I-10 WB Ramps			1									2	\$140,000	14.2%	\$10,080
57 Haven Ave./I-10 EB Ramps												1	\$105,000	7.1%	\$7,455
58 Haven Ave./Mission Blvd.												1	\$70,000	30.7%	\$21,490
60 Haven Ave./SR-60 EB Ramps												1	\$35,000	43.7%	\$15,285
62 Milliken Ave./I-10 WB Ramps												1	\$35,000	4.4%	\$1,540
63 Milliken Ave./I-10 EB Ramps												1	\$35,000	4.4%	\$1,540
64 Milliken Ave./Mission Blvd.												1	\$35,000	24.0%	\$8,400
67 I-15 SB Ramps/Jurupa St.						2						1	\$315,000	9.4%	\$29,610
68 I-15 NB Ramps/Jurupa St.			2									1	\$350,000	7.4%	\$25,900
71 I-15 SB Ramps/Limonite Ave.												1	\$35,000	37.6%	\$13,160
72 I-15 NB Ramps/Limonite Ave.			1										\$35,000	66.2%	\$23,170
73 Elwanda Ave./Jurupa St.			1		1							1	\$245,000	3.2%	\$7,840
74 Elwanda Ave./SR-60 WB Ramps												1	\$280,000	3.0%	\$8,400
75 Elwanda Ave./SR-60 EB Ramps						2							\$105,000	8.3%	\$8,715
78 Elwanda Ave./Van Buren Blvd.			1		1							1	\$420,000	7.5%	\$31,500
78 Mulberry Ave./Jurupa Ave.												1	\$105,000	3.2%	\$3,360
79 Country Village/SR-60 WB Ramps												1	\$35,000	6.4%	\$1,890
80 Mission Blvd./SR-60 EB Ramps												1	\$70,000	10.4%	\$7,280
Total Cost													\$4,340,000		\$787,500

00007 0007 100 17 T
 1 24 55601 311
 TTE1000245
 03/03
 PAGE

Fax



Stantec

Stantec Consulting Inc.
22690 Cactus Avenue Suite 300
Moreno Valley CA 92553-9024
Tel: (951) 697-8300 Fax: (951) 653-5308

To: Kim Le
Company: City of Chino
Fax: (909) 591-6829
Date: December 9, 2006
File: 2052204400

From: Cheryl DeGano
Phone: (951) 697-8269
Fax: (951) 653-2214

6 page(s) total includes cover sheet.
Original will NOT follow by mail.

The content of this fax is confidential. If the reader is not the intended recipient or its agent, be advised that any dissemination, distribution or copying of the content of this fax is prohibited. *If you have received this fax in error, please notify us immediately and return the original fax to us by mail at our expense. Thank you.*

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR

Ms. Le;

Transmitted on behalf of the City of Ontario are responses to the City of Chino's comments on the Draft EIR for The Avenue Specific Plan.

STANTEC CONSULTING INC.

Cheryl DeGano
Associate, Environmental Planning
cheryl.degano@stantec.com

Attachment:

c.

*** TX REPORT ***

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO	0769	
CONNECTION TEL		19095916829
SUBADDRESS		
CONNECTION ID		
ST. TIME	12/09 11:00	
USAGE T	01'04	
PGS. SENT	6	
RESULT	OK	

Stantec Consulting Inc.
22690 Cactus Avenue Suite 300
Moreno Valley CA 92553-9024
Tel: (951) 697-8300 Fax: (951) 653-5308
stantec.com



Stantec

December 9, 2006
File: 2052204400

County of Riverside Transportation and Land Management Agency
Transportation Department
4080 Lemon Street, 8th Floor
Riverside, CA 92501
Fax (951) 955-3198

Attention: Farah Khorashadi, Engineering Division Manager

Dear Farah Khorashadi:

**Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
State Clearinghouse No. 2005071009**

On behalf of the City of Ontario (City), Stantec is responding to comments made on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Avenue Specific Plan by the County of Riverside Transportation Department (County) in its letter to Mr. Richard Ayala dated December 7, 2006.

Comment 1

The County of Riverside Transportation Department has reviewed the Specific Plan and the supporting traffic impact analysis for The Avenue Specific Plan located in the City of Ontario. Following are our comments:

Specific Plan report

1. Page 3-1. Interstate 60 is referenced, should be State Route 60.

Response to Comment 1

Comment noted. The Draft EIR will be revised to reflect this change.

Comment 2

2. Page 5-15-10. State Route 271 is referenced, should be State Route 71.

Response to Comment 2

Comment noted. The Draft EIR will be revised to reflect this change.

Stantec

December 9, 2006

Farah Khorashadi, Engineering Division Manager

Page 2 of 5

Reference: **The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR**
State Clearinghouse No. 2005071009

Comment 3

3. *Page 5.15-39. The intersection of Archibald/Cloverdale is shown to be mitigated through the payment of City DIF and fair share. Mitigation and funding will need to be coordinated with the County of Riverside.*

Response to Comment 3

The City has ongoing coordination with the County regarding transportation issues and will coordinate with the County regarding mitigation and funding for the Archibald/Cloverdale intersection.

Comment 4

4. *Page 5.15-40. Same comment as comment #3 for the intersection of Hamner/Edison.*

Response to Comment 4

The City has ongoing coordination with the County regarding transportation issues and will coordinate with the County regarding mitigation and funding for the Hamner/Edison intersection.

Comment 5

5. *Page 5.15-41. The improvements shown for the 1-15 ramps at Edison will need to be coordinated with the improvement project now in the planning stage by the County of Riverside.*

Response to Comment 5

The I-15 ramps at Edison are currently under construction. Additionally, the City has ongoing coordination with the County regarding transportation issues and will continue to coordinate with the County in the future.

Comment 6

TIA report

1. *Page 3-16. It is unclear who has jurisdiction of several intersections included in the study area, needs clarification. Note: City of Ontario Circulation Element does not match Riverside County.*

Response to Comment 6

The jurisdictions for the intersections identified in "The Avenue Specific Plan Traffic Impact Study" are a function of the jurisdiction in which the intersection is located. For example, intersections within the unincorporated County of San Bernardino are within its jurisdiction, intersections within the corporate limits of the City of Ontario are in the City's jurisdiction. The City acknowledges the County's comment regarding the City and County circulation elements.

Comment 7

2. *Page 5-5, Table 5-2. The improvements shown for the 1-15 ramps at Edison will need to be coordinated with the improvement project now in the planning stage by the County of Riverside.*

Stantec

December 9, 2006

Farah Khorashadi, Engineering Division Manager

Page 3 of 5

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
State Clearinghouse No. 2005071009

Response to Comment 7

The I-15 ramps at Edison are currently under construction. Additionally, the City has ongoing coordination with the County regarding transportation issues and will continue to coordinate with the County in the future.

Comment 8

3. *Page 5-8, Table 5-3. The ultimate improvements at the intersection of Archibald/Cloverdale will need to be coordinated with the County of Riverside. At this time, the County of Riverside has not implemented triple left turn treatments.*

Response to Comment 8

The City has ongoing coordination with the County regarding transportation issues and will coordinate with the County regarding the ultimate improvements for the Archibald/Cloverdale intersection. The City acknowledges the County has not implemented the triple-left turn treatments.

Comment 9

4. *Page 5-8, Table 5-3. The analysis for the intersection of Archibald/Cloverdale for year 2015 did not include the west leg of the intersection while the Riverside County Circulation element includes a west leg.*

Response to Comment 9

There is no funding source identified for the west leg of the Archibald/Cloverdale intersection for 2015, therefore the analysis conservatively assumed that this leg would not be constructed by 2015 and thus not available.

Comment 10

5. *Page 5-15, Table 5-5. See comment #3 and #4*

Response to Comment 10

The City notes that the reference in Comment 10 to comment #3 and #4 refers to the comments under the heading "TIA report" as numbered by the County in their response. With respect to comment #3 (coordination), the City has ongoing coordination with the County regarding transportation issues and will coordinate with the County regarding mitigation and funding for the Archibald/Cloverdale intersection. With respect to comment #4 (not including the west leg of the Archibald/Cloverdale intersection in the traffic analysis), the traffic analysis conservatively assumed the west leg of the Archibald/Cloverdale intersection would not be constructed by 2015 as there is no funding source identified for construction of this leg by 2015.

Comment 11

6. *Page 6-6, Table 6-2. The improvements for the intersection of Archibald/Cloverdale are identified as part of the City Fee Program/fair share. Mitigation and funding will need to be coordinated with the County of Riverside.*

Stantec

December 9, 2006

Farah Khorashadi, Engineering Division Manager

Page 4 of 5

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
State Clearinghouse No. 2005071009

Response to Comment 11

The City has ongoing coordination with the County regarding transportation issues and will coordinate with the County regarding mitigation and funding for the Archibald/Cloverdale intersection.

Comment 12

7. *Page 6-8, Table 6-2. The improvements at the 1-15 ramps and Edison are shown to be already funded. See comment #2.*

Response to Comment 12

The funding sources for the improvements at the I-15 ramps and Edison are: (i) Federal STP – Discretionary, (ii) Federal Highway Administration – Demonstration funds, (iii) Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) – Measure A, (iv) Mira Loma Road and Bridge Benefit District (RBBB), and (v) TUMF – Northwest Zone Funds (WRCOG). Source: Tayfun Saglam, Riverside County Transportation Department, email to Cheryl DeGano, October 20, 2006.

Comment 13

8. *Appendix. The majority of the counts in the study were made in 2004. The counts are not adjusted with a growth factor for year 2006 conditions. No explanation is given as to why this is acceptable.*

Response to Comment 13

As explained on pages 1-8 and 1-9 of "The Avenue Specific Plan Traffic Impact Study," 2004 traffic count data was used for the existing condition at the direction of City staff. Minor manual adjustments were made to ensure reasonable existing traffic flow conservation. If a growth factor had been applied, unreasonable flow conservation discrepancies would have occurred.

Comment 14

Appendix. A passerby reduction is assumed for the 1-15 ramps at Edison and Hamner at Edison for Year 2015 without project. What is this reduction?

Response to Comment 14

The reduction represents traffic volumes associated with the project. The 2015 without project traffic volumes were calculated in the traffic analysis software by subtracting the project traffic volumes (shown under the label "PasserBy/Vol" on pages K-85 and K-86 in the appendices to "The Avenue Specific Plan Traffic Impact Study") from the 2015 with project volumes.

Comment 15

Minimum green times for pedestrian crossings are not consistently adjusted for the wider cross-section evaluated in Year 2015 conditions with improvements.

Response to Comment 15

The green times shown are conservative and assume pedestrians will be present at every signal cycle.

December 9, 2006
Farah Khorashadi, Engineering Division Manager
Page 5 of 5

**Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR
State Clearinghouse No. 2005071009**

Comment 16

Thank you for the opportunity to review the DEIR and the accompanying traffic study. Please contact me if I can answer any questions.

Response to Comment 16

The City acknowledges the County's review of the Draft EIR.

Sincerely,

STANTEC CONSULTING INC.



Cheryl DeGano
Associate, Environmental Planning
Tel: (951) 697-8269
Fax: (951) 653-2214
cheryl.degano@stantec.com

Attachment:

c. Richard Ayala, City of Ontario

Fax



Stantec

Stantec Consulting Inc.
22690 Cactus Avenue Suite 300
Moreno Valley CA 92553-9024
Tel: (951) 697-8300 Fax: (951) 653-5308

To:	Farah Khorashadi	From:	Cheryl DeGano
Company:	County of Riverside Transportation and Land Management Agency, Transportation Department	Phone:	(951) 697-8269
Fax:	(951) 955-3198	Fax:	(951) 653-2214
Date:	December 9, 2006	6 page(s) total includes cover sheet. Original will NOT follow by mail.	
File:	2052204400		

The content of this fax is confidential. If the reader is not the intended recipient or its agent, be advised that any dissemination, distribution or copying of the content of this fax is prohibited. If you have received this fax in error, please notify us immediately and return the original fax to us by mail at our expense. Thank you.

Reference: The Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR

Farah Khorashadi;

Transmitted on behalf of the City of Ontario are responses to the County of Riverside Transportation Department's comments on the Draft EIR for The Avenue Specific Plan.

STANTEC CONSULTING INC.

Cheryl DeGano
Associate, Environmental Planning
cheryl.degano@stantec.com

C.

*** TX REPORT ***

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO	0770	
CONNECTION TEL		9553198
SUBADDRESS		
CONNECTION ID		
ST. TIME	12/09 11:03	
USAGE T	00'59	
PGS. SENT	6	
RESULT	OK	



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Sean Walsh
Director

December 11, 2006

Richard Ayala
City of Ontario
303 East B Street
Ontario, CA 91764

Subject: The Avenue Specific Plan EIR (PSP 04-003) and Related General Plan Amendment (PGPA 06-006)
SCH#: 2005071109

Dear Richard Ayala:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on December 8, 2006, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Terry Roberts".

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2005071109
Project Title The Avenue Specific Plan EIR (PSP 04-003) and Related General Plan Amendment (PGPA 06-006)
Lead Agency Ontario, City of

Type	EIR Draft EIR
Description	<p>1. The Avenue Specific Plan encompasses approximately 571 gross acres and establishes comprehensive zoning, development regulations and design guidelines governing the development of approximately 2,326 residential units and 174,000 square feet of commercial and retail uses in the New Model Colony. The Avenue Specific Plan features pedestrian amenities that encourage walking and biking to schools, parks and basic commercial and retail needs. The Avenue Specific Plan proposes a variety of housing types and neighborhoods that will be affordable to a broad and diverse array of families and homeowners.</p> <p>2. An amendment to the City of Ontario General Plan to: (i) modify the boundaries of Subarea 18 within the New Model Colony (NMC) to include portions of Subareas 12 (~ 63 acres), 17 (~ 134 acres), and 23 (~ 43 acres) and (ii) clarify the ambiguity that exists in the NMC General Plan between the permitted residential density set forth in the Land Use Plan, which allows for 4.6 dwelling units per gross acre, and the Development Capacity, which allows 2,059 dwelling units in the modified boundaries of Subarea 18. The General Plan will permit development of the 2,326 dwelling units proposed by The Avenue Specific Plan.</p> <p>3. Cancellation of Williamson Act Contracts.</p> <p>4. Relocation of certain above ground electrical transmission and distribution lines owned by Southern California Edison Corporation (SCE).</p> <p>5. The approval of various development agreements between builders and/or landowners that own or control areas covered by The Avenue Specific Plan.</p> <p>6. Tentative Tract Maps may also be processed concurrently with The Avenue Specific Plan and the other related project entitlements.</p>

**Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

Lead Agency Contact

Name Richard Ayala
Agency City of Ontario
Phone (909) 395-2036 **Fax**
email
Address 303 East B Street

City Ontario **State** CA **Zip** 91764

Project Location

County San Bernardino
City Ontario
Region
Cross Streets Edison Avenue, Schaefer Avenue, Haven Avenue, Archibald Avenue
Parcel No.
Township **Range** **Section** **Base** SB

Proximity to:

Highways 60
Airports
Railways SPRR
Waterways Cucamonga Creek
Schools Colony HS, Ranch View
Land Use Agriculture (Dairy), vacant, electrical transmission corridor
 GP: Low and Medium Density Residential, Green Belt, Neighborhood Center
 Z: "SPIAG" (Specific Plan, Agricultural Overlay)

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

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

Date Received 10/25/2006 **Start of Review** 10/25/2006 **End of Review** 12/08/2006