


Save Empire Lakes Golf Course

Oct 14 2015  Save Empire Lakes (/author.php?petid=75675&ref=petition)

1024 Signatures (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

6718 Views

Like Share 29



Target: City of Rancho Cucamonga
Region: United States of America (/petition-campaigns/United-States-of-America/)
Website: http://saveempirelakes.com (http://saveempirelakes.com)

Empire Lakes Golf Course was, and could be again, the crown jewel of the Inland Empire. Lewis Homes has purchased the course and is planning on tearing it down to put up exactly what Rancho Cucamonga does not need, MORE APARTMENTS!

The course is home to all sorts of wild life that used to come free in the area before it was severely over developed. Red Tail Hawks, Cranes, Herons and Owls are only a few of the species you find out on the course. The course is a great place for children to learn many aspects that golf has to

Sign the petition

Sponsor

Mr, Ms, Dr, etc

First name

Last name

Email

State, county or province

City or town

Street address

Zip code or post code

Comment to target

Display my name publicly

[?]

PC 413-16
EXHIBIT AA

offer such as; honesty, sportsmanship, respect and build character.

We are trying to keep the city from rezoning the golf course for homes. Please help us. If Lewis Homes were to put as much money into the golf course as they are putting into trying to destroy it, it could be easily be the top rated course in the Inland Empire and thrive once again as a professional tour stop, generating huge tax dollars for the city and revenue for the surrounding businesses.

We, the undersigned, call on the City of Rancho Cucamonga to deny the rezoning of Empire Lakes Golf Course for residential use and motion to keep it as a green zone so it can once again become the Crown Jewel of the Inland Empire.

f Comments

 Share (<https://www.addthis.com/bookmark.php>)

 Sponsor (</sigreceipt.php?petid=75675>)  Info

WOULD YOU SPEND \$99



To knock a shot off every hole?

Click Here Now to Buy

squaretosquaremethod.com

Petition tags: [golf course \(/tag/golf%20course\)](/tag/golf%20course), [golf \(/tag/golf\)](/tag/golf), [save empire lakes \(/tag/save%20empire%20lakes\)](/tag/save%20empire%20lakes), [keep it green rancho cucamonga \(/tag/keep%20it%20green%20rancho%20cucamonga\)](/tag/keep%20it%20green%20rancho%20cucamonga), [rancho cucamonga \(/tag/rancho%20cucamonga\)](/tag/rancho%20cucamonga), [inland empire \(/tag/inland%20empire\)](/tag/inland%20empire)

GoPetition respects your privacy

reCAPTCHA
Privacy - Terms

(/pushers/content/petition-privacy).

Sign this petition

4 Stages to a Heart A



4 Signs

The Car

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 29

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS

Pool Service & Repair

Serving Upland & Rancho Cucamonga Quality Service Since 1988



Signatures **1024** to **951** of **1024**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
1024	Miss	Rachel MacKay	Upland	California	N/G	Apr 04, 2016
1023	Mrs	Cheryl Bater	Phelan	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19867572)	Apr 03, 2016
1022	Mr	Robert MacKay	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19867547)	Apr 03, 2016
1021	Mrs	Melissa MacKay	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19867484)	Apr 03, 2016
1020	Mrs	Nicole Pacheco	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Mar 29, 2016
1019	N/G	Mandi Horwitz	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Mar 29, 2016
1018	Mrs	Monique Gandy	Fontana	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19846596)	Mar 28, 2016
1017	Mr.	Don Allan	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Mar 28, 2016
1016	Ms.	Anonymous	Fontana	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19846568)	Mar 28, 2016

1015	Me	Mark Esgemon	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19846560)	Mar 28, 2016
1014	N/G	Anonymous	Fontana	CA	N/G	Mar 20, 2016
1013	Dr	Mark Matzaganian	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19822591)	Mar 17, 2016
1012	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Mar 15, 2016
1011	N/G	Gail van Velzer	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19812202)	Mar 14, 2016
1010	N/G	janice takemoto	rancho cucamonga	CA san bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19811918)	Mar 14, 2016
1009	N/G	dick takemoto	rancho cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19811904)	Mar 14, 2016
1008	Mrs	Victoria Burch	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19811873)	Mar 14, 2016
1007	Mr	Anonymous	Chino	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19807633)	Mar 12, 2016
1006	Mr	Michael Urciuoli	Ontario	Ca	N/G	Mar 09, 2016
1005	Mrs	Aegli Crow	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19790685)	Mar 06, 2016
1004	N/G	Larry Quintana	West Covina	CA	N/G	Mar 01, 2016
1003	Mr	Joseph Stofa	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Feb 29, 2016
1002	Mr	Bob Newton	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19775559)	Feb 29, 2016
1001	N/G	Nicholas Crow	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19772431)	Feb 27, 2016
1000	N/G	Yvonne Tackoor	Etiwanda	CA	N/G	Feb 27, 2016
999	Mr	John Fitzgerald	rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Feb 26, 2016
998	N/G	Anonymous	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19768794)	Feb 25, 2016
997	Mrs	Nelly Hodeib	Alta Loma	ca	N/G	Feb 25, 2016
996	Dr	Anonymous	Alta loma	Ca	N/G	Feb 25, 2016

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS



Signatures **1014** to **951** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
1014	N/G	Anonymous	Fontana	CA	N/G	Mar 20, 2016
1013	Dr	Mark Matzaganian	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19822591)	Mar 17, 2016
1012	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Mar 15, 2016
1011	N/G	Gail van Velzer	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19812202)	Mar 14, 2016
1010	N/G	janice takemoto	rancho cucamonga	CA san bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19811918)	Mar 14, 2016
1009	N/G	dick takemoto	rancho cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19811904)	Mar 14, 2016
1008	Mrs.	Victoria Burch	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19811873)	Mar 14, 2016
1007	Mr	Anonymous	Chino	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19807633)	Mar 12, 2016
1006	Mr	Michael Urciuoli	Ontario	Ca	N/G	Mar 09, 2016

1005	Mrs	Aegli Crow	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19790685)	Mar 06, 2016
1004	N/G	Larry Quintana	West Covina	CA	N/G	Mar 01, 2016
1003	Mr	Joseph Stofa	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Feb 29, 2016
1002	Mr	Bob Newton	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19775559)	Feb 29, 2016
1001	N/G	Nicholas Crow	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19772431)	Feb 27, 2016
1000	N/G	Yvonne Tackoor	Etiwanda	CA	N/G	Feb 27, 2016
999	Mr	John Fitzgerald	rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Feb 26, 2016
998	N/G	Anonymous	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19768794)	Feb 25, 2016
997	Mrs	Nelly Hodeib	Alta Loma	ca	N/G	Feb 25, 2016
996	Dr	Anonymous	Alta loma	Ca	N/G	Feb 25, 2016
995	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Feb 25, 2016
994	N/G	david hwang	ALTA LOMA	CA	N/G	Feb 19, 2016
993	N/G	Mason Ross	San Clemente	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19743198)	Feb 16, 2016
992	MR	JAMES CAREY	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	CALIFORNIA SAN BERN	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19737015)	Feb 15, 2016
991	N/G	Atana Paopradith	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Feb 11, 2016
990	Dr	Kai Dunn	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19718699)	Feb 09, 2016
989	Mr	Paul Schaffman	Upland	Ca	N/G	Feb 05, 2016
988	N/G	Amelia Castro	Upland	Calif	N/G	Feb 02, 2016
987	N/G	Jose Castro	Upland	Calif	N/G	Feb 02, 2016
986	Mr	Charles Rogers	Claremont	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19694659)	Feb 02, 2016
985	Mr	Dennis Carlson	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View	Jan 29, 2016
984	N/G	Anonymous	Upland	CA	N/G	Jan 25, 2016

983	Mr	Chuck McDonald	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19631266)	Jan 25, 2016
982	Dr	George Herrick	Upland	CA	N/G	Jan 25, 2016
981	Mr	Brian LaClaire	Rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Jan 24, 2016
980	Mr	Kyle Mulvey	Ontario	CA	N/G	Jan 24, 2016
979	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Jan 23, 2016
978	Mrs	Debra Clark	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19628621)	Jan 23, 2016
977	Mrs	Toni Alvarez	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Jan 23, 2016
976	Mr	Troy Flath	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Jan 23, 2016
975	Mrs	Heidi Bustamante	Ranch Cucamonga	CA	View	Jan 23, 2016
974	N/G	Billy Jones	ALTA LOMA	CA - California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19626108)	Jan 22, 2016
973	Mr	Ron Miller	Rancho cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19626031)	Jan 22, 2016
972	Mrs	Monique Gandy	Fontana	CA	N/G	Jan 22, 2016
971	MR	John Paul Dauber	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Jan 22, 2016
970	Ms	Barbara McDonald	Upland	Ca	N/G	Jan 21, 2016
969	Mr	Albert Balogh	Upland	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19622295)	Jan 21, 2016
968	Mrs	Catherine Brotherton	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Jan 21, 2016
967	Mr	Michael Brotherton	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Jan 21, 2016
966	N/G	Diane Graham	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Jan 21, 2016
965	Ms	Heather Tipple	FONTANA	Ca	N/G	Jan 21, 2016
964	N/G	Chris Hernandez	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca, Inland Empire	N/G	Jan 21, 2016
963	Mr.	Rick McGuire	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Jan 21, 2016
962	N/G	Vanessa Stewart	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Jan 21, 2016
961	N/G	steven rodriguez	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Jan 21, 2016

960	MR & MRS	Anonymous	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19621361)	Jan 21, 2016
959	N/G	Jerry Curcio	Rancho Cucamonga	CA California	N/G	Jan 11, 2016
958	N/G	Stacie Curcio	Rancho Cucamonga	CA California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19597416)	Jan 11, 2016
957	N/G	Jay Jung	LOS ANGELES	CA	N/G	Jan 07, 2016
956	Ms	Anastasia Duane	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19581560)	Jan 04, 2016
955	MR	Jason Duane	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19581554)	Jan 04, 2016
954	mr	wayne burkhardt	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Jan 03, 2016
953	Mr	Christian Barton	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 29, 2015
952	N/G	Josh Kwok	Chino Hills	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19572124)	Dec 27, 2015
951	N/G	Anonymous	Sturgis	Kentucky	N/G	Dec 24, 2015

- [« \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html) 1
- [2 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page2.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page2.html)
- [3 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page3.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page3.html)
- [4 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page4.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page4.html) ...
- [10 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page10.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page10.html) ...
- [15 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page15.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page15.html)
- [16 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page16.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page16.html)
- [17 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page17.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page17.html)
- [18 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page18.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page18.html)
- [Next \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page2.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page2.html)
- [» \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page20.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page20.html)

- N/G - not given by the signer
- N/C - field not collected by the author
- S/C/P - State, County or Province
- View - mouseover to view comment
- Dates displayed in the signature list are based on CST (GMT-6) and CDT (GMT-5)
- Anonymous signatures signify people who have chosen not to display their names publicly. [?]
- A comment in red indicates that the signer has hidden their comment from public view. [?]

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS

Social Security Shutdown

Born before 1969? You can get an extra \$4,098 monthly with this



Signatures 950 to 901 of 1014

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
950	N/G	Linnie Drolet	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Dec 23, 2015
949	N/G	Jean Boni	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 21, 2015
948	Mrs	Anonymous	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19560417)	Dec 16, 2015
947	MRS	ANNE LESCRINIER	ALTA LOMA	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19556672)	Dec 14, 2015
946	Mrs	Cindy Kirmsse	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 14, 2015
945	N/G	Betty Zacharias	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Dec 14, 2015
944	Mrs	Betty Smith	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 14, 2015
943	N/G	Eric Valmoja	Rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Dec 14, 2015
942	N/G	Linda Wong	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19555753)	Dec 13, 2015
941	Mr	Mark Cushman	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19555741)	Dec 13, 2015
940	N/G	Cynthia Cushman	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19555717)	Dec 13, 2015

939	N/G	Alanna Kelly	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 13, 2015
938	N/G	Anonymous	rancho cucamonga	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19555284)	Dec 13, 2015
937	Mrs	Lori Pilarcik	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Dec 13, 2015
936	Mr	Gary Price	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19555197)	Dec 13, 2015
935	Mr	Tom Faust	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Dec 13, 2015
934	N/G	Shirley Ott	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19553249)	Dec 11, 2015
933	ms	Marlene leon	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	N/G	Dec 11, 2015
932	Ms	Nancy Kimbrough	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Dec 11, 2015
931	N/G	Nancy Charest	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19552481)	Dec 11, 2015
930	Mr	David Von Hegedus	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 11, 2015
929	Mrs.	Anonymous	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Dec 11, 2015
928	Mr	Danny Pierce	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 10, 2015
927	Mr	Juan Reyes	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Dec 10, 2015
926	Ms	K Miller	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 10, 2015
925	Mr	Ronald Hendricks	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19549760)	Dec 10, 2015
924	mrs	Doreen McKillop	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19548907)	Dec 09, 2015
923	Mrs	Danielle Giacchetti	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19546872)	Dec 08, 2015
922	Mrs	Sheila Stratton	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19546623)	Dec 08, 2015
921	N/G	Anonymous	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 08, 2015
920	N/G	JOAN TUCKER	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 08, 2015

919	Mrs	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 08, 2015
918	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 08, 2015
917	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 08, 2015
916	Mr	Roger Roldan	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19545615)	Dec 08, 2015
915	Mr	Warren Crawley	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 07, 2015
914	MR	FRED CROMER	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19544508)	Dec 07, 2015
913	Mrs	LAVONNE CROMER	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19544500)	Dec 07, 2015
912	N/G	David Garlow	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 07, 2015
911	MR	Brian Drolet	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19544151)	Dec 07, 2015
910	N/G	Anonymous	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 07, 2015
909	N/G	Eileen Correa	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19543087)	Dec 07, 2015
908	N/G	Ben Lautenslager	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Dec 07, 2015
907	N/G	Angela Smith	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View	Dec 07, 2015
906	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 07, 2015
905	Mrs	Deborah Geyser	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
904	N/G	Kevin Cartney	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
903	Me	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
902	N/G	Gary Bach	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
901	N/G	Mary McHan	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Dec 06, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like **Share** 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

 [Map \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS 

4 Stages to a Heart Attack





4 Signs

The Cardiac Killer

Signatures **900** to **851** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
900	Mrs	Joanne Weigh	Ranch Cucamonga	California	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
899	Mrs	maude shumaker	alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
898	N/G	Ashley Angle	Chino	CA	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
897	MR	RICHARD DAVISON	ALTA LOMA	CA	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
896	N/G	JAYNE DAVISON	ALTA LOMA	CA	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
895	Mr.	Mark Haddon	La Verne	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19541659)	Dec 06, 2015
894	Mrs	Suzanne Sausedo	Rancho cucamonga	Usa	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
893	N/G	Michael Newman	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Dec 06, 2015
892	N/G	Anonymous	rancho cucamonga	san bernadino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19541167)	Dec 05, 2015
891	Mrs	Sherryl Howell	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19541145)	Dec 05, 2015
890	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 05, 2015
889	N/G	grant gardner	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Dec 05, 2015

888	N/G	Edward Salazar	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	CA	View	Dec 05, 2015
887	Mr	Anonymous	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	CA	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19540804)	Dec 05, 2015
886	Mrs	Christina Surface	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 05, 2015
885	N/G	Robin Outram	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Dec 05, 2015
884	N/G	William Campoa	Rancho cucamonga	Califonrnia	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19539645)	Dec 04, 2015
883	N/G	Kevin Ades	Laguna Hills	CA	N/G	Dec 02, 2015
882	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 02, 2015
881	Mrs	Elizabeth Skinner	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19532248)	Dec 02, 2015
880	N/G	William Balas	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
879	N/G	Rocky Bettar	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
878	Mr	Howard Scholl	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19531861)	Dec 01, 2015
877	N/G	Mars Serna	Fontana	Ca	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
876	Mr	Philip Smith	Indianapolis	IN	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
875	N/G	Anonymous	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19531551)	Dec 01, 2015
874	Mr	Dennis Cisneros	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19531496)	Dec 01, 2015
873	Mrs	Allyson McGuire	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
872	N/G	Anonymous	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	CA	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19531299)	Dec 01, 2015
871	Ms	Dee Hixson	Alhambra	CA	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
870	N/G	Tom Matreyek	Upland	CA	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
869	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
868	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
867	N/G	Javier Garcia	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Dec 01, 2015

866	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Dec 01, 2015
865	N/G	Darisa Morton	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19530365)	Nov 30, 2015
864	N/G	Edward Vargas	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19530358)	Nov 30, 2015
863	Mr	Kyle Marquez	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 30, 2015
862	mr	Joe woo	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19529641)	Nov 30, 2015
861	mrs	devyn Gutierrez	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 30, 2015
860	Miss	Erika Smith	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 30, 2015
859	N/G	Yadira De Leon	Ontario	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19529369)	Nov 30, 2015
858	Miss	Irene Loera	Granada Hills	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19529220)	Nov 30, 2015
857	Mrs	Krista Marino	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19528888)	Nov 30, 2015
856	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA, USA	N/G	Nov 30, 2015
855	Mrs	Brooke Salgado	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19528860)	Nov 30, 2015
854	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 30, 2015
853	N/G	Anonymous	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 30, 2015
852	Ms	Samantha Townsend	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19528841)	Nov 29, 2015
851	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 29, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS+



Signatures **850** to **801** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
850	Mrs	Christie Osborn	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19528826)	Nov 29, 2015
849	N/G	Marian Hall	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
848	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
847	N/G	Deborah Cornell	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
846	N/G	Kenneth Rogers	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
845	Mrs	Radwa Moussa-Youssef	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19528380)	Nov 29, 2015
844	N/G	Susan Villarroel	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19528365)	Nov 29, 2015
843	Mr	John McCall	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
842	Me	Brian Stranahan	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19528334)	Nov 29, 2015
841	Mrs	Michelle Gonzalez	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 29, 2015

840	N/G	Ticha Loera	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
839	Ms	Luz De Guzman	Rsncho cucamonga	Ca	View	Nov 29, 2015
838	N/G	Claudia Platts	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
837	N/G	Michael Voelker	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
836	Mrs	Louisa Schweigert	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
835	N/G	Jennifer Posalski	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
834	N/G	Richard Grissom	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
833	Mr	Chris Lewis	Rancho cucamonga	San bernardino	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
832	Ms	Diana Ochoa	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19528119)	Nov 29, 2015
831	N/G	Mark Reel	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
830	N/G	Erica Reel	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
829	N/G	JoAnne Conrad	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19528098)	Nov 29, 2015
828	N/G	marie sonnenfeld	alta loma	san vernarfino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19528095)	Nov 29, 2015
827	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho CUCAMONGA	Ca	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
826	N/G	Erika Durst	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 29, 2015
825	Mr	Steve Lefebvre	Fontana	CA	N/G	Nov 28, 2015
824	N/G	Caryn Kratzer	Fontana	CA	N/G	Nov 27, 2015
823	N/G	Kevin Place	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 27, 2015
822	Mr	Wayne Cox	Rancho cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19524962)	Nov 27, 2015
821	N/G	Stephanie Greer	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 27, 2015
820	Mrs	Myra Bolanos	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 27, 2015
819	N/G	Abdul Chamseddine	Fontana	California	N/G	Nov 27, 2015

818	N/G	Scott Guyson	rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 27, 2015
817	Mrs	Judith Perkins	Alta Loma	Calif	N/G	Nov 27, 2015
816	N/G	David McWilliam	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19524561)	Nov 27, 2015
815	Mr	Tamer Youssef	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19524499)	Nov 27, 2015
814	Ms	Karen Roberts	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 27, 2015
813	Mr	George Ramos	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 26, 2015
812	N/G	Bernie Dickey	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 26, 2015
811	Mr	CHRISTOPHER SNOW	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 26, 2015
810	Mr	Paul Campos	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19519744)	Nov 25, 2015
809	Ms	Deborah Alfaddaghi	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 25, 2015
808	N/G	Doreen Murray	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 25, 2015
807	Mr	Jack Stannard	Rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 25, 2015
806	Ms	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19519460)	Nov 25, 2015
805	N/G	Joshua Centeno	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19519444)	Nov 25, 2015
804	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19519438)	Nov 25, 2015
803	Mr	Michael Floyd	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 25, 2015
802	Mrs	Barbara barcinas	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 25, 2015
801	N/G	Melissa Peres	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 25, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS



Signatures **800 to 751 of 1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
800	Mrs	Cindee Dunlap	RANCHO Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19519291)	Nov 25, 2015
799	N/G	Laura Kurtz	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 24, 2015
798	N/G	Miley Ramirez	Riverside	CALIFORNIA (CA)	N/G	Nov 24, 2015
797	Dr.	Barbara Andrew	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19516119)	Nov 23, 2015
796	MS	Paula Gomez	Ontario	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19514837)	Nov 22, 2015
795	Mr.	Benjamin Cutler	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19513299)	Nov 21, 2015
794	N/G	Robert Clements	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 21, 2015
793	N/G	PATRICIA MCDOWELL	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	California	N/G	Nov 21, 2015
792	Mr	Jesse Golem	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 21, 2015

791	Mr	Robert Watson, Jr	Upland	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19511808)	Nov 21, 2015
790	N/G	Teresa Duncan	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 21, 2015
789	Mrs	Debby Thomas	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19511676)	Nov 20, 2015
788	N/G	Carolyn Krauss	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 20, 2015
787	N/G	Judith Caputo	Rch Cucamonga	CALIFORNIA	N/G	Nov 20, 2015
786	N/G	Sabrina Luboch	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19510773)	Nov 20, 2015
785	Ms	Anne Watson	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 20, 2015
784	Mrs	Lilian Diaz	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19509316)	Nov 20, 2015
783	N/G	Steven Nguyen	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 20, 2015
782	Mr.	Jason Hartfield	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 19, 2015
781	N/G	Karima Ammar	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 19, 2015
780	Mrs	Monica Kuhn	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19509179)	Nov 19, 2015
779	N/G	Kimberly La Hue	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 19, 2015
778	Mr.	John McNally	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 19, 2015
777	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 19, 2015
776	N/G	Rocky Bettar	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19508818)	Nov 19, 2015
775	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 19, 2015
774	Ms	Jennifer Speer	Brownsville	Oregon	N/G	Nov 19, 2015
773	Mrs	Janis Caldwell	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 18, 2015
772	Ms	Judy Vickery	Georgetown	Texas	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19505094)	Nov 18, 2015

771	N/G	Julie Cespedes	Ontario	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19505015)	Nov 18, 2015
770	N/G	Jodi Archer	Cornelius, NC	North Carolina	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19504817)	Nov 18, 2015
769	Mr	Timothy Biby	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 18, 2015
768	N/G	Anonymous	Valley Village	Ca	N/G	Nov 18, 2015
767	Mrs	Gail Werhane	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19503906)	Nov 18, 2015
766	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 15, 2015
765	N/G	Joe Molnar	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 15, 2015
764	Ms	Donnette Osborn	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 15, 2015
763	Ms	Linda Mudry	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19476621)	Nov 14, 2015
762	N/G	Elise enrico	rancho cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19471030)	Nov 14, 2015
761	Mr	James Todd	Lake Worth	Florida	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19468651)	Nov 14, 2015
760	N/G	Denise Van Hill	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 14, 2015
759	N/G	Eneyda Torres	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 14, 2015
758	ms	elizabeth ramirez	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	California	N/G	Nov 14, 2015
757	Mrs	Patricia Brown	Alta loma	CA	N/G	Nov 14, 2015
756	N/G	Anonymous	upland	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19464478)	Nov 14, 2015
755	N/G	Anonymous	Raancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 14, 2015
754	N/G	Tina Langmaack	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19463178)	Nov 14, 2015
753	N/G	Darla Osborn	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 14, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS



Signatures **750** to **701** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
750	N/G	Melissa Hintz	Rancho cucamonga	California	View	Nov 14, 2015
749	Mrs	Melissa Smith	upland	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
748	Mr	Richard Rios	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
747	Mr.	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
746	Mrs	Marisa Kadlec	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19461866)	Nov 13, 2015
745	N/G	Anonymous	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
744	N/G	Anonymous	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
743	Mrs	Kathleen SMITH	Fontana	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
742	Ms	Anonymous	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
741	Mrs.	Jeanne Narmore	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19461749)	Nov 13, 2015
740	Mrs.	Margaret Tellkamp	Thousand Palms	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
739	N/G	Kerri Krewson-Cornett	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015

738	Me	Hugo Valdez	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19461677)	Nov 13, 2015
737	N/G	Anonymous	Alta loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
736	N/G	Christine Ausdemore	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
735	Mr	Anonymous	Alta loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
734	Mr	Anonymous	Alta loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
733	Mrs	Debbie Hunt	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19461481)	Nov 13, 2015
732	Mrs	Alma York	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
731	N/G	Ellen Lien	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
730	N/G	Daniel Rose	CLAREMONT	CALIFORNIA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
729	Mr.	Chris Reep	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
728	Mrs	Wendy Holt	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
727	Mr.	Charles Scaggs	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
726	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
725	N/G	Bill Hanna	Etiwanda	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
724	Mr	Marty Beaver	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19461325)	Nov 13, 2015
723	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
722	Mr	Andres Sanchez	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
721	N/G	Dennis Walker	Fontana	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
720	Mrs	April Moss	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
719	N/G	Pamela Davis	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
718	N/G	Shannon Mead	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19461054)	Nov 13, 2015
717	Mr	Cole Thompson	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19461052)	Nov 13, 2015
716	N/G	Anonymous	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015

715	N/G	Venetta Carter	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
714	Ms	Heather Pasicznyk	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460986)	Nov 13, 2015
713	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460964)	Nov 13, 2015
712	N/G	Karen Beehler	Rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
711	Mrs	Cindy Sanchez	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
710	Mrs	Rochelle Howell	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
709	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
708	N/G	Carolyn Ace-Partridge	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460803)	Nov 13, 2015
707	N/G	Katherine Caldera	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino county	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
706	Ms	Brenda Ray	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
705	mr	ray garcia	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
704	Ms	Anonymous	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
703	Mr	Katie Davis	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
702	Mrs	Sherri Craig	Alta loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460697)	Nov 13, 2015
701	Mr.	derek saenz	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460670)	Nov 13, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS



Signatures **700** to **651** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
700	Mr	Michaelson Creencia	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
699	MS	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
698	N/G	Gloria Loofbourrow	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View	Nov 13, 2015
697	Mr	Gavin Graham	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
696	Mr	Jason Woods	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
695	Mr	Michael Lechner	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460567)	Nov 13, 2015
694	Miss	Nadia Higgins	Alta Loma	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
693	Mrs	Jan Plazola	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
692	Mr.	Austin Reeves	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca.	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
691	N/G	Patricia Longuevan	Ranch Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460528)	Nov 13, 2015
690	N/G	Lael Singleton	RCH CUCAMONGA	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460498)	Nov 13, 2015

689	Ms	Chelsea Delphin	Rancho cucamonga	San bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460482)	Nov 13, 2015
688	N/G	Anonymous	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
687	Mrs	Evelyn Blanks	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
686	Mrs	Anonymous	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460475)	Nov 13, 2015
685	N/G	Scott Tiemann	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
684	Mr	Michael Brown	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
683	Mr	Joseph DeVito	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460465)	Nov 13, 2015
682	N/G	Mike Gorajewski	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
681	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
680	N/G	Anonymous	alta toma	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19460444)	Nov 13, 2015
679	Mr	Lionel Mandrake	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
678	Mr.	John Kent	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 13, 2015
677	mrs	Cindy Mondello	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19459067)	Nov 12, 2015
676	mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 12, 2015
675	mrs	wei song	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 12, 2015
674	mr.	Bruce Noreen	ALTA LOMA	CA	N/G	Nov 12, 2015
673	N/G	Anonymous	Upland	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19458633)	Nov 12, 2015
672	Mrs	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19458529)	Nov 12, 2015
671	Mr	Donald Tausch	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 12, 2015

670	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 12, 2015
669	N/G	Milo Oostinga	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 12, 2015
668	mr	Antonio Ale	Ranch Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19458218)	Nov 12, 2015
667	Mr	Gary Carman	San Bernardino	CA	N/G	Nov 12, 2015
666	ms	ingrid spiteri	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 12, 2015
665	N/G	Sally Jenkins	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19456182)	Nov 12, 2015
664	Mrs	Karla Magana	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 12, 2015
663	N/G	Lizette Garcia	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 11, 2015
662	Mrs	Sylvia Roldan	Alta Loma	CA	View	Nov 11, 2015
661	Mrs	Joyce Guerra	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View	Nov 11, 2015
660	N/G	keith schmedes	alta loma	ca	N/G	Nov 11, 2015
659	Mr	Wes Burns	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454991)	Nov 11, 2015
658	N/G	Adrianna Silva	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454944)	Nov 11, 2015
657	N/G	Daniel Hernandez	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino County	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454391)	Nov 11, 2015
656	N/G	Sabrina Hills	Rancho cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 11, 2015
655	Dr	bruce victor	r cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454382)	Nov 11, 2015
654	Mr	Henry Ose	Ranch Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454256)	Nov 11, 2015
653	mr	Bob Sims	Ranch Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454235)	Nov 11, 2015
652	N/G	Monica Reyes	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 11, 2015
651	ms	shu hunter	Ranch Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454226)	Nov 11, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

 Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS 

Providence Christian

Follow Your Faith & Learn to Lead. A More Complete Christian College!



Signatures **650** to **601** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
650	Ms.	Linda Start	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454173)	Nov 11, 2015
649	mrs	Rosa Alarcon	Etiwanda	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454164)	Nov 11, 2015
648	Mr	John Adams	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19454143)	Nov 11, 2015
647	Ms	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 11, 2015
646	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View	Nov 11, 2015
645	ms	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 11, 2015
644	Mrs.	Susan Brown	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19453918)	Nov 11, 2015
643	N/G	Racquel Hernandez	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19453862)	Nov 11, 2015
642	Mrs.	Nyree shaw	ALTA LOMA	CA - California	N/G	Nov 11, 2015
641	Mr	Dan Griffith	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19453821)	Nov 11, 2015

640	N/G	Anne Baker	Alta Loma	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19453818)	Nov 11, 2015
639	N/G	Patricia Chavez	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19453813)	Nov 11, 2015
638	Mrs	CoCo Stone	alta loma	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19453795)	Nov 11, 2015
637	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 11, 2015
636	N/G	Susan Johnson	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19453733)	Nov 11, 2015
635	Mr	Robert Padilla	Rialto	Ca	N/G	Nov 11, 2015
634	Mr	Travis Hamming	Chino	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452967)	Nov 11, 2015
633	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452929)	Nov 11, 2015
632	N/G	Celia Huston	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
631	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
630	N/G	Tammy Tapia	Rancho Cucamonga	CALIFORNIA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452726)	Nov 10, 2015
629	Mr	William Balas	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452721)	Nov 10, 2015
628	N/G	Mary Robbins	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
627	N/G	Garry Dyson	Azusa	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452710)	Nov 10, 2015
626	Ms	Suzanne Kind	Eastvale	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
625	N/G	Carol Enriquez	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
624	Mrs	Debbie Rohr	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
623	Mr	Erik Steelman	RanchoCucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
622	Mrs	Christine Lomen	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452534)	Nov 10, 2015
621	Mr	Mark Bornais	Alta loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452530)	Nov 10, 2015
620	Mrs	Sharon Hunt	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
619	Mr	Donny Brubaker	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015

618	Mr	Chris Rasmussen	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452442)	Nov 10, 2015
617	Mr	Miguel Medina	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca.,San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
616	Mrs	Heidi Cox	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452431)	Nov 10, 2015
615	Ms	Mary Dineen	Alta Loma	CA - California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
614	N/G	Christine Maitten	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452419)	Nov 10, 2015
613	Mr	Anonymous	Alta loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
612	Mrs	Linda Madeira	Upland	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
611	ms	susan Ma	Ranch Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452371)	Nov 10, 2015
610	Mr	Kevin Fu	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452360)	Nov 10, 2015
609	N/G	Dani Hiltzman	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
608	N/G	Johanna Keeney	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
607	N/G	Lindy Newton	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
606	N/G	Ryan Palomino	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
605	Mrs	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452229)	Nov 10, 2015
604	N/G	Terri Iwatsuru	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino County, Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
603	N/G	Diana Arredondo	Alta Loma	ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
602	N/G	Pam Arterburn	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452146)	Nov 10, 2015
601	Mrs	Victoria Margraff	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS -



Signatures **600** to **551** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
600	N/G	Maria Bivens	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452109)	Nov 10, 2015
599	Ms	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
598	Ms	Janine Dzwonkas	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
597	Mrs	Anonymous	Alta lona	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
596	N/G	Anonymous	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
595	N/G	Deborah Schmitt	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
594	N/G	Anita Palmer	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19452020)	Nov 10, 2015
593	Mrs	Donna Harris	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451988)	Nov 10, 2015
592	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
591	Mrs	Amy Morgan	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
590	Ms	Linda McConnell	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451967)	Nov 10, 2015

589	N/G	Roberta Perea	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451964)	Nov 10, 2015
588	Mrs.	Jeanette Rey	La Verne	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
587	ms	Courtney Essman	Etiwanda	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451949)	Nov 10, 2015
586	Mrs	Karlyn Sweet	Alta Lima	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
585	Mr	Eric Daker	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View	Nov 10, 2015
584	Mr.	Ethan LaFleur	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451845)	Nov 10, 2015
583	Mrs	Susan Boyette	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451803)	Nov 10, 2015
582	N/G	John Hess	Alta loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451788)	Nov 10, 2015
581	Mr	Albert Martinez	Altar Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
580	Mrs	Lisa Martinez	Altar Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
579	N/G	Neal Perry	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451724)	Nov 10, 2015
578	Realtor	Diane C Williams	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451712)	Nov 10, 2015
577	Mrs	Amber Thompson	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
576	Mrs	Cindy Munoz	Alta loma	San Bernadino	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
575	Mr	Alexander Salazar	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
574	Ms	Shannon Peterson	Fontana	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451575)	Nov 10, 2015
573	N/G	Ed Gandara	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451573)	Nov 10, 2015
572	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451550)	Nov 10, 2015
571	N/G	Anonymous	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015

570	Mrs	Ashley Watson	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
569	Mr	Sergio Montelongo Jr	alta loma	ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
568	Mr.	CHRIS MACIAS	Rancho Cucamonga	Calif	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
567	Ms	MARLA DIRKS	Rancho Cucamonga	Calif	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451498)	Nov 10, 2015
566	Mrs	Karen Zinkosky	Alta Loma	CA	View	Nov 10, 2015
565	N/G	Tiffany Crowe	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
564	Mr & Mrs	David & Connie Endter	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451469)	Nov 10, 2015
563	N/G	SHARRON VARGA	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
562	Ms	Diona Santiago	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451462)	Nov 10, 2015
561	Mrs	Linda Zirbes	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
560	Mrs	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
559	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451441)	Nov 10, 2015
558	Ms	Deredith Nagy	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
557	Miss	Abby Thomas	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
556	N/G	Tressy Capps	Fontana	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451422)	Nov 10, 2015
555	N/G	Anonymous	Eastvale	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
554	N/G	David Garcia	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451413)	Nov 10, 2015
553	N/G	Katherine Bergreen	Alta loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451411)	Nov 10, 2015
552	Ms	Heather Givens	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451394)	Nov 10, 2015
551	N/G	Howard Humbles	RCH CUCAMONGA	CA - California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS



Signatures **550** to **501** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
550	Mr	Anonymous	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
549	Mr.	Keith Bolechowski	Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451376)	Nov 10, 2015
548	Ms	Sharon Mitchell	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
547	N/G	Susan Arehart	Alta Loma	CA	View	Nov 10, 2015
546	Mr.	David Vianu	Ranchocucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
545	N/G	Kim Segool-Earl	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451356)	Nov 10, 2015
544	Mrs	Darlene Duran	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
543	N/G	Ron Garman	Alta Loma/Rancho Cucamong	California, San Bernardin	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451323)	Nov 10, 2015
542	Mrs	Anonymous	Alta loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
541	N/G	Jenneen Halladay	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451296)	Nov 10, 2015
540	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
539	Mrs	Jennifer Bernhardt	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
538	Mr.	Ross Wilson	rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015

537	Mrs	Shannon Wilson	rancho cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451277)	Nov 10, 2015
536	Mrs	Miranda Rios	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
535	N/G	Tom Colgan	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
534	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
533	Mrs	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
532	N/G	Janice Arredondo	Redlands	Ca	N/G	Nov 10, 2015
531	mrs	angela neil	rancho cucamonga	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19451054)	Nov 10, 2015
530	Mrs	Tamara Hayes	Alta loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19450999)	Nov 10, 2015
529	Ms	Dianna Musarra	Rancho cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19450574)	Nov 10, 2015
528	N/G	David Scholtz	Rialto	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19450545)	Nov 10, 2015
527	Mrs	Deborah Parkinson	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19450293)	Nov 09, 2015
526	Mr	gene bevacco	rialto	ca	N/G	Nov 09, 2015
525	Mr	Jeff Hubert	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 09, 2015
524	Mrs	Anonymous	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 09, 2015
523	Mrs	Patricia Brown	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 09, 2015
522	N/G	Gary Bowden	ALTA LOMA	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19450019)	Nov 09, 2015
521	Mr	Earnest Yun	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 09, 2015
520	mr	Bret Hope	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19449496)	Nov 09, 2015
519	Mr	Chris Diederich	San Bernardino	CA	N/G	Nov 09, 2015
518	N/G	Dede Ramella	Upland	CA	N/G	Nov 08, 2015
517	Mrs	Leigh Worley	Ontario	CA	N/G	Nov 08, 2015
516	N/G	mike wepplo	rancho cucamonga	california	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19447069)	Nov 08, 2015
515	N/G	Kavitha Harrington	Rancho Cucamong	CA	N/G	Nov 08, 2015

514	N/G	Luis Mir	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19445594)	Nov 08, 2015
513	N/G	Don Ritz	Rancho Santa Margarita	CA	N/G	Nov 08, 2015
512	Mrs	Sharon Monnich	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19443848)	Nov 07, 2015
511	N/G	Allen Brewster	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 07, 2015
510	N/G	jjin k noh	ontario	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19440464)	Nov 07, 2015
509	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19439478)	Nov 07, 2015
508	N/G	Greg Smith	Wildomar	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19438903)	Nov 06, 2015
507	Mr	Mike Henderson	Glendora	Ca	N/G	Nov 06, 2015
506	N/G	vicki novell	monrovia	Ca	N/G	Nov 06, 2015
505	Mr.	Dale Last	Chino Hills	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19438010)	Nov 06, 2015
504	Mr	Andrew Wright	Elk Grove	Sacramento	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19437900)	Nov 06, 2015
503	Mr	Nathan Ben	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19437876)	Nov 06, 2015
502	Mr	Ant Ale	Ranch cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19437835)	Nov 06, 2015
501	Mr	Doug Bow	Ranch cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19437832)	Nov 06, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like **Share** 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

 [Map \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS •



Signatures **500** to **451** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
500	N/G	Dennis Grant	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 06, 2015
499	Mr	Ryan Gotdon	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19437571)	Nov 06, 2015
498	Dr.	Daniel Channell	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19437013)	Nov 06, 2015
497	N/G	Elsa Talavera	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	CA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
496	Mr.	Steven Heise	Upland	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19436854)	Nov 05, 2015
495	N/G	James Anders	Upland	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19436830)	Nov 05, 2015
494	N/G	Dana Keithly	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
493	N/G	Bart Kennedy	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19436629)	Nov 05, 2015
492	N/G	Rian DuRose	Hawthorne	CA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015

491	Mr.	Gerry James	Ponte Vedra Beach	Florida	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19436465)	Nov 05, 2015
490	Mr.	Anonymous	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19436422)	Nov 05, 2015
489	N/G	Anonymous	chino hills	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19436278)	Nov 05, 2015
488	N/G	Eric Teran	Rialto	Ca	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
487	Mr.	David Cagle	Escondido	California	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
486	Mr	Christian Gross	Valley village	Ca	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
485	N/G	Rodney Reynolds	Albuquerque	NM, USA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
484	Mr	Jose Carrillo	Fontana	Ca	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
483	Mr	Kevin Quinton	Syracuse	NY	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
482	Mr	Fred Fautkner	BAKERSFIELD	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435856)	Nov 05, 2015
481	N/G	cory rains	okc	ok	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
480	Mr	Daniel Kelley	Corona	Ca	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
479	Mr	Beryl Dagy	Carlsbad	Ca	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
478	N/G	Paul Stillwell	Laguna Niguel	CA - California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435804)	Nov 05, 2015
477	Mr	Parvveen Joshi	Fontana	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435803)	Nov 05, 2015
476	Ms	Erica Floyd	Corona	CA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
475	N/G	Craig Olsen	Palm Desert	Ca	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
474	Mr	Sue Chang	Ranch cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435763)	Nov 05, 2015
473	mr.	mike gross	ontario	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435759)	Nov 05, 2015
472	N/G	Siddharth Malik	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435756)	Nov 05, 2015
471	N/G	Anonymous	Ontario	Ca	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
470	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435737)	Nov 05, 2015

469	ms	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
468	N/G	Tom Kennedy	Modesto	CA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
467	Mr	Larry Gibson	Albuquerque	New Mexico	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435723)	Nov 05, 2015
466	Mr	Robert Collins	ORANGE	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435708)	Nov 05, 2015
465	Mr	Jeff Santolucito	Upland	CA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
464	N/G	Mark Neveu	Escondido	CA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
463	mr	Abba Kader	Grand Terrace	California	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
462	N/G	Lakha Wahla	Alta loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435686)	Nov 05, 2015
461	Mr	Robert Valdes	El Centro	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435679)	Nov 05, 2015
460	N/G	Adam Braley	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435673)	Nov 05, 2015
459	Mr	Anonymous	Marina del Rey	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435669)	Nov 05, 2015
458	N/G	Rosie Torres	Fontana	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435667)	Nov 05, 2015
457	Mr	Curt McPherson	La Verne	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435665)	Nov 05, 2015
456	N/G	Larry Van Aalst	Brush Prairie	WA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
455	N/G	Tyler Cross	Fontana	CA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
454	N/G	Jon Bratta	Corona	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435657)	Nov 05, 2015
453	N/G	Marlise Avina	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19435649)	Nov 05, 2015
452	N/G	Tyler Coates	Denver	CO	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
451	Mr	Brad Bender	Joliet	IL	N/G	Nov 05, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS



The Audi A3 e-tron®.
 Plug in and take names.
 WaltersAudi.com



Signatures 450 to 401 of 1014

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
450	Mr	Jack Adams	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19435587)	Nov 05, 2015
449	N/G	Mark Bluethman	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19435482)	Nov 05, 2015
448	N/G	Boyd Moore	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
447	Mr	Trevor Pate	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
446	Mr.	Carl Torres	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 05, 2015
445	mr	robert pace	alta loma	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19435002)	Nov 05, 2015
444	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Palos Verdes	California	N/G	Nov 04, 2015
443	Mr	Ravi Thuraisingham	Los Angeles	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19434963)	Nov 04, 2015
442	Ms	Pamela Johnson	Alta loma	Calif	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19434915)	Nov 04, 2015

441	Mr.	Christian Guynes	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19434393)	Nov 04, 2015
440	N/G	Eric Moua	Ontario	Ca	N/G	Nov 04, 2015
439	Ms	lisa Song	Ontoraio	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19434130)	Nov 04, 2015
438	N/G	Brd Stuit	Fontana	CA	N/G	Nov 04, 2015
437	Mr	Scott Zbinden	R CUCAMONGA	San Bernardino	N/G	Nov 04, 2015
436	Mr	Gary Jones	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19434016)	Nov 04, 2015
435	Dr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19433612)	Nov 04, 2015
434	ms	Anonymous	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 03, 2015
433	mr	Anonymous	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 03, 2015
432	mr	Anonymous	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 03, 2015
431	N/G	Andrew Schile	Fontana	Ca	N/G	Nov 03, 2015
430	Ms	Jenna Bell	LaVerne	CA	N/G	Nov 03, 2015
429	Mr.	Tom Higgins	Upland	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19432712)	Nov 03, 2015
428	N/G	Dianne Martinez	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 03, 2015
427	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19432430)	Nov 03, 2015
426	MR	Lance Faanes	Oceanside	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19432348)	Nov 03, 2015
425	mr	scott shaw	upland	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19432334)	Nov 03, 2015
424	Ms	Susan Duran	Ontario	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19431568)	Nov 03, 2015
423	ms	Nikki Vanderkallen	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Nov 03, 2015
422	N/G	crazy rick	yorba linda	California	N/G	Nov 02, 2015

421	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19431026)	Nov 02, 2015
420	N/G	Mario Teran	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19430937)	Nov 02, 2015
419	Ms	Hong Zhang	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19430838)	Nov 02, 2015
418	N/G	Robert Harrington	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 02, 2015
417	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19430568)	Nov 02, 2015
416	Ms	Maya Bhat	Claremont	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19430534)	Nov 02, 2015
415	Dr	Y. Tony Song	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19430437)	Nov 02, 2015
414	N/G	Gustavo saldivar	rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 02, 2015
413	Mr.	Philip Browning	San Bernardino	California	N/G	Nov 02, 2015
412	N/G	cheryl timmons	Rancho cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19428843)	Nov 02, 2015
411	Mrs	Sharifa Raspe	Fontana	Ca	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
410	N/G	Ryan Steely	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
409	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
408	Mrs	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19428699)	Nov 01, 2015
407	N/G	Jeffrey Ehrnman	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19428594)	Nov 01, 2015
406	Mr	Thomas Scarpelli	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19428572)	Nov 01, 2015
405	Dr.	Teresa Hull	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19428566)	Nov 01, 2015
404	N/G	Bonnie Weist	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Nov 01, 2015

403	Dr.	gurbinder sadana	pomona	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19428516)	Nov 01, 2015
402	Dr.	John Hull	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19428488)	Nov 01, 2015
401	Mrs.	Connie Crawford	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Nov 01, 2015

[< \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)
[Previous \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page11.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page11.html)
[1 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)
[2 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page2.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page2.html)
[3 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page3.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page3.html)
[4 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page4.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page4.html)
[5 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page5.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page5.html)
[6 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page6.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page6.html)
[7 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page7.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page7.html)
[8 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page8.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page8.html)
[9 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page9.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page9.html)
[10 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page10.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page10.html)
[11 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page11.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page11.html) **12**
[Next \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page13.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page13.html)
[> \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page20.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page20.html)

- N/G - not given by the signer
- N/C - field not collected by the author
- S/C/P - State, County or Province
- View - mouseover to view comment
- Dates displayed in the signature list are based on CST (GMT-6) and CDT (GMT-5)
- Anonymous signatures signify people who have chosen not to display their names publicly [?]
- A comment in red indicates that the signer has hidden their comment from public view. [?]

- [Sign Petition \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/sign.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/sign.html)
- [View Petition \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)
- [Map \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html) [Tell \(/tell.php?petid=75675\)](/tell.php?petid=75675)
- [Banners \(/bannerspage.php?petid=75675#banners\)](/bannerspage.php?petid=75675#banners) [Bookmark](#) [Tip Jar \(/one-off-sponsorship.php\)](/one-off-sponsorship.php)
- [Sponsor \(/sigreceipt.php?petid=75675\)](/sigreceipt.php?petid=75675)

I Hate Social Security

Born before 1969? You can get an extra \$4,098 monthly with this



GoPetition

Help

Social

Newsletter updates

[Home \(/\)](#)

[Help \(FAQ\) \(/help.php\)](/help.php)

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS



Signatures 400 to 351 of 1014

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
400	N/G	Brittany Griffin	Claremont	CA	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
399	N/G	Jaime Alvarez	Pomona	CA	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
398	Mr.	David Kirshbaum	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19428291)	Nov 01, 2015
397	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
396	Mr	Anonymous	Upland	Ca	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
395	Mr	Anonymous	San Dimas	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19428126)	Nov 01, 2015
394	Ms	LIN ALBERTI	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19428101)	Nov 01, 2015
393	N/G	Bob Sallis	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19428085)	Nov 01, 2015
392	Mr.	Michael Jones	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
391	N/G	Ramon Vicente	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
390	Mr.	Gregg Hoyle	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19428043)	Nov 01, 2015

389	N/G	Bob Redick	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19428037)	Nov 01, 2015
388	N/G	Patrick Myers	Portland	Oregon	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
387	Ms	Diana Greenwood	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
386	Mr	Edward Knuff	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
385	N/G	Wanda Knight	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19427884)	Nov 01, 2015
384	Mr	Matthew Young	Rancho Cucamonga	CALIFORNIA	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
383	Mr	monroe lair	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19427845)	Nov 01, 2015
382	Mr.	Raul Acuña	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
381	Mr	Steve Gomez	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19427717)	Nov 01, 2015
380	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Nov 01, 2015
379	Mr	Matthew Munson	ONTARIO	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19427434)	Nov 01, 2015
378	Mr	Steve Bal	Rancho Cucamonga	CA, San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19427431)	Nov 01, 2015
377	N/G	Elaine Eoff	San Clemente	California	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
376	Mr	Anonymous	Ontario	Ca	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
375	N/G	Tom Palzer	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19427281)	Oct 31, 2015
374	Mr.	Bradford McColl	Alta aLoma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19427227)	Oct 31, 2015
373	Mr	Erik Gonzales	Fontana	Ca	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
372	N/G	Brian Barajas	san bernardino	san bernardino	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
371	N/G	Anthony Gambale	Corona	Ca	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
370	N/G	Brett Smith	Upland	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19427110)	Oct 31, 2015

369	mr	michael ellis	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
368	N/G	Renee scalise	Ontario	california	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
367	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
366	N/G	Ashlee Love	hesperia	ca	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
365	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
364	N/G	Nikki Gabany	Alta Loma	San Bernardino County	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
363	N/G	Kristina Davis	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
362	Mrs.	Amberleigh Burns	1102	California	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
361	mr	Eric Bridgewater	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
360	Mr	Frank O'Farrell	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
359	Ms	Diane Robbins	Ontario	California	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
358	N/G	Joseph Smith	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19426763)	Oct 31, 2015
357	mR	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 31, 2015
356	N/G	Karen Davis	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View	Oct 31, 2015
355	N/G	kris brackmann	claremont	ca	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
354	Mr.	Anonymous	Claremont	California	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
353	N/G	Anonymous	Alta loma	ca	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
352	Mrs.	Maria McCullough	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
351	N/G	Jesus Madrid	Pico Rivera	CA	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19425819)	Oct 30, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS

View New Inventory View Vehicle Specials





16 Mercedes-Benz Metris Cargo Van
\$33,950
[Get ePrice](#)



16 Mercedes-Benz Metris Cargo Van
\$33,233
[Get ePrice](#)

Signatures 350 to 301 of 1014

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
350	Mr	Robert Solano	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
349	N/G	Rudolph Vera	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19425791)	Oct 30, 2015
348	N/G	Lisa Meyer	Fontana	CA	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
347	Ms	Traci Meyer	Fontana	California	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
346	Mr	Michael Padden	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
345	Mr.	Austin Melody	Claremont	CA	View	Oct 30, 2015
344	N/G	Kelly Ransom	Claremont	CA	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
343	N/G	Anonymous	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	CA	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
342	N/G	Minnie Talton	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
341	N/G	Anonymous	rancho Cucamonga	san bernardino	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
340	Mr	Anonymous	Highland	San Bernardino	N/G	Oct 30, 2015
339	mr	dennis butler	rancho cucamonga	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19423828)	Oct 29, 2015

338	mr	donald dlugos	rancho cucamonga	ca	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19423771)	Oct 29, 2015
337	Mrs	Michelle Westlake	Central Point	Oregon	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
336	N/G	Anonymous	Alta loma	CA	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
335	N/G	Suzette Smith	Etiwanda	Ca	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19423508)	Oct 29, 2015
334	mrs	lauren terrazas	alta loma	ca	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
333	Mr	Allan Grant	Riverside	CA	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
332	N/G	Matthew Schliebe	Buena Park	CA	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
331	Mrs	Janelle Lane	Fontana	CA	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
330	Mr	David Block	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
329	Mr	Jaime Bedolla	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
328	N/G	Lauren Eaker	Fontana	CA	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
327	N/G	Lauren Gaskill	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19423273)	Oct 29, 2015
326	Mr	Anonymous	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
325	Mr	Richard Clark	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19423093)	Oct 29, 2015
324	N/G	Matthew Benson	Santa Monica	California	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
323	N/G	Eric Smutko	Los Angeles	California	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
322	Mr.	Samuel Perez	Los Angeles	CA	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
321	Mrs	Cori waller	rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
320	Mr	matthew waller	rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
319	MR	Kevin Genchi	Upland	California	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19422767)	Oct 29, 2015
318	N/G	Linda Fuentes	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
317	N/G	Carla Jager	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
316	Mrs	Kendy Arellanos	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Oct 29, 2015
315	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonmga	CA	N/G	Oct 28, 2015

314	N/G	Kevin Bae	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
313	Mrs	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
312	ms	sandy meza	rancho cuxamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
311	Mrs.	Nancy Hamper	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19421709)	Oct 28, 2015
310	Ms	Colleen Kearns	Sn Bernardino	Ca	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
309	Mrs	Kelli Myers	Rancho Cucamonga	California (CA)	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
308	mr	rick solano	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
307	N/G	Jeffery Vandermate	Rancho cucamonga	CA - California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19421094)	Oct 28, 2015
306	Ms	Kelly Teague	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19420867)	Oct 28, 2015
305	N/G	Celeste Messina	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
304	Mrs	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
303	N/G	Gabe Gonzalez	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
302	N/G	Jonathan Davis	Riverside	California	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
301	mr	eric johnson	long beach	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19420706)	Oct 28, 2015

- [« \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)
- [Previous \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page13.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page13.html)
- [3 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page3.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page3.html)
- [4 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page4.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page4.html)
- [5 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page5.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page5.html) ..
- [7 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page7.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page7.html) -
- [11 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page11.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page11.html)
- [12 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page12.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page12.html)
- [13 \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page13.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page13.html) **14**
- [Next \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page15.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page15.html)
- [> \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page20.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures-page20.html)

- N/G - not given by the signer
- N/C - field not collected by the author

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Search sigs by last name

Go

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS



Signatures 300 to 251 of 1014

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
300	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
299	N/G	Patrick Neilon	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19420252)	Oct 28, 2015
298	N/G	Jason Hackerd	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
297	Mr.	Anonymous	Chino	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19420201)	Oct 28, 2015
296	N/G	Linda Brook	Chino Hills	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19420041)	Oct 28, 2015
295	mr	derek partin	williamstown	New Jersey	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19420004)	Oct 28, 2015
294	MR	Luis Batson	Bellflower	Ca	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
293	Mrs	Sheri Jones	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 28, 2015
292	N/G	Anonymous	Fountain Valley	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19419190)	Oct 28, 2015
291	Mr.	Jon Simmons	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 28, 2015

290	Mr	Michael Fletcher	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
289	Mr	Naoki Sato	Riverside	Ca	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
288	N/G	Beau fournier	fontana	california	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19419125)	Oct 27, 2015
287	N/G	Ly Kou	Ontario	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19419047)	Oct 27, 2015
286	Mr	David Riley	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19419045)	Oct 27, 2015
285	Mr	Anonymous	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
284	Mrs	Susana Carretero	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418981)	Oct 27, 2015
283	Mr	Mario Merandi	Citrus heights	Ca	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
282	N/G	Anonymous	Ontario	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
281	Ms	Diane Atherton	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418926)	Oct 27, 2015
280	Ms	Anonymous	Ontario	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
279	N/G	JUDY MAY	LA QUINTA	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
278	Mrs.	Patricia Homan	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418817)	Oct 27, 2015
277	Mr	Dean Jarvis	Knoxville	Tennessee	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418788)	Oct 27, 2015
276	N/G	Jaclyn Parslow	Fontana	California	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
275	N/G	Rhonda King	Temecula	California	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
274	N/G	James Harvey	Ranco Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
273	MR	DEAN MADISON	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418751)	Oct 27, 2015
272	Mr	Dale Lepper	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
271	Mrs.	Darlinda Nuby	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
270	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
269	Mr.	Justin Johnson	Alta Loma	CALIFORNIA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418686)	Oct 27, 2015

268	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
267	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418603)	Oct 27, 2015
266	Mrs	Elizabeth Prouty	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
265	N/G	Tony Visconti	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
264	N/G	Jennifer Ewing	Alta loma	Ca	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
263	N/G	Elizabeth A Allerton	Etiwanda	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418576)	Oct 27, 2015
262	N/G	Eric Glenn	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
261	Ms	Grace Pruett	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	California	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
260	Mr	Boris Chung	Anaheim	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
259	N/G	JOHN JAMERSON	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418546)	Oct 27, 2015
258	Mr	Ralph Sanchez	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
257	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
256	mr	chad Center	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418272)	Oct 27, 2015
255	Mrs	Deloris Faheem	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19418143)	Oct 27, 2015
254	mr.	Anonymous	alta loma	ca	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
253	N/G	Joseph luzzini	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 27, 2015
252	Mr	Bill Davis	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19417261)	Oct 27, 2015
251	Mrs	Annette Smith	Upland	Ca	N/G	Oct 27, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS



Signatures 250 to 201 of 1014

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
250	Mr	Brent Miller	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19417075)	Oct 26, 2015
249	N/G	Teresa Miller	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19417027)	Oct 26, 2015
248	N/G	Anonymous	Ontario	CA	N/G	Oct 26, 2015
247	Mr	Scott Brown	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19416840)	Oct 26, 2015
246	Mr	Frank Franov	Upland	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19416823)	Oct 26, 2015
245	mr	carlos vega	rancho cucamonga	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19416397)	Oct 26, 2015
244	Mr	Dale Sumner	Upland	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19416368)	Oct 26, 2015
243	N/G	Brett Mcmillan	Oak hills	California	N/G	Oct 26, 2015
242	N/G	Jeremy Miller	Corona	CA	N/G	Oct 26, 2015
241	Mr	Ryan Miller	Fontana	California	N/G	Oct 26, 2015
240	Mr	Aaron Miller	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 26, 2015

239	Mrs	Bog Kim	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 26, 2015
238	N/G	Nathan Wu	Walnut	CA	View	Oct 26, 2015
237	N/G	Marianne Edralin	Walnut	CA	N/G	Oct 25, 2015
236	N/G	Aaron Edralin	Walnut	CA	N/G	Oct 25, 2015
235	Mr	Chuck Stidham	Corona	Ca	N/G	Oct 25, 2015
234	Ms	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 25, 2015
233	N/G	Edward Kim	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 25, 2015
232	N/G	Beryl Rose	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19414070)	Oct 25, 2015
231	Mr	Justin Farrell	Diamond Bar	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19414058)	Oct 25, 2015
230	Ms	Gina Farrell	Diamond Bar	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19414050)	Oct 25, 2015
229	Mr	Anonymous	Diamond Bar	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19414044)	Oct 25, 2015
228	N/G	Stephan Lee	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 25, 2015
227	Mrs	Bernadette Duncan	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19413746)	Oct 25, 2015
226	Mr	Peter Merandi	Corona	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19413726)	Oct 25, 2015
225	Mr	Terrence McHatten	pomona	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19413633)	Oct 25, 2015
224	Mr	Ray Baker	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19413614)	Oct 25, 2015
223	N/G	John Haigh	Upland	San Bernardino County	N/G	Oct 25, 2015
222	Mrs	Lisa Baker	Alta Loma	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19413555)	Oct 25, 2015
221	Mr	David Bedell	Claremont	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19412394)	Oct 24, 2015

220	N/G	Kathleen Sell	Ranch Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
219	Mr	Ronald Redmond	Inglewood	California	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
218	Mr	Daniel Fitzgerald	Rancho cucamonga	San bernardino	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19412151)	Oct 24, 2015
217	Dr	Thomas Radi	Claremont	Ca	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19412149)	Oct 24, 2015
216	mr	steve ryan	diamond bar	ca	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
215	Mr.	Michael Huston	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19412080)	Oct 24, 2015
214	Mr	Gary Soper	Lake Elsinore	Ca	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
213	Dr	Renee Pigeon	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19412009)	Oct 24, 2015
212	mr	ira kwatcher	claremont	ca	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
211	Mr	Anonymous	Upland	California	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
210	N/G	Stuart Schwartz	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
209	Mr	Jordan Martino	San Bernardino	Ca	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19411922)	Oct 24, 2015
208	N/G	Brian Musashi	Ontario	Ca	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19411705)	Oct 24, 2015
207	N/G	Arnold Lopez	Fontana	California	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
206	Mrs	Laura Rosales	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
205	Mr	Michael Weedall	Alta loma	Ca	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
204	N/G	Cynthia Kresch	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
203	Mr	David McClenton	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19410792)	Oct 24, 2015
202	Mrs	Kim McGinty	Alta Loma	ca	N/G	Oct 24, 2015
201	Ms	Beatriz Calixto	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition- comment.php? cid=19410711)	Oct 23, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

[Map \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html\)](/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

[RSS](#)



Hilton New Orleans Riverside

Book now in New Orleans!

hilton.com

Signatures **200** to **151** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
200	N/G	Anonymous	San Francisco	Ca	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
199	Mr.	Tom Rheiner	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19410673)	Oct 23, 2015
198	N/G	Matthew DeMeyer	Tustin	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19410623)	Oct 23, 2015
197	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
196	Ms	Holly Bagdasarian	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
195	Dr	Christevan Sihotang	Riverside	CA	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
194	Mrs	Jolene Fox	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19410462)	Oct 23, 2015
193	N/G	Anonymous	alta loma	CA	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
192	Mr.	Walter McBeth	Ranchop Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
191	Mr	Eric Sell	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19410447)	Oct 23, 2015
190	Ms	Anne Watson	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 23, 2015

189	N/G	Roseann Dugic	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19410403)	Oct 23, 2015
188	Mrs	Maria Quimpo	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
187	Dr.	Alex Martin	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
186	N/G	Pamela Watson	Alta Loma	California (CA)	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
185	N/G	Gregory Beehler	Fontana	San bernardino	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
184	Mrs.	Nancy McBeth	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19410328)	Oct 23, 2015
183	Mr	Matthew Scola	Ontario	CA	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
182	N/G	Elizabeth Sell	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
181	Mr.	Dana Cartney	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
180	Me	David Hontz	Upland	San Bernardino	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
179	MS	Georgian Sawyer	Upland	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19410110)	Oct 23, 2015
178	Mr	Leonel Artola	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
177	Ms	Lisa Pineda	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
176	Ms	Margaret Silas	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19410051)	Oct 23, 2015
175	N/G	Veronica Rodriguez	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View	Oct 23, 2015
174	N/G	Jan Kishbaugh-hurley	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19409846)	Oct 23, 2015
173	Mrs	Nicole Gonzales	Fontana	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19409813)	Oct 23, 2015
172	N/G	Dawn Gambale	Corona	Ca	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
171	N/G	Kathleen Bennett	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
170	Ms	Tori Campbell	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
169	mr	Joel Duprey	Ontario	CA	N/G	Oct 23, 2015

168	Mr	Tom Hill	Upland	Ca	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
167	Dr.	Ramon Medina-Cue	San Jose	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19409199)	Oct 23, 2015
166	N/G	Marissa serna	Fontana	ca	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
165	mrs	dee sarratt	rancho cucamonga	ca.	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
164	Mrs	Natalie Sanchez	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Oct 23, 2015
163	N/G	chris Stallard	rancho cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
162	Mrs	Christy Eimen	Alta Loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19409094)	Oct 22, 2015
161	N/G	Susan Jones	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19409093)	Oct 22, 2015
160	N/G	Carol Nichols	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
159	Ms	Heather O'Donovan	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
158	Mrs	kaThryn fabos	ranCho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
157	Mrs	Lorri Porter	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
156	N/G	Daniel Villarroel	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
155	N/G	Shelley vess	Rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
154	Mrss	Kimberly La Hue	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
153	N/G	Diane Long	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
152	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
151	N/G	Cary Martin	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Oct 22, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS

Start Download Now

Convert From Doc to PDF, PDF to Doc Simply With The Free On-line Appl

Signatures 150 to 101 of 1014

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
150	N/G	Autumn mattner	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
149	Ms	Sara Yeh	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19409061)	Oct 22, 2015
148	N/G	Cassi Warner	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
147	Mr.	Joshua Marsh	Upland	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
146	N/G	Jeannette Toomey	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
145	Mr	Scott Campbell	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
144	Mr	Randy Johnston	Ontario	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
143	Mr	arthur drumwright	San Bernardino	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19409034)	Oct 22, 2015
142	Mr	Dominic Spezialy	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
141	N/G	Raeann Stevens	Ontario	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
140	N/G	Nancy Turnage	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 22, 2015

139	N/G	Dean Bennett	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19408977)	Oct 22, 2015
138	Mrs	Shelly Constant	Fontana	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
137	Mrs.	Jessica Haigh	Upland	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
136	N/G	Jason Mcginty	Alta Loma	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19408897)	Oct 22, 2015
135	mrs	leeann blakemore	upland	LA	View	Oct 22, 2015
134	Mr	Taylor Emerick	Edwardsville	IL	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
133	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
132	N/G	Hwasoo Lee	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
131	N/G	David Boughton	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19408619)	Oct 22, 2015
130	N/G	Daniel Salazar	Rancho cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19408568)	Oct 22, 2015
129	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
128	Ms	Dana Mayer	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19408415)	Oct 22, 2015
127	N/G	Bill Paringer	Claremont	CA	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
126	N/G	Anonymous	Upland	CA	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
125	N/G	kristi snyder	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
124	Mrs.	Nancy Barahona	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
123	N/G	ricardo alvarez	upland	ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
122	ms	Dianne Manna Manna	Upland	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19407932)	Oct 22, 2015
121	Mr.	Cary Wanner	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19407644)	Oct 22, 2015
120	N/G	Richard Coriary	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
119	N/G	Carlos Nava	Rancho Cucamonga	San bernardino	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
118	Me	Jeff Westfall	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19407580)	Oct 22, 2015

117	N/G	Shawn Miller	Ontario	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
116	Mr	Michael Fabian	Boardman	Ohio	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19407227)	Oct 22, 2015
115	Mrs	Bonnie zeledon	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19407087)	Oct 22, 2015
114	Ms	Sylvia Pimentel	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
113	N/G	Brett Hutchison	Corona	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
112	Ms	Anonymous	Alta Loma	California	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
111	N/G	kasey oneill	rancho cucamonga	san bernardino	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
110	Mr	David Becker	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 22, 2015
109	MR	Gregory Mulligan	Lake Arrowhead	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19406965)	Oct 22, 2015
108	Mrs	Dina Anderson	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
107	Mrs.	Darla Farrell	Diamond Bar	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19406949)	Oct 21, 2015
106	N/G	Candace Benson	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
105	mr	joseph hartline	upland	California	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
104	N/G	Cathy Allan	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19406842)	Oct 21, 2015
103	Ms	Marilyn Lobreto	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
102	Mr	Graham Labarge	Rancho cucamonga	Ca. San bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19406772)	Oct 21, 2015
101	Mr	Craig Olson	rancho cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19406764)	Oct 21, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

Map (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html)

RSS -

Start Download Now

Convert From Doc to PDF, PDF to Doc Simply With The Free On-line App!

Signatures **100** to **51** of **1014**

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
100	Mrs	Susan Tellkamp	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
99	Mr	Paul Gonzales	Fontana	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406683)	Oct 21, 2015
98	Ms	Sheila Dill	rancho cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
97	N/G	Maria Velasco	Fontana	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
96	mrs	erika johnson	rialto	ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
95	Mr	Gus Arredondo	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406513)	Oct 21, 2015
94	Mr	Tommy Hudspeth	Alta Loma	Ca, San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406486)	Oct 21, 2015
93	Mr	Donald Mowery	Upland	San Bernardino	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
92	Mr	Robert Donohue	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
91	Mrs	Melissa Hurley	Alta Loma	CA	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
90	Mr	Joe Gasparin	Etiwanda	california	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406432)	Oct 21, 2015

89	Mr	Roger Chen	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406430)	Oct 21, 2015
88	N/G	burton Tashman	upland	ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
87	Mr	Edward Kuethen	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View	Oct 21, 2015
86	N/G	Tom Del Priore	Fontana	CA	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
85	N/G	Gail Denkers	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
84	Mr	John Elliott	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406350)	Oct 21, 2015
83	Mr	John Rudow	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
82	Mr	Neil Gerard	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406335)	Oct 21, 2015
81	Ms	Dixie Anderson	Upland	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
80	Mr	Paul Anker	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
79	Mrs	Cheri Tschoepe	Rancho cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
78	Mr	Howard Humbles	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
77	N/G	Karen Bruggeman	Alta loma	CA	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
76	Dr	Anonymous	Rancho cucomonga	CA	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
75	N/G	Salky l'Farrell	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406191)	Oct 21, 2015
74	N/G	Kenneth Landkammer	Rancho Cucamonga	ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
73	Mrs	Bernice McGree	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
72	Mrs	Cheryl Balogh	Upland	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406153)	Oct 21, 2015
71	Mr.	Gamal Guirges	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid-19406138)	Oct 21, 2015
70	N/G	Anonymous	Alta loma	California	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
69	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 21, 2015

68	N/G	Craig Chastain	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
67	N/G	Jeff Anderson	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
66	N/G	Philip Paleg	Upland	California	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
65	N/G	Rawlee Genchi	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19405844)	Oct 21, 2015
64	Mr.	Brandon Brook	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19405842)	Oct 21, 2015
63	Mr	Jason Logan	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
62	N/G	Jerry Fenning	Upland	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19405769)	Oct 21, 2015
61	N/G	Anonymous	Tucson	Az	View	Oct 21, 2015
60	N/G	Ally Zheng	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
59	Mrs	Kaylene Sihotang	Riverside	Ca	N/G	Oct 21, 2015
58	N/G	andrew manna	Upland	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19405460)	Oct 21, 2015
57	mrs	claudia manna	Upland	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19405454)	Oct 21, 2015
56	mr	andrew manna	Upland	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19405452)	Oct 21, 2015
55	N/G	Bill Daub	Claremont	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19405404)	Oct 21, 2015
54	N/G	Aung Wun	Fontana	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19404478)	Oct 20, 2015
53	N/G	Dorothy Klepp	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 20, 2015
52	Mrs.	Rhonda McKinnon	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19404358)	Oct 20, 2015
51	Mr.	Willie Jordan	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19404058)	Oct 20, 2015

Save Empire Lakes Golf Course (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html)

This petition (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html) was published by Save Empire Lakes on Oct 14, 2015

Like Share 0

Public Signature List (/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signatures.html)

[Map \(/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course/signature-map.html\)](#)

[RSS](#)

View New Inventory View Vehicle Specials

walter's AUTOMOTIVE
SPRINTER



16 Mercedes-Benz Metris Passenger Van
\$43,465
[Get ePrice](#)



16 Mercedes-Benz Metris Passenger Van
\$43,695
[Get ePrice](#)

Signatures 50 to 1 of 1014

#	Title	Name	Town/City	S/C/P	Comment	Date
50	Mr	John McKinnon	Upland	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19403994)	Oct 20, 2015
49	Mr.	Gary Basrajian	Crestline	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19403964)	Oct 20, 2015
48	Mr	Eric Evans	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19403960)	Oct 20, 2015
47	N/G	Alexandra Kasenda	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 20, 2015
46	Mrs.	Jill Bastajian	Crestline	Ca	N/G	Oct 20, 2015
45	N/G	Ernest Landeros	Rialto	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19403473)	Oct 20, 2015
44	Mr	Anonymous	Cedar city	Utah	View	Oct 20, 2015
43	N/G	Frederick Kasenda	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 20, 2015
42	Mrs.	Isabel Low	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19402813)	Oct 20, 2015
41	Ms.	Mary Horsley	Yorba Linda	CA	View	Oct 19, 2015
40	N/G	Jeff Kim	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 19, 2015

39	N/G	Mochael Baum	Corona	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19399866)	Oct 18, 2015
38	N/G	John Klempner	Rancho Cucamonga	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19399306)	Oct 18, 2015
37	N/G	Adrian Sabater	Newport Beach	CA	N/G	Oct 18, 2015
36	N/G	mel Marcum	Eugene	Oregon	N/G	Oct 18, 2015
35	Mr.	Greg Barnhart	Upland	Ca	N/G	Oct 18, 2015
34	Mr	Anonymous	Upland	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19398734)	Oct 18, 2015
33	N/G	Anonymous	Claremont	California	N/G	Oct 18, 2015
32	N/G	Jeff Fobel	Fishers	IN	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19398565)	Oct 18, 2015
31	N/G	Kevin Quinn	alta Loma	CA	N/G	Oct 18, 2015
30	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 18, 2015
29	Mr	Anonymous	Grand junction	Co	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19398130)	Oct 17, 2015
28	N/G	John Pickering	Alta Loma	Ca	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
27	N/G	Anonymous	Upland	California	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
26	Mr	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19397673)	Oct 17, 2015
25	N/G	Jacob Williams	Fontana	California	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
24	N/G	Matthew Chalew	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
23	mr	mikal abduallah	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
22	N/G	Anonymous	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
21	N/G	Zachary Williams	Rialto	CA	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
20	N/G	Tammy Proulx	Rancho Cucamonga	California	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
19	N/G	Ingrid Van Valkenburg	Portland	OR	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
18	N/G	Jane Clemens	I'm Alta Lima	Calufornia	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
17	Mr	Dietmar Beulke	Friedrichshafen	Germany	N/G	Oct 17, 2015
16	Mr	Michael Marcum	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19396455)	Oct 16, 2015

15	N/G	Wanda Courey	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19396430)	Oct 16, 2015
14	N/G	Myung Marcum	Rancho Cucamonga	San Bernardino	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19396425)	Oct 16, 2015
13	Mrs	Patricia Padden	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19396371)	Oct 16, 2015
12	Mrs	Jeanette Reyjdrey2@gmail.com	La Verne	Los Angeles	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19396364)	Oct 16, 2015
11	N/G	Malvin Velasco	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	N/G	Oct 16, 2015
10	Mr	Joel Nash	Redlands	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19396333)	Oct 16, 2015
9	Ms.	Nancy Guirges	Rancho Cucamong	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19396329)	Oct 16, 2015
8	N/G	russ bauman	alta loma	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19396327)	Oct 16, 2015
7	Mrs	Erin Decker	Rancho Cucamonga	Ca	N/G	Oct 16, 2015
6	Mr	F. Mulvey	Ontario	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19391759)	Oct 14, 2015
5	N/G	Ryan Kelley	San Diego	CA	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19391543)	Oct 14, 2015
4	Mr	Dan Smith	Upland	California	N/G	Oct 14, 2015
3	N/G	Wayne Altman	Fontana	California	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19390970)	Oct 14, 2015
2	Mr	David Morton	Cucamonga	Ca	View (/petition-comment.php?cid=19390912)	Oct 14, 2015
1	N/G	Steve rush	rancho cucamongA	ca	N/G	Oct 14, 2015

METROLINK.

Southern California Regional Rail Authority

December 24, 2015

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

Michael Smith
City of Rancho Cucamonga Planning Department
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

JAN 05 2016

RECEIVED - PLANNING

RE: **Empire Lakes/Rancho Cucamonga Industrial Area Specific Plan Amendment Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)**

Dear Mr. Smith:

The Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) has received the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Empire Lakes/Rancho Cucamonga Industrial Area Specific Plan Amendment DEIR. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on key issues relative to SCRRA and operations of the railroad adjacent to the project site. As background information, SCRRA is a five-county Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that operates the regional commuter rail system known as Metrolink. Additionally, SCRRA provides rail engineering, construction, operations and maintenance services to its five JPA member agencies. The JPA consists of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (METRO), San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) and Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC).

The railroad right of way portion adjacent to the proposed project is operated and maintained by SCRRA and owned by SANBAG. The proposed Empire Lakes Sub Area 18 Specific Plan Amendment project is adjacent to the Metrolink Rancho Cucamonga Station.

Please note that these are initial general comments submitted to meet the public comment period. SCRRA may follow up with more specific comments for consideration if further analysis deems it necessary.

Comments on the DEIR for the Specific Plan Amendment are as follows:

1. The Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) is the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that operates and maintains the commuter rail service known as Metrolink. Please be sure to include the acronym SCRRA as needed in future documents.
2. For future mailings on NOP's and DEIR's please mail to Metrolink Planning Department, P.O. Box 531776, Los Angeles, CA 90053-1776.
3. Currently there are 38 Metrolink passenger trains and 2 BNSF freight trains operating through the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station area. Trains can run 24 hours a day, seven days a week.



metrolinktrains.com

One Gateway Plaza, Floor 12, Los Angeles, CA 90012 T (213) 462-0200

PC-4-13-16

EXHIBIT BB


Mr. Michael Smith
Page 2
December 24, 2015

4. We are encouraged to see that the Specific Plan would generate a walkable TOD with pedestrian and bicycle links to the existing Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station. It is also encouraging to see that employee work schedules for new businesses in the development will be coordinated around the Metrolink train schedules to encourage more commuting opportunities.
5. We encourage you to work with the adjacent property owners to ensure that proposed pedestrian paths are designed to provide for the most direct route to the Metrolink Station.
6. Development of lots and recreation spaces on the northern limits of the project that are immediately adjacent to the railroad right of way must be developed as to not drain into the railroad property. All surface drainage should be directed southerly and collected into storm drains.
7. To ensure no trespassing into the active rail corridor it is a requirement that an acceptable fence or block wall be constructed to separate the development from the rail corridor.
8. Construction of portions of the project within close proximity to the railroad right of way may require the developer's contractor to enter into a Right of Entry Agreement with SCRRA. SCRRA's Right of Entry Agreement and encroachment approval process, along with other SCRRA requirements can be found on the Metrolink website at www.metrolinktrains.com.
9. All public vehicular access to and from the station must be maintained during construction for our commuters.

City shall provide timely notice, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092.5 and State CEQA Guideline Section 15088, of the written proposed responses to our comments on this environmental document and the time and place of any scheduled public meetings or public hearings by the agency decision makers at least 10 days prior to such a meeting.

Thank you again for cooperating with SCRRA to help ensure the development of a successful project. If you have any questions regarding these comments please contact me at 213-452-0456 or via e-mail at mathieur@scrra.net.

Sincerely,



Ron Mathieu
Sr. Public Project Specialist

Cc: Justin Fornelli, SANBAG
Roderick Diaz, SCRRA
Patricia Watkins, SCRRA
Scott Johnson, SCRRA

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

JAN 04 2016

RECEIVED - PLANNING

DEAR MR SMITH,

I AM WRITING YOU A LETTER IN
REGARDS TO THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PROPOSED)
TO BUILD A HIGH-DENSITY HOUSING PROJECT
AT THE EMPIRE LAKES PROPERTY -

ITS TO MY UNDERSTANDING ITS FOR
2500 - 4000 UNITS. I HAVE LIVED IN
RANCHO CUCAMONGA FOR 30 YEARS.

WHEN I FIRST MOVED HERE,
THE POPULATION WAS ABOUT 80,000 -
IT HAS NOW DOUBLED TO OVER
160,000 -

WHEN I HAD FRIENDS THAT
LIVED HERE IN THE 60'S, THE
POPULATION WAS ABOUT 1,000 -

EVERYWHERE I LOOK NOW, THERE
IS BUILDING ON LOTS. EITHER
HOUSING, OR WAREHOUSES.

THE CITY IS GETTING ~~CROWDED~~.
CROWDED. TAXS KEEP GOING UP, AND
MORE BONDS GET TACKED ON TO
HOME OWNERS. I MYSELF DONT WANT
TO KEEP PAYING TAX INCREASES.

WE JUST HAD A BIG VOTER
REVOLT ABOUT MEASURE "A",

THE POWER OF THE PEOPLE

(2)

SPOKE AND THERE WAS A LARGE DEFEAT.

WE DO NOT NEED 4,000 MORE TOILETS, SINKS, SHOWERS AND MORE PEOPLE IN SUCH A LITTLE AREA.

WE ARE IN A MAJOR DROUGHT AND WITH MORE AND MORE PEOPLE COMING, I DON'T WANT TO CUT BACK 50% OR MORE!

IT'S TIME TO PUT THE BRAKES ON AND SLOW THIS ~~DOWN~~ GROWTH WE ARE ALREADY OVERCROWDED. NO MORE CONCRETE JUNGLE.

LET'S STOP THESE RIDICULOUS TAX INCREASES.

PLEASE RECONSIDER

RESPECTFULLY

R. CONLEE
A CONCERNED HOMEOWNER.

December 24, 2015

Michael Smith
Planning Department
City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

DEC 24 2015

RECEIVED - PLANNING

Mr. Smith,

Please review and respond to my comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Specific Plan at Empire Lakes Golf Course.

The purpose of this letter is to express the interest to keep the Specific Plan area as a golf course with no change in land use per **Alternative 1: No Project as identified in the DEIR section 5.6.1.**

My specific objections relate to air quality and soil contamination specifically involving the Gerdau Steel plant formerly known as Tamco Steel. After attending a community meeting 11-30-15 conducted by SCAQMD in Rancho Cucamonga it was clear to me that extensive air testing and soil testing must be done before any further development is approved in and around the impact area. Empire Lakes is on the border of the impact area. I learned at this meeting that it will be years before the benefits of new air quality mitigation measures effectiveness can even be fully gauged. To build thousands of units which children will live in without knowing the current and future impacts is ill-advised, irresponsible and could expose the city to potential litigation. Professor Andrea Hricko from USC spoke at the meeting about the need for soil testing in and around the land surrounding Gerdau (formerly known as Tamco) to learn what contamination may have occurred as a result of Tamco's failure to properly monitor and mitigate contaminants being spewed into the surrounding air and soil. Please see YouTube link documenting same: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fiYHlePrb5s&feature=youtu.be>

Minimally, soil testing must be done before any further development can move forward.

Additionally I attended the initial CAP meeting last week which had a specific section dealing with open green spaces. This elimination of an open space in the city directly contradicts those stated goals. I have toured the golf course to see what is at stake here. Empire Lakes like Victoria Gardens is a destination which if managed properly could bring tourism and tax dollars to the city. I hope the city leaders will reject this proposal and work with Mr. Lewis or the owners to retain it.

Sincerely,



Tressy Capps (951)333-2000

December 24, 2015

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

Michael Smith
Planning Department
City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

DEC 24 2015

RECEIVED - PLANNING

Dear Mr. Smith,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Specific Plan at Empire Lakes Golf Course. The purpose of this letter is to express the interest to keep the Specific Plan area as a golf course with no change in land use per **Alternative 1: No Project as identified in the DEIR section 5.6.1.**

Significant Environmental Impacts

DEIR sections 1.6 and 7.2 describe the four Significant Environmental Effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed Empire Lakes/IASP Sub-Area 18 Specific Plan Amendment is implemented. As further indicated in the DEIR, even with incorporation of Regulatory Requirements (RRs), Project Design Features (PDFs), and project-specific Mitigation Measures (MMs), the proposed project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts in the categories listed below (direct reference to DEIR, sections 1.6 and 7.2):

Air Quality

- Operational Air Quality Impact
- Cumulative Air Quality Impact
- Air Quality Management Plan Consistency

Noise

- Substantial Temporary or Periodic Increase in Noise
- Construction-Related Noise Would Exceed Noise Standards

Population and Housing

- Population and Housing Growth

Transportation/Traffic

- Project-Related Traffic Impacts
- Cumulative Traffic Impacts

There are no feasible mitigation measures that could reduce these potentially significant project and cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. In order to approve the proposed project, the lead agency (city of Rancho Cucamonga) would have to adopt of a Statement of Overriding Considerations. This would involve a finding by the city that the benefits of the project outweigh its unavoidable adverse impacts.

Justification for the Proposed Redevelopment

Justification for the proposed redevelopment and Specific Plan Amendment is cited throughout the DEIR as consistency with adopted State and Regional plans and guidelines and local General Plan and other city planning documents. Consistency and conformance with established planning framework is certainly the basis for orderly development, provided that the guidelines are applied in the appropriate set of circumstances and that implementation of a given set of guidelines does not adversely impact a community.

I understand that decisions concerning public resources and land uses involve a balance in the benefits and impacts of a given decision. That being said, while the proposed project has benefits and follows adopted planning guidelines, it also would result in significant air quality, noise, population and traffic congestion impacts to the community.

Specifically, the proposed Specific Plan Amendment will result in significant impacts in four categories that will seriously affect the quality of life in an already highly developed community. I respectfully submit that the **adverse impacts to the city and surrounding community** in the four categories described in the DEIR **are greater than the benefit of accommodating housing needs** as cited in the above mentioned State, Regional, and local plans. These categories, particularly traffic, are already at levels that impact any travel in southern California.

Value of Empire Lakes Golf Course to the Community

The DEIR sections 4.9 (Land Use and Planning, page 4.9-38) and 4.12 (Public Services and Recreation, page 4.12-26) address the Empire Lakes Golf Course and the role of the golf course in the community. Both sections contain a conclusion that loss of the golf

course **would not** be considered a significant impact (Land Use and Planning, page 4.9-40 and Public Services and Recreation, page 4.12-26).

In order to provide an objective and complete description of the value the golf course to Rancho Cucamonga and the Inland Empire, the following **facts** should be included in the DEIR:

- The course was the host site of the Nationwide Tour event from 2003 to 2007 with over 30,000 spectators in 2007, and broadcasted by the Golf Channel to Canada, United Kingdom, Japan, and across the United States. Event participants included players from 18 countries and from several continents. Charity benefactors included Loma Linda University Children's Hospital, PAL (Promoting Arts and Literacy benefiting Victoria Gardens Cultural Center), Steven's Hope for Children, and Hope Through Housing.
- California professional tour events are presently held at Empire Lakes, the most recent being the Pepsi tour in February 2015.
- Lessons for golfers, including youth starting out in golf, are conducted regularly by professional staff at the course.
- The course provides space for animals, migratory birds, and other species to have access to water, habitat, and cover in an otherwise highly developed metropolitan area. While "special status" species as defined by the resource agencies have not been observed during biological surveys, the 162-acre open space golf course does provide habitat for numerous bird and animal species.

I have attended the June 10, 2015 Notice of (DEIR) Preparation Scoping Meeting and the November 10, 2015 City's presentation for Planning Commission Workshop, and the December 10, 2015 Community meeting hosted by Lewis Operating Corporation at the Marriott Courtyard. **At all three forums, community members who provided comments unanimously opposed the Specific Plan Amendment and expressed strong interest to keep the golf course in place.** The DEIR should acknowledge the interest by the community that the golf course has high value for both Land Use and Recreation as expressed by community members. This level of interest should at least be considered when determining "level of impact" in the DEIR process.

As of the date of this letter, the on-line petition to support the golf course:

<http://www.gopetition.com/petitions/save-empire-lakes-golf-course.html>

contains 950 signatures expressing support to keep the golf course in place, in addition to the members of the public who have spoken to the Planning Commission and provided written comments. If this number of interested parties is not sufficient in the city staff's opinion to constitute a significant level of support, the city and the project applicant should go beyond the minimum legal requirements to inform the greater local population of the proposed project. The community meetings now being hosted by Lewis Operating Corporation are a useful first step. I submit that the public support thus far in the process represents a strong level of interest to keep the golf course in its current condition.

Judging from the reaction of the public, I believe that it is difficult to make the case, as in the DEIR, that the loss of the course does not represent an impact.

Conclusion

I appreciate the time and resources invested by the applicant and by city staff to coordinate the process to review the DEIR for the proposed project. As mentioned above, I recommend approval of the Alternative 1: No Project in view of the Significant Unavoidable Impacts as described in the DEIR. Thank you for your time and assistance. Please let me know if there are any questions.

Yours truly,

Thomas M. Rheiner



PAUL S. LEON
MAYOR

DEBRA DORST-PORADA
MAYOR PRO TEM

ALAN D. WAPNER
JIM W. BOWMAN
PAUL VINCENT AVILA
COUNCIL MEMBERS

December 23, 2015

AL C. BOLING
CITY MANAGER

MARY E. WIRTES, MMC
CITY CLERK

JAMES R. MILHISER
TREASURER

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

DEC 23 2015

RECEIVED - PLANNING

Michael Smith, Associate Planner
City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

RE: NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY FOR THE EMPIRE LAKES/RANCHO CUCAMONGA INDUSTRIAL AREA SPECIFIC PLAN SUB-AREA 18 SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT PROJECT DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for allowing the City of Ontario an opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced project. After reviewing the Notice of Availability, the City requests that the following comment be addressed:

1. Intersection # 20: Vehicle storage capacity appears inadequate for the eastbound left turn movement from 4th Street into the proposed Project Driveway. Approximately 275 feet of "usable" median exists between Cleveland Avenue and the Project Driveway, which distance includes an existing 100 feet long westbound left turn lane at Cleveland Avenue plus an existing 120-foot-long bay taper transition. Only 50-55 feet remains for the proposed eastbound left turn pocket to serve the project driveway. Even with a dual turn lane configuration, the resultant storage is only 100 feet which is insufficient to serve the anticipated 180 peak-hour vehicles during the PM peak hour.

Further, the Synchro worksheets appear to assume a two-phase signal operation, a very short cycle length (approx. 60 seconds); and equal "splits" between east-west and north-south traffic. This assumed operational strategy is unrealistic, with dual left turn lanes and cross product of EBL * WBT volumes. Protected left turn signal phasing will be required. Plus the typical (coordinated) cycle lengths on major arterials; and the ratio of side street volumes to those of the main street will change the signal cycle splits to favor the coordinated Fourth Street phases.

This performance and feasibility of this intersection, operated by the City of Ontario, needs to be re-evaluated under all study scenarios, with changes to the aforementioned inputs. The EIR needs to be updated based on revised findings.


2. EIR Page 4.13-62 through 4.13-65: The Fourth Street Project Driveway should align with the existing south leg to prevent unconventional signal phasing strategies and vehicle movement conflicts. This requirement needs to be included in the sections of the EIR and TIA that are dedicated to circulation and access.
3. Intersection # 17: The proposed mitigation at 4th/Haven is stated to be infeasible (with the corresponding impact deemed significant and unavoidable,) due to right-of-way and jurisdictional constraints. This statement should be revised if the City of Rancho Cucamonga already has possession (or can guarantee acquisition) of all necessary right-of-way within its City limits. The existing northbound approach, which lies within Ontario City Limits, has sufficient paved width to support the proposed (mitigated) lane configurations with minor striping changes. The necessary configuration for the intersection's northbound approach can be achieved without any right-of-way acquisition. Further, City of Ontario, owner of the facility, supports the implementation of the recommended improvement.
4. EIR Page 4.13-19 through 4.13-21: The 18% internal-capture (derived from the MXD methodology) appears to be unrealistically high given the composition of the proposed development. Whereas mixed used seems to be an ancillary component of the overall project, the internal-capture (trip reduction) applied to the entire development. The document needs to more clearly explain the MXD results and justify the 18%.
5. Intersections #20 and #36: Existing, opening-year, and horizon-year lane configurations are incorrect at the following intersections – reanalyze and revise EIR accordingly:
 - South leg (northbound approach) of 4th Street/Project Driveway intersection is incorrectly configured in the report. There is only 1 outbound lane, rather than two.
 - Northbound Haven @ Guasti is incorrectly configured in the report. 4 NB Lanes, rather than 5.
6. Intersections #17, 22, and 30: Three City of Ontario intersections have been identified as requiring timing changes as mitigation under various scenarios. While this is a low-cost measure, resources will be needed for its implementation. No costs/fair shares are reported for this or any other proposed mitigation measures. The financial responsibility for these mitigation measures should be assigned/addressed in the appropriate EIR sections.

Mr. Smith
Empire Lakes EIR
December 18, 2015
Page 2

7. Project should construct 4th WB lane on 4th Street, between Project Driveway and Haven Avenue to improve the level of service of this arterial segment and the intersections contained within.
8. Per Section 4.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the Draft EIR, the project will be required to address all National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) water quality requirements prior to discharging to the City of Ontario storm drain system.
9. The proposed development will significantly impact the City of Ontario existing storm drain within 4th Street. The project states that an additional 420 cfs will drain into the storm drain system. In 2004, the Ontario and Rancho Cucamonga entered into an agreement that identified various improvements planned for Fourth Street and the reimbursement for those improvements. The Empire Lakes site was not included as part of that agreement. As a result, to accommodate the increased drainage to the Fourth Street storm drain, proper mitigation and a modification to the agreement is necessary.

We appreciate being involved in the environmental review of the project and look forward to continued communications regarding this project. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact me at (909) 395-2419, or Richard Ayala, Senior Planner, at (909) 395-2421.

Sincerely,



Scott Murphy, AICP
Planning Director

cc: Jeff Bloom, Deputy City Manager, City of Rancho Cucamonga
Otto Kroutil, Development Director
Louis Abi-Younes, City Engineer



Department of Public Works

- Environmental & Construction • Flood Control
- Operations • Solid Waste Management
- Surveyor • Transportation

Gerry Newcombe
Director

December 21, 2015

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

File: 10(ENV)-4.01

City of Rancho Cucamonga
Attn: Michael Smith, Senior Planner
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA. 91730
Michael.smith@cityofrc.us

DEC 22 2015

RECEIVED - PLANNING

RE: CEQA – NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE RANCHO CUCAMONGA INDUSTRIAL AREA SPECIFIC PLAN SUB-AREA 18 SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for giving the San Bernardino County Department of Public Works the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced project. **We received this request on November 14, 2015**, and pursuant to our review, the following comments are provided:

Environmental Management Division (Marc Rodabaugh, Stormwater Program Manager, 909-387-8112):

1. On Page 4.8-4, the Draft EIR states that "This permit expired on January 29, 2015." The EIR should clarify this and state that the permit was slated to expire on January 29, 2015, but was administratively extended by the Santa Ana RWQCB on January 29, 2015. Through this extension process, the current permit will remain valid and enforceable until such time as a new permit is approved by the Santa Ana RWQCB and issued to the Permittees.

If you have any questions, please contact the individual who provided the specific comment, as listed above.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Nidham Aram Alrayes".

NIDHAM ARAM ALRAYES, MSCE, PE, QSD/P
Public Works Engineer III
Environmental Management

NAA:PE:nh

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

ROBERT A. LOVINGOOD
Vice Chairman, First District

JANICE RUTHERFORD
Second District

JAMES RAMOS
Chairman, Third District

CURT HAGMAN
Fourth District

JOSIE GONZALES
Fifth District

GREGORY C. DEVEREAUX
Chief Executive Officer

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

DEC 14 2015

RECEIVED - PLANNING

Dec. 11, 2015

Michael Smith
Senior Planner
City of Rancho Cucamonga Planning Department
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Dear Mr. Smith:

This comment is in response to the Empire Lakes Specific Plan proposal. I am a concerned citizen from Rancho Cucamonga and I am writing against this proposal.

My main concern is for the open space that would be lost. When the plan for the Terra Vista development was first approved, the open space – in this case the golf course – was considered an important element in balancing land uses. To get rid of it and replace it with about 3,000 housing units plus commercial turns this balance into a joke. I see that the plan mentions pocket parks, bark parks, and activity areas. These will be pleasant places to sit and socialize but they are hardly what you would call open space.

The plan says people will cut down driving because retail will be nearby. I do not believe this plan will get many people out of their cars. There is no supermarket in walking distance. Work places are not close by. The development would add a tremendous amount of traffic, air pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions.

The draft EIR makes this point clearly and notes that there is no feasible mitigation:

"The proposed project would conflict with the SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan due to (1) the projected long-term operational emissions of non-attainment pollutants exceeding SCAQMD significance thresholds, which could increase the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or delay timely attainment of air quality standards and (2) project trip generation at the project site substantially greater than trip generation anticipated in the General Plan for PAI resulting from proposed high density development and associated population growth in an area designated as a golf course in current planning documents."

I realize that the governing body can find overriding considerations to allow significant impacts without mitigation. We have seen these before in many cities and counties. The city will use phrases like "benefits outweigh adverse effects," "densities appropriate to existing development," and "economic vitality." What they actually mean is a lower quality of life and a longer time spent in heavy traffic breathing polluted air. That is clear in this sentence from the draft EIR: "The proposed project would induce substantial housing and population growth in the City and region beyond adopted growth forecasts..."

Kurtz, page 1


The problem is also clear in this paragraph from the draft EIR: "CMP-designated intersections and freeway facilities would operate at deficient with the proposed project. Identified mitigation for certain intersections is not feasible... Impacts would be significant and unavoidable." Clearly, the proposed density of this project is too high.

A few other points:

- Regarding the charts about the declining popularity of golf, this does not give the Lewis Corp. a blank check to tear out the open space and create a high density project with a few "pocket parks."
- I don't see the proposed apartments and condos as alleviating a housing shortage for singles, couples and retirees. These units will probably be high-priced. There are plenty of high-priced units in Rancho Cucamonga, but not so many for moderate income people.
- If you are aiming at retirees, I hope you include elevators in your proposed multi-story buildings.
- Impact on schools, libraries, police and fire: Yes, the Joint Use Public Facility fees are supposed to mitigate these impacts, but the fees never seem to cover the actual impact of thousands of residents.

For all of these reasons and impacts without mitigation, I urge you to reject this project.

Sincerely,



Holly Kurtz
8255 Vineyard Ave. Apt 2500F
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
hkurtz2@earthlink.net
phone 909-476-3213

Rancho Cucamonga City Council
and Planning Department
Attn. Michael Smith
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

12/21/2015

DEC 21 2015

RECEIVED - PLANNING

Subject: Project Title: Rancho Cucamonga Industrial Area Specific Plan (IASP) Sub-Area 18 Specific Plan Amendment Project (also referred to as the Empire Lakes Specific Plan Project) – **Draft Environmental Impact Report - Comments**

Dear Mr. Smith,

I am again writing to you concerning the potential rezoning of and potential development of the Empire Lakes Golf Course as proposed in the Rancho Cucamonga Industrial Area Specific Plan (IASP) Sub-Area 18 Specific Plan Amendment Project and would like to add my comments concerning the Draft – Environmental Impact Report which was released for public review on November 10.

After reviewing the Draft-EIR, I believe that many of my concerns that were in my original letter to the City Council have been confirmed, which I would like to cover in the pages ahead, beginning with what I believe are the most important to the City of Rancho Cucamonga Residents and Businesses. At the same time I want to point out as you know, but many of the public will not be aware, that the strongest terminology that can be used in an EIR is, **“Significant and Unavoidable Impacts”**.

1. **Traffic** - on pg. 4.13-22 under Impact Analysis, the question is posed by **Threshold 13.1**:

“Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?”

On the same page, the report described the current operation as of year 2014 stating “the existing traffic volumes, lane configurations, and signal timing information were used to evaluate operations at the study intersections for existing AM and PM peak hour conditions.” “As shown, the following intersections currently operate at a deficient LOS (Level of Service) during the peak hours:

1. Foothill Boulevard and Rochester Avenue – PM Peak Hour **(LOS E)**
2. Arrow Route and Milliken Avenue – PM Peak Hour **(LOS E)**
3. 6th Street and Cleveland Avenue – PM Peak Hour **(LOS F)**
4. 4th Street and I-15 Southbound Ramps-Ontario Mills Drive – PM Peak Hour **(LOS D)**

5. I-10 Westbound Ramps – Ontario Mills Parkway and Milliken Avenue – PM Peak Hour **(LOS D)**
6. I-10 Eastbound Ramps and Milliken Avenue – AM Peak Hours **(LOS D)**”

It should be noted for the public to understand, that LOS E is explained that “operations with high delay values indicating poor progression, long cycle lengths, or high V/C ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences”. Furthermore, it is clarified, “these grades range from level of service (LOS) A (minimal delay) to LOS F (excessive congestion). LOS E represents at-capacity operations”.

On pg. 4.13-59, the next question is posed under **Threshold 13.2:**

“Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion?”

The answer to this question is described from pg. 4.13-59 to 4.13-62, with the statement, “CMP-designated intersections and freeway facilities would operate at a deficient LOS (Level of Service) with the proposed project. Identified mitigation for certain intersections is not feasible and/or the Property Owner/Developer and the City of Rancho Cucamonga cannot guarantee implementation of mitigation in the City of Ontario or for Caltrans facilities. Therefore, impacts to identified CMP facilities would be **significant and unavoidable.**”

On page 4.13-66, the report goes on to state, “cumulative traffic impacts consider the impact of future growth and development in the City of Rancho Cucamonga and City of Ontario on the roadway system serving the area”. It goes on to state “the analysis presented under Thresholds 13.1 and 13.2, the proposed project would result in **significant and unavoidable** cumulative impacts under the Cumulative Year (2036) Plus Project conditions, which accounts for existing traffic plus the addition of growth derived from the SBTAM”. The report goes on to clarify that “while a number of roadway improvements are planned for the area, these improvements have been considered in the analysis” and “traffic impacts on area intersections and Caltrans facilities due to the addition of project-generated traffic would exceed LOS (Level of Service) standards and would be considered **significant.** Even with the implementation of MM (Mitigation Measures) 13-1 through MM 13-3, cumulative traffic impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** for the intersections and freeway facilities”.

The report describes the issues with “Intersections” as, “the proposed project would have **significant and unavoidable** cumulative impacts at the following intersections under the Cumulative Year (2036) Plus Project traffic analysis scenario for one or both of the following reasons: (1) the improvements needed at these intersections are not feasible and/or (2) the City of Rancho Cucamonga cannot implement or require another agency with jurisdiction over an intersection to implement necessary physical improvements.” The report goes on to describe four key intersections that will impact Rancho Cucamonga

Residents and Businesses, as well as Ontario and anyone traveling near or through this region, both streets and freeways. The intersections of:

- A. Foothill Blvd. and Rochester Avenue, in the City of Rancho Cucamonga (Ref. pg. 4.13-66)
- B. 4th St. and Haven Avenue, City of Ontario (Ref. pg. 4.13-66)
 - 1. The report is clear, “the following intersections would have **significant and unavoidable** impacts because the **required mitigation is infeasible** and/or the mitigation requires approval from the City of Ontario and the City of Rancho Cucamonga cannot guarantee they would be implemented.”
- C. 4th Street and I-15 Southbound Ramps-Ontario Mills Drive (Ref. pg. 4.13-66)
- D. I-10 Eastbound Ramps and Haven Avenue (Ref. pg. 4.13-66)
 - 1. The report is clear concerning C and D, “the following intersections would have **significant and unavoidable** impacts because the **required mitigation is infeasible** and/or mitigation requires approval from Caltrans and the City of Rancho Cucamonga cannot guarantee they would be implemented.”

Continuing on to page 4.13-67, concerning the impact on the freeway facilities in the region it states, “the proposed project would have **significant and unavoidable** cumulative impacts at the following I-10 and I-15 mainline segments and ramps under the Cumulative Year (2036) Plus Project condition. Interstate highways are not controlled by the project applicant or the City of Rancho Cucamonga **and implementation of the identified mitigation measures is not guaranteed**, and the City of Rancho Cucamonga cannot require Caltrans to implement improvements to State highway facilities”. The Draft EIR describes 41 sections of I-10 and I-15, as far north as I-15/ I-210 (approximately 6 miles), as far south as Cantu Galleano Rancho Road/I-15 (approximately 7 miles), as far east as Citrus Ave./I-10 (approximately 7 miles) and as far west as Euclid/I-10 (approximately 5 miles), that will be impacted by this project (ref. pg. 4.13-67).

On pg. 4.13-69, under Level of Significance **After** Mitigation, it answers the question of Threshold 13.1. It states, “even with the implementation of the mitigation measures above, the project and cumulative traffic impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project **cannot be fully mitigated**. Thus, as presented in the analysis, operational traffic impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable**.” Besides listing the intersections that were noted above, the report added the following intersections and freeway facilities as having **significant and unavoidable project impacts**:

- A. Arrow Route and Haven Avenue
- B. Inland Empire Boulevard and Haven Avenue
- C. I-10 Westbound Ramps- Ontario Mills Parkway and Milliken Avenue
- D. Plus 32 additional I-10 and I-15 Freeway mainline segments and ramps (ref. pg. 4.13-70 and 4.13-71)

On pg. 4.13-72, under Level of Significance **After** Mitigation, it answers the question of Threshold 13.2. It states, “as identified above, CMP-designated intersections and freeway facilities would operate at a deficient LOS (Level of Service) with the proposed project based on identified agency thresholds. Identified mitigation for certain intersections is not feasible and/or the Property Owner/Developer and City of Rancho Cucamonga cannot guarantee implementation of mitigation in the City of Ontario or for Caltrans facilities. Therefore, impacts at these CMP facilities would be **significant and unavoidable**, as identified”.

With all this said, it is my opinion this would be a terribly irresponsible decision to approve this project based on the seriousness of the impact, not only on the Rancho Cucamonga residents and businesses, but the impact on neighboring cities and travelers of the I-10 and I-15 Freeway corridor. As reported in the Draft-EIR, the Level of Service in the area is currently deficient. The data from 2014, accurately reflected this deficiency that residents and businesses are already experiencing on a daily basis, then to add this project, along with so many other projects that are being added by the City of Ontario, the report again is clear that the cumulative impacts would haunt the future generations who live and/or work in this area. Add to this, that the report clearly warns that mitigation will be nearly impossible to ensure the Rancho Cucamonga residents and businesses, due to the fact the city cannot control the City of Ontario or Caltrans, the risk is far too great, when compared to what will be lost to the community.

2. **Public Services** – Fire, Police, Schools ref. pg. 4.12-1 to 4.12-31

The report states on pg. 4.12-30 at 4.12.7 Level of Significance after Mitigation:

“With incorporation of PDF 12-1 through PDF 12-3 into the proposed project, compliance with RR12-1 through RR 12-4, and inclusion of provisions in the proposed/potential Development Agreement regarding the RCFPD’s acquisition of property for a future fire station, impacts to public services and recreation would be less than significant.”

After reading RR 12-1 through RR 12-4, this appears to reflect a situation where the City of Rancho Cucamonga Fire, Police and Schools are operating at or above their level of capacity and shows that with this development, and per the Regulatory Requirements they will need to collect fees and add facilities to attempt to mitigate the additional level of service that will be required due to this project.

A. **Fire** –

Concerning Fire Protection, the report states (pg. 4.12-16 and 17) that this “proposed project will generate approximately 2,000 additional calls for service each year given the design density and type of use. **Increased traffic on City Streets may also increase the potential for accidents, requiring emergency response from the RCFPD.** Additionally, the proposed project would require fire protection services,

including administrative tasks associated with approval and construction of the proposed project. Studies conducted by the Insurance Services Organization (ISO) have shown that when a response area consistently exceeds 2,500 calls for service in a year it is considered to be impacted and additional companies should be added to that response area. Three of the Fire District's response areas were near or exceeded the 2,500 call threshold in 2014. In those response areas, drawdown occurs on a more frequent basis. Drawdown results in extended response times. Station 174, the station that is the primary response crew for the Empire Lakes project site, was just 35 calls below the 2,500 call threshold in its response area. **The projected annual number of additional calls for service that would result from the project is nearly the number that would require a fire/EMS company that would be dedicated to just the project site.**

B. Police –

The report states on pg. 4.12-18 to -19, "Implementation of the proposed project...would increase existing demands for police protection services at the project site. Anticipated crime and safety issues during construction of the proposed project include theft of building materials and construction equipment, malicious mischief, graffiti and general vandalism. During operation, the proposed project could create the typical range of police service calls that other similar uses in the City experience. The primary types of crimes experienced in non-residential areas are property crimes (e.g., burglary, larceny, theft/auto theft, arson, shoplifting, vandalism). In addition to property crimes, "crimes against persons" are typically associated with residential uses. These include, but are not limited to, assault, battery, domestic violence, sexual and child abuse, and robberies. **The increase in vehicle trips on public roadways resulting from the proposed project could also increase the potential for traffic accidents and violations.**

The report goes on to say on pg. 4.12-19, "the current service ratio is 1 officer for every 1,309 residents...the RCPD anticipates that the project would generate the need for new sergeants, corporals, deputy sheriffs, office specialists, and sheriff's service specialist... The funding for new positions needed to maintain acceptable citywide police protection service levels would come from the City's General Fund. The RCPD has indicated...an on-site police substation would be required in the future."

C. Schools –

The report states on pg. 4.12-20, under Threshold 12.3, "Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?"

On pg. 4.12.3, under Impact 12.3, Implementation of the proposed project would generate additional students in the CSD and CJUHSD. Payment of required new development fees pursuant to Section 65995 of the California Government Code (RR 12-4) would result in less than significant impacts to school services.

This appears to be a poorly worded answer, when you look at pg. 4-12-21, “construction of the number of residential units allowed by the proposed Specific Plan Amendment, 3,450 units, would generate up to 1,657 new students including 658 in the CSD (K-8) and 999 in the CJUHSD (High School). With implementation of the proposed project and generation of new students, the student enrollment would exceed the current design capacity for schools in the CSD and CJUHSD”.

This is clearly understated, as the Table 4.12-4, shows that the Existing Enrollment of 2,498 at CSD (K-8) is already over the total capacity of 2,478 and the Existing Enrollment of 23,777 at CJUHSD is also already over the total capacity of 22,927. **This project is not causing them to exceed the current design capacity, IT’S MAKING IT WORSE!** Yes, the developer will have to pay a school impact fee to cover, the inconvenience for the students who go to these schools and/or possibly for future schools. Tell this to the students at these schools and their parents.

In summary, I want to point out 4.12.6 Mitigation Measures on pg. 4.12-30, where it states, “no significant impacts related to public services and recreation have been identified; therefore no mitigation is required”. This takes me back to my original concerns that I sent in back August; **this project promises us more traffic, more accidents, more crime and overcrowded schools, in which the developer will pay impact fees to cover the need to add fire facilities, police facilities and somehow deal with the additional students, but it will not change the facts.**

3. Biological Resources

The report states on pg. 4.3-14 that “the project site generally provides habitat for wildlife species adapted to a high degree of human presence and development. The report provided a long list of avian species, including California quail, red-tailed hawk, cooper’s hawk, American coot, mallard, ruddy duck, great egret, snowy egret” and later on pg. 4.3-15, the report states, “the presence of artificial ponds on the golf course could be used by migrating waterfowl and other avian species as a stopover or resting place. Additionally, the artificial ponds could be used by migrating waterfowl for breeding and nursery purposes. **However, during the course of conducting surveys of the golf course over a two year period, there was no observation of avian nesting or breeding, primarily by waterfowl, on or in association with the ponds.**”

My comments in reference to the Biological Resources, are that I doubt that Rancho Cucamonga community is aware of the amount of wildlife that can be found at Empire Lakes Golf Course. As a person that has played this course extensively over the years, I **know for a fact that whoever conducted the surveys failed to look very hard “over a**

Brandon Brook

10860 6th Street | Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
+1 (909) 527-7600 x 827214 | m +1 (330) 604-1824 |

two year period". I have personally seen evidence of nesting between the 1st and 9th fairways, within 20 yards of the artificial lake, as well as have photographic proof.

In closing, it is my opinion so much of the Draft EIR appears to be slanted or biased in favor of the developer and at times, I believe, shows a strong disregard for the opinions and potential frustration by Rancho Cucamonga Residents and Businesses, for not having been fairly represented by the Planning Department and City Council.

The lack of commentary or questions by the Planning Department at the Workshop on 11/10/15, was quite surprising though they claim to have just received the report. Most of the information was not surprising to the public, as there was information released in the local papers and the Initial Study that was released on 4/15/15, along with a presentation made by the Planning Department to the City Council on 9/16/15 concerning Mixed Used Development.

Add to this, the City Council and Planning Department repeatedly stating after the 9/16/15 Special Meeting, the importance of this project, due to the fact the golf course is losing money, water usage is critical at this time of drought and later the benefit to "millennials", it appears there was a bias for the project from the beginning. It was even stated by a Council Member that the City had another golf course (Red Hill Country Club) that was private, but was moving to being open to the public, which turned out to be false. I believe the fact concerning profitability to be overstated, as the course would have gone out of business long ago. It may be possible the profit margin is not typical of many courses in the area, but again it would have closed long ago, if it was losing money. As this is a private business, clearly the information on profitability is limited to the public, if not impossible to ascertain. Concerning water usage, the Draft EIR is clear that the potable water usage will soar from 2 AFY to 1,446 AFY with this project. Whether "millennials" desire or can afford this type of housing is still debatable.

In a neighboring city, Chino Hills, where they face the same type of Mixed Used Development at one-tenth the size, the Planning Department is already concerned of the impact on traffic and resources, even before any study was called for, while looking at an area that is truly an "in-fill" project and vacant lot. Add to it they are using all means of notification, including the local newspaper the Champion, to make sure they hear every ones concerns from the community, it might be better for Rancho Cucamonga Planning to look at these actions from a neighboring community as a good model of representing their communities concerns.

I have heard now in 2 meetings from the Planning Department that this process is in the early stages, trying to give the public a feeling the decision is still a substantial time period away, when in fact by notice as of November 2015 the City Council Public Hearing is 4 months away. When reviewing the Draft EIR, it is clear the studies started in 2014, which included the "beginning" of the legal process when the Initial Study was released April 15, 2015. Though I have heard it repeated several times by the Planning Department, "the report was released as soon as it was available", it appears very suspicious that the Workshop was planned three weeks in advance and the Draft EIR was released approximately 2 hours prior to the Workshop on 11/10/15 at 3:47 pm. Though it

Brandon Brook

10860 6th Street | Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
+1 (909) 527-7600 x 827214 | m +1 (330) 604-1824 |

may be legal to have a 45 day review period, releasing it at a time during the holiday season and closing the public comment period on December 24, 2015 does not seem fair to the residents and businesses in this great City.

Add to it, that the Lewis Group claims that notice went out to “everyone” bordering the Empire Lakes Golf Course only to find out it went out to the leasing companies that own the buildings, not the residents or actual businesses in the area. Also it should be pointed out, that one of the apartment complexes, Ironwood Apartments, appears to have clear ties to the Lewis Group. It is my opinion, the Planning Department and the Lewis Group failed to perform the proper notification to the public.

With all of this said, I believe this should be publicized better to the Rancho Cucamonga and Ontario communities. They are the ones that will be facing the effects of this decision for years and decades to come. The Draft EIR is very clear, if this project is approved as requested by the Lewis Group, there will be **significant and unavoidable** traffic within a 5 mile radius of the project, effecting the residents and businesses of Rancho Cucamonga, the neighboring cities and anyone traveling the I-10 and I-15 freeways. I have heard it said by a very responsible city council member in the area, “when you create these types of traffic problems in an area, it spreads like a cancer from the center out, effecting areas far outside the immediate area”. The report clearly shows that this is true. Add to the the fact that the report states there would be an increase in accidents due the traffic (under the Public Services portion of the report 4.12), all of the calculations concerning traffic are not taking into account, what the community will be facing at the AM and PM Peak hours if an accident occurs. I have spoken with companies in the immediate area that are concerned of this project and the potential traffic congestion we are facing, and one in particular stood out. The company, Southwire, is in the process of renegotiating their lease and was not aware of the project. They are a growing business and are looking to add additional trucks to transfer product in and out of their facility. With the amount of warehouse space in the area, this type of business growth, I don’t believe can be forecasted in the report.

There will be **an increase in property crime and “crimes against persons”**, but the City will have to add a police substation so they can deal with this increase. There will be **an increase in accidents due to the increase in traffic along with the typical emergency calls made**, which will again require the police substation and an additional fire/EMS company (facility) just to handle this project. There will be **an increase of students at schools that are currently operating over designed capacity**. All of this means there will be **a need for more tax dollars** to sustain all this. The developer will pay impact fees, but this will not offset the damages. **This needs to be decided by the Rancho Cucamonga community as a whole and needs to be communicated better to the citizens and businesses throughout the entire City.**

The Lewis Group states on their own website, “Creating new master planned communities is far more than a business for Lewis Community Developers, a member of the Lewis Group of Companies. It is a passion. Lewis is dedicated to creating communities that address the highest aspirations of the people who live within them.

Brandon Brook

10860 6th Street | Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
+1 (909) 527-7600 x 827214 | m +1 (330) 604-1824 |

Quality and vision go hand in hand throughout the planning and development process.

Understanding that open space equals peace of mind, parks promote healthful living and recreation centers kindle community spirit". It appears they need to fix their website to better reflect what they are now doing; that profits, long term income and political posturing are more important than the benefit of the community, with elimination of open space, peace of mind, healthful living, recreation that kindles community spirit.

Approval of this project, I will repeat again would be irresponsible. This decision should not be taken lightly as this will affect many generations to follow. Rancho Cucamonga is a beautiful city with so much to offer. To lose this "green belt", the wildlife and open space would be a tragedy when compared to the results of this project with increased traffic congestion, over population, overloading of services and crime. I hope the Planning Department and City Council will look to **Alternative #1 – No Project.**

Thank you,



Brandon Brook

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Michael Smith
City of Rancho Cucamonga
Planning Department
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
Michael.smith@cityofrc.us

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

DEC 19 2015

RECEIVED - PLANNING

FROM: Stuart J. Schwartz
11583 Ragusa Drive
Alta Loma, CA 91701
Stuart77@charter.net
(909) 944-1449

DATE: December 21, 2015

RE: Comments on the Draft EIR for the Empire Lakes/Rancho Cucamonga Industrial Area,
Specific Plan Sub-Area 18, Specific Plan Amendment Project

Preamble to My Comments

With reference to my comments on the draft EIR contained in this Memorandum, I would like to initially note the following:

A. Whether written in the form of a comment, question, statement or otherwise, each of my below comments on the draft EIR should be treated as and deemed an inquiry for clarification, revision or correction of the draft EIR. References to "project" and "proposed project" and to "Applicant" and "Lewis Homes" are used interchangeably.

B. For ease of your review, my comments are made sequentially in order of the sections of the draft EIR and not in order of importance or level of concern.

C. I apologize in advance for the lapses in editing of my comments, the occasional abruptness in tone of some of my comments, the occasional repetition in some of my comments and I suspect the possible occasional and inadvertent errors in restating facts or statements from the draft EIR. Normally, I would carefully edit any such comment memorandum prior to submission; however, the rather short 45 day time period permitted for reviewing the draft EIR and submitting comments made it impossible to allocate the time necessary to fully review the draft EIR and prepare a polished and fully reviewed and edited memorandum of comments. As various members of the public stated at the November Workshop, and subsequently, at the Applicant's initial Community Forum in December, the timing of review period was less than ideal as the period encompassed the traditional Christmas holiday season commencing with the Thanksgiving holiday, which is probably the busiest and most harried period of

time for members of the public during the year, with pending year end work commitments, preparation for the Christmas holidays, myriad business and social holiday events, holiday vacations and children home from school. Plus, it was a daunting and rather impossible task for me and I suspect other members of the public to fully and carefully review a highly technical document of close to 6,000 pages especially when I and other members of the public have little or no familiarity with EIRs. Put simply, I simply ran out of time after expending over 30 hours in reviewing, verifying and commenting on the draft EIR over a four week period and was compelled to utilize "speed" drafting in order to get my comments to you prior to the December 24 deadline and maintain my sanity. Even with the expenditure of 30 plus hours of time, I was able to review only portions of the draft EIR due to time constraints and the highly technical nature of several sections of the draft EIR.

D. I also apologize in advance for my usage of facts that may on occasion be my best estimates as I didn't have the time or the access to the resources that the City or the Applicant may have to obtain and verify precise facts and that some of my earlier questions or comments might possibly be partially addressed later in the draft EIR but again I simply lacked the time and the editing software tools to do a thorough cross checking of my comments with the draft EIR's approximately 5,888 pages of text, charts and diagrams.

E. As indicated by my comments, based upon my initial review of the draft EIR, I have a concern that the draft EIR at times seems biased in favor of the Applicant, superficial in its analysis and contains a number of unsupported or not fully supported assumptions and opinions again quite favorable to the Applicant. Bottom line in my opinion the objectivity of the draft EIR is in question, which is not that surprising as the Applicant I believe provides the funding for the preparation of the EIR and is a likely source of future business for the entity (and its consultants) preparing the EIR.

F. I am, of course, available to clarify or discuss with you or your colleagues my comments.

And now my specific comments:

Section 1.3 (Project Description)

Page 1-2: The first sentence of the second full paragraph on this page refers to "implementing the preferred development strategies in PAI including....;" however, it is unclear as the origin of these preferred development strategies. What is the history of these of these strategies? Shouldn't it be noted that the referenced maximum 220,000 square feet of non residential uses actually is less than 5 acres of a 160 plus acre proposed project?

Page 1.2: As illustrated by the fourth full paragraph on this page and also in the many other project descriptions in the draft EIR, the preparers of the EIR seem to have adopted a pro Applicant bias by consistently utilizing project descriptive language taken from from the Applicant's marketing materials rather than utilizing simpler and less inherently opinionated descriptive language. For example, "seamless pedestrian connections", "enclaves" and "holistic people-centric places". Admittedly, this particular paragraph is far less egregious than later descriptive paragraphs and the chosen descriptive language is more annoying than substantive in effect.

Section 1.5 (Areas of Controversy)

Page 1.5: I think this section is somewhat misleading when it states that the primary area of controversy is focused on the retention of the golf course. Certainly, retention of the course has significant public focus but the public also has expressed equal or greater concern regarding the necessity or benefit of a large high density residential project in general and whether this major remaining “open space” should be protected by keeping the existing and long standing “open space” zoning intact to permit future recreational use even if other than a golf course, consistent with the current Empire Lakes Specific Plan which seems to have resulted in the successful development of the Empire Lakes area exactly as envisioned by the current Specific Plan.

Section 2.0 (Introduction)

Page 2-7: Regarding “Planning Commission Comments”, the draft EIR at best only cursorily and often less than objectively addresses the Planning Commission Comments especially the first and second such comments. What is meant by “highest and best use?” What is the legal background of “highest and best use”? Where is “highest and best use” actually discussed in the draft EIR? No section references for provided for this specific comment and I couldn’t find any other references to “highest and best” use in the EIR.

Section 3.5 (Description of the Rancho Cucamonga...Plan Amendment)

Page 3-3: The last paragraph on this page is another example of the use of non objective descriptions of the proposed project containing jargon, wishful thinking, limited substance and pro Applicant bias, e.g., “daily lifestyle elements in a setting where the spaces for living and playing are intimate, personal and connected” or “Community programming would generate a dynamic built environment with people-places, fostering an active lifestyle and providing access to transportation solutions.” Hard to believe this is objective descriptive language rather than language blindly “borrowed” from the Applicant’s marketing materials.

Page 3-6: Shouldn’t the paragraph entitled “Transit (T)(Transit-oriented Services)” make very clear that most of the listed transit supporting services are highly speculative as to actual implementation such as car share facilities, bike share stations and concierge services as well as the composition of retail establishments located in the proposed project. Many of these services have had problems with feasibility, including maintenance and theft issues, when implemented elsewhere in urban environments in this country.

Page 3-6: How does the MU Placetype actually intend to specifically contribute to the employment/housing balance?

Page 3-15: Fourth full paragraph is another example of flowery and marketing descriptions of the proposed project’s speculative benefits. “There may be bark parks (isn’t this another way of saying doggie parks similar to the ION pedestrian experience being simply a street underpass), urban farming areas, expanded plazas, pocket parks or celebration spaces (whatever such spaces are). Sounds

wonderful although unlikely, really urban farming? Does this mean the project will cater to the recent millennial craze of raising chickens in their backyards? Once the draft EIR moves beyond cloning the Applicant's marketing hype, it is disclosed that these recreational spaces are likely to be about 900 square feet or the size of half a tennis court.

Section 4.0.1 (Introduction to the Environmental Analysis)

Page 4-5: With respect to the second paragraph under the heading "Biological Resources", yes, I suspect that no fish were observed in the artificial ponds during the habitat assessment but this no fish observation needs to be clarified to not be misleading by omission. The artificial ponds did contain fish for many years until the management in the spring/summer of 2015 ceased periodically adding fresh reclaimed water to the ponds and elected to allow the ponds to disappear by evaporation, which policy has been quite successful as one pond is entirely gone and the other ponds have materially shrunk in size and depth, exposing large patches of rather unseemly dirt and mud. My understanding is that management simply wanted to reduce expenses for reclaimed water. The result is ever smaller ponds with highly toxic water (e.g., massive amounts of mud hen droppings and other debris) due to lack of clean water circulation and thus the fish all died. I also question the conclusion that a golf course with a great deal of native vegetation is not suitable to support any special status plant or wildlife species. Given the obvious visual conditions of the ponds, I would have thought that even a modestly thorough habitat assessment would involve some additional inquiries about the absence of fish since fish are quite common to golf course water features in Southern California.

Page 4.3-25: I and most golfers regularly playing the Empire Lakes Golf Course are in stunned disbelief that the preparers of the draft EIR during surveys conducted over a two year period were unable to observe avian nesting or breeding as stated in the last paragraph of the subsection headed "Wildlife Movement". In particular, the now drained pond on Hole 16 had been the home to several generations of a single extended and quite friendly duck family for several years and also home to a family of egrets. Ducks and egrets were and still are (as of December 15) constantly seen and present in the other ponds on the course. Active nests for raptors and various other birds are regularly present and readily observable by golfers including myself for the nesting seasons of these raptors and birds. I am again troubled by the seeming inaccuracy of the surveys. I also note the course also has had coyotes and a family of semi feral cats for several years until a few months ago when the cats inexplicably ceased to be seen. Also given the disclosed timeline for the sales process of the golf course, I am a little curious as to how the survey covers a two year period for that means the survey commenced no later than late 2013.

Page 4.3-25: With respect to the first paragraph of the subsection entitled "Migratory Birds and Nesting Raptors," the quality of the habitat assessment again is questionable as golfers regularly see nests for red tailed hawks on the golf course, in particular, along the trees lining the twelfth and thirteenth holes. Evidence of nests for other birds is also readily observable. Perhaps interviews with the course maintenance staff would be helpful. Migrating Canadian geese occupy the course for a number of months in recent years

Section 4.6 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

General Comment: I am assuming that this section on greenhouse gas emissions and the analysis contained in this section will specifically address and be appropriately revised and updated to reflect and conform with the holding and intent of the recent California Supreme Court opinion, *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife* (filed November 30, 2015). I have concerns that the analysis in the draft EIR is not necessarily in compliance with this opinion's provisions on greenhouse gas emissions analysis for EIRs.

Pages 4-6-50 and 4-6-51: After several pages of highly technical analysis which I concede is rather incomprehensible to me without substantial further review, the draft EIR is still not able to conclude that the proposed project's emission reductions would exceed the 28.5 percent reduction necessary to avoid such emissions being classified as a potentially significant impact; however, the draft EIR then rather remarkably finds some very flexible and questionable mitigations which are just sufficient to allow the draft EIR to claim a mitigated emission reduction of 28.6 percent for the proposed project, which being 0.1 percentage over the required minimum reduction percentage permits the draft EIR to ultimately conclude on the very next page that the project's GHG emissions are deemed to be less than significant. More specifically, based on a single study, the draft EIR assumes that provision of bicycle parking and related changing/shower facilities would create an estimated 1.5 percent reduction in GHG emissions; additionally, based on almost pure speculation, the draft EIR also assumes that electric vehicle charging facilities would create an additional 0.5 percent reduction in GHG emissions; and finally, the draft EIR assumes that installation of high energy non-incandescent light bulbs and fixtures and Energy Star rated appliances would create the remaining needed 0.6 percent reduction in GHG emissions. When I earlier mentioned that I felt at times that the draft EIR was biased towards the Applicant, this GHG analysis is one section that got my attention. Looking at the analysis objectively, it feels like the preparers of the draft EIR hunted for or created "fudge factors" just sufficient enough to massage an undesired outcome into an acceptable outcome from the Applicant's perspective, i.e., after a complex analysis initially concludes that GHG emissions reductions for the project will probably fail to meet the required standard, a few very questionable mitigating activities are cited and assumed with limited authority to provide just enough additional emission reduction to meet the necessary standard to avoid citing GHG emissions as a significant environmental concern for the Project.

Pages 4.6-54 and 4.6-55: I am troubled by the paragraphs which seem in some degree to attempt to make the project's additional GHG emissions of little consequence by noting that a single project's emissions are not significant when emissions are viewed on a state or global basis. I would think that the City with its emphasis on healthy living and being a leader in urban planning would want to be a leader in reducing insidious GHG emissions rather than passing the burden onto other governmental agencies. Success in global reduction of GHG emissions is going to require hundreds of thousands of small efforts. In particular, I am troubled by the sentence reading "Due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change, it is speculative to identify the specific impact, if any, to the global climate change from one project's incremental increase in global greenhouse emissions."

Pages 4.6-56 and 4.6-57: As I read these pages, the draft EIR essentially resolves the GHG emissions problems with the proposed project by assuming that other governmental agencies will take steps in the future to make the project's emissions less than significant. For example, "The City believes that these agencies will implement these measures to reduce and control GHG emissions. Therefore, at a project level impact, under AB 32, the amount of GHG the project will emit is less than significant," or in a later paragraph, "The significance of the project's impact from greenhouse gas emissions depends on measures that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies....If such measures are implemented and the City believes that the measures will be implemented, the project's ... are less than significant." While such belief is nice, it is also a very large assumption as governmental adoption of measures is subject to many unforeseen variables and therefore to a significant degree the conclusion that the project's GHG emissions are less than significant is highly speculative, especially given the present adversarial and gridlocked national political environment and highly controversial nature of the climate change issue.

Section 4.9 (Land Use and Planning)

Page 4.9-12: Please see my comments on golf course usage presented later in this comment letter. In particular, the statement that golf course rounds declined from 53,894 rounds in 2012 to 50,103 rounds in 2014 is rather misleading as implying the course usage is declining naturally. I believe a clarifying explanation is necessary indicating that a strong likelihood that the decline was a result of management actions or omissions such as extremely poor maintenance of the course and a several month delay in replacing an aging golf cart fleet which often resulted in golfers having to obtain replacement carts, if available, during the round. The poor playing conditions during 2014 were made widely known to golfers via word of mouth and golf social media. It might also be noted that the course ownership in 2014 had commenced its discussions with the Applicant to sell the course for development, and realistically, declining usage would enhance the course's saleability for development purposes.

Page 4.9-13: Please see my comments on alternative golf courses presented later in this comment letter with such comments incorporated in this comment to the fourth full paragraph of this page.

Page 4.9-39: This page contains several paragraphs attempting to justify that the golf course has limited benefit to the community and substantial convenient alternative courses exist. The reasoning is very superficial, often inaccurate and comprising many broad unsupported opinions. Rather than repeat my extensive comments to an almost identical discussion in Section 4.12, I refer to such comments and incorporate them by reference into this comment. While technically correct as stated that the City can't mandate the continued operation of the course as being privately owned, the preparers of this draft EIR can make a reasoned analysis as to the likelihood of the course's continuation in the event the project's approval is denied or consideration of the proposed project is substantially delayed or postponed for additional study and analysis. For example, the preparers of the EIR can interview the Applicant regarding its intentions regarding the course in such events. It could be noted that the Applicant owns golf courses and has a golf course management company, and indeed, to my understanding, it has been announced to users of the Empire Lakes Golf Course, including local high schools, that the new owner, i.e., the Applicant, would continue in all events to operate the course at least through 2016 after the

change of ownership in March, 2016. Realistically, it is unlikely the Applicant would simply close the course in any event as it is my understanding from discussions with course employees and other golf industry personnel that regardless of the course's ultimate return on investment for the selling owners or the Applicant, the course has a positive operating cash flow exclusive of any existing debt service. Also, it is hard to believe that the closure of the golf course can really be characterized as not a significant land use impact.

Section 4.11 (Population and Housing)

Page 4.11-3: When discussing the concept of AMI, it would be informative to state what the actual income amounts in dollars are for various percentage levels of the AMI.

Page 4.11-4: References are made to reports listing pending projects, Vacant Uncommitted Residential Land Inventory and Mixed Use inventory in the City, I believe these reports should be included in the EIR or at least either added to the City project website or the website should provide a means of accessing these reports as these reports contain information central to evaluating the project's public benefit. These reports don't seem to be referenced in the References subsection of this section although possibly part of another cited reference which I can't locate or identify after searching.

Page 4.11-4: I am perplexed by the conclusion that the City has a shortfall of sites for meeting its moderate income housing requirements as that would seem to be the targeted group for many of the apartment complexes being constructed or already constructed by Lewis Homes or other developers in the City.

Page 4.11-7: In the first paragraph of the subsection entitled "Existing and Projected Employment", the sentence stating the golf course provides 32 jobs seems entirely gratuitous and an unnecessary "cheap shot" at the course. It is another example of the draft EIR's preparation bias in favor of the Applicant and possible excessive involvement of the Applicant in its drafting. It is a relevant but minor fact in context and legitimately addressed four pages later when employment growth is discussed in depth.

Page 4.11-11: In the interest of balance, it should perhaps be noted that the jobs at the golf course while small in number are actual jobs often held by the same employees for many years as compared to a purely theoretical 373 jobs projected to be generated by the proposed project, i.e. no discussion of the mechanism by which these jobs will be created by the project but merely based on the assumption that by magic every 590 square feet of additional residential space creates one additional job. Admittedly, neither the project nor the golf course are significant job creators but just in the interests of compassion shouldn't the economic impact on the existing long term employees of the golf course be given some consideration and mention.

Page 4.11-5: I am confused. I had thought that one of the key reasons that supported this project is that it would potentially be a generator of higher income or professional and technology employment for the City's residents, but the draft EIR seems to conclude that the benefit of the project is that it would only minimally increase employment in the City as apparently the City is a "jobs-rich" area.

Section 4.12 (Public Services and Recreation)

Page 4.12-11: The statement in the second full paragraph reading, "Plans to complete Central Park...will further expand the City's park system." is another example of the draft EIR's inherent bias in favor of the Applicant and use of misleading statements due to the failure to fully state the underlying facts. The statement as written implies that Central Park will be completed in the foreseeable future and that the City is actively moving towards such completion. However, as any long time resident of the City is aware, other than the construction of the senior center (due mainly to the efforts of former State Senator Brulte), little or no progress has been made on the development of Central Park since 1990 when the City promised Central Park would be a comprehensive state of the art recreational facility including pools, duck ponds, tennis courts and many other recreational features. I am unaware of nor can I find any reference in any publicly available City materials of any serious current efforts to complete the long promised Central Park, so any implication that Central Park will help satisfy the increased demand for recreational facilities arising from the proposed project is purely speculative.

Page 4.12-11: In the third full paragraph on this page, shouldn't for completeness and accuracy, it be clarified that unlike the Empire Lakes Golf Course which is open to the public, the Red Hills Country Club Golf Course is a membership only facility charging substantial initiation and monthly fees making it not a reasonable alternative to the Empire Lakes Golf Course for most of the City's residents.

Section 4.12.2(Existing Setting-Parks and Recreation-Empire Lakes Golf Course)

General Comment: I am extremely disappointed in the superficial and often seemingly Applicant biased analysis contained in "Empire Lakes Course". I would have expected that this section addressing a key issue of expressed public concern would have received more careful attention. I have the impression, perhaps not accurate, that the preparation of this crucial subsection was delegated to a rather junior member of the EIR preparation team evidenced by the referenced telephone inquiries to golf courses being made by a person with the title of Assistant Analyst. I have the similar, possibly mistaken, impression that the preparer of this subsection may not necessarily be a golfer or familiar with this recreational activity in sufficient detail to fairly and properly analyze a golf facility and its alternatives.

General Comment: I believe it would be appropriate to mention in this subsection that (i) the teaching professionals at the Empire Lakes Golf Course are very active in introducing children of all ages to the game of golf and use the course to teach large groups of children the fundamentals of golf including taking them out on the actual course to experience actual golf play; (ii) a charity uses the course to permit blind and other disabled persons to experience the joys of golf, with the convenient location of the course's driving range to flat sidewalks and streets particularly suitable for this purpose; and (iii) golf courses are utilized in significant ways by non golfers as the courses' clubhouses and vistas are frequently used for weddings, baby showers, community service organization meetings and business related meetings and seminars..

Page 4.12-11 (1st paragraph of subsection "Empire Lakes Golf Course"): I'm not sure whether the intended implication of stating that the course has averaged 52,364 rounds over the last three years is that the course is underutilized but I suspect that such is the implicit implication, even though 52,364

rounds per year means a minimum of 143 rounds per day which is not insubstantial use, and even more rounds per day if adjusted for the estimated 10 to 20 days a year that the course play is minimal due to severe weather conditions, e.g., rain or high winds, and for the estimated 15 to 30 days where usage is restricted for twice yearly course maintenance periods. Further, over the last three years, the course has been subject to some major events that significantly reduced course play and encouraged golfers to seek alternative venues, e.g., for several months, the golf carts were consistently breaking down due to age until ultimately replaced, and during such times, golfers were often forced to interrupt rounds to obtain replacement carts which caused significant playing delays; for several months during 2015 until repaired in September, 2015, six of the courses greens were so damaged by rot or a fungus that many golfers including members just refused to play the course; since spring, 2015, management primarily to avoid paying for reclaimed water(rather than drought concerns) ceased adding water to the ponds and lakes allowing the pond on the 16th hole to dry up and disappear and the lakes on holes 2, 3, 7, 9 and 18 to evaporate creating rather ugly and increasingly odoriferous water features; very limited and largely ineffectual measures, presumably due to cost, to limit the fouling of several greens and the lakes by the dropping of the flocks of mud hens residing on the course for four to five months a year; lack of an on course food and beverage cart (a feature of every course other than Empire Lakes); closure of a fully lit driving range one hour after sunset; lack of a men's club (a feature of every other course) and more recently frequent breakdowns in the electronic tee time booking system (almost completely unavailable before and during the crucial 2015 Thanksgiving holiday period) which systems have become the primary means utilized by golfers to make tee times conveniently. The general feeling among golfers and current and former employees is that management has at least taken a very casual and cost minimization approach to marketing and maintaining the course as compared with other local golf courses of the same category, with such approach possibly motivated by a desire to make the course more justifiable for development by the Applicant.

Page 4.12-11(1st paragraph of subsection "Empire Lakes Golf Course"): This paragraph contains the statement reading "Currently there are 111 golf club members and 57 range members...." Without further explanation, this statement is very misleading (and perhaps biased in favor of the Applicant) as it suggests that golf course usage is limited to less than 200 persons, i.e., for the sake of completeness and objectivity, it is crucial that it be clearly stated that such memberships are really just discount programs available to golfers who frequently use the course by permitting them to pay a set annual or monthly fee in advance for the right to play the course at will during the prescribed time, and more importantly, golfers with memberships represent only a very small percentage of the persons playing the course as the course is fully open to the public for daily play, i.e., the course is played annually by several hundred or thousands of different individuals.

Page 4.12-11(2nd paragraph of subsection "Empire Lakes Golf Course"): While a small point in of itself, Isn't the use of "some" in lieu of "many" in the first sentence rather misleading and against biased towards the Applicant as the very next paragraph states clearly that every high school in the City utilizes the golf course as well as two of the Pomona colleges.

Page 4.12-12: I am very disappointed in the superficial, biased, misleading and unsupported opinions of this subsection entitled "Other Golf Courses" especially when the subsection is implicitly directed at

addressing one of the key underlying Applicant and perhaps City assumptions, that the closure of the Empire Lakes Golf Course would have minimal impact on the quality and convenience of golf to residents of the City. I believe this subsection needs to be substantially redrafted to reflect reality. Let me illustrate in some detail:

First, the subsection states that there are eight golf courses within ten miles of the Empire Lakes Golf Course. I presume from the maps contained in the draft EIR, this is literally true; however, it is not a particularly relevant or meaningful statistic as not terribly relevant regarding access to alternative courses by City residents that the alternative courses are within ten miles of Empire Lakes Golf Course as the crow flies on a straight line. It should be obvious that, at the very least, a more meaningful and relevant distance measure would be the distance as measured by actual driving distance. Using Google maps, the relevant driving distances in miles from the Empire Lakes Golf Course for the eight courses cited as being within 10 miles on a straight line are, respectively, for the Goose Creek Golf Club, the Indian Hills Country Club, the Oak Quarry Golf Club, the Paradise Knolls Golf Course, the Red Hills Country Club, the Sierra Lakes Golf Course, the Upland Hills Country Club and the Whispering Lakes Golf Course are 10.6 miles, 12.9 miles, 11.6 miles, 12.3 miles, 6.5 miles, 11.3 miles, 7.2 miles and 7.2 miles. Or put another way, there actually are only two open to public courses within 10 miles of Empire Lakes Golf Course rather than the claimed eight by driving distance, i.e., the Upland Hills Country Club and the Whispering Lakes Golf Course (Red Hills being a private country club not open to public play). And neither of these two remaining courses within 10 miles of Empire Lakes are even remotely of the same quality as Empire Lakes Golf Course, as the Upland Hills Country Club is an extremely short course measuring less 6,000 yards from its longest set of tees and Whispering Lakes Golf Course has had a long history of very poor playing conditions and is known as a very low cost facility.

Second, even this revised distance measure based on actual driving distances doesn't fully represent the true distances to alternative golfing facilities for City residents: as shouldn't such distances be measured from say a midpoint in the City rather than from the Empire Lakes Golf Course which is located on the extreme southern border of the City. For example, if I were to measure driving distances from a more central point in the City such as Central Park, then using Google maps, the relevant driving distances in miles to the eight cited golf courses would now, respectively, be for the Goose Creek Golf Club, the Indian Hills Country Club, the Oak Quarry Golf Course, the Paradise Knolls Golf Course, the Red Hills Country Club, the Sierra Lakes Golf Course, the Upland Hills Country Club and the Whispering Lakes Golf Course 13.2 miles, 17 miles, 14.7 miles, 18.4 miles, 4.5 miles, 9.1 miles, 5.3 miles and 9.3 miles. Using a centralized starting point in the City, there are again only three open to the public courses within 10 miles, i.e., the Whispering Lakes Golf Course and the Upland Hills Country Club, both of which as previously noted are not really equivalent courses to the Empire Lakes Golf Course, as well as additionally Sierra Lakes Golf Course.

Third, the subsection states that there are an additional seven courses (the El Prado Golf Course, the Fairmount Golf Course, the Hidden Valley Golf Club, the Jurupa Hills Country Club, the Los Serranos Country Club, the Marshall Canyon Golf Course and the Van Buren Golf Center) within 10 to 12 miles of the Empire Lakes Golf Course. Again, using actual driving distances, measured from the Empire

Lakes Golf Course, of the cited seven courses, none are within 12 miles of the Empire Lakes Golf Course, and measured from Central Park, again none of the cited seven courses are within 12 miles of the City.

Fourth, of course, not even use of actual driving distances reflects the relative convenience or inconvenience of the initial listed 15 proposed course alternatives to the Empire Lakes Golf Course, as perhaps, the most meaningful measure of convenience, or lack thereof, would be estimated commuting time, which for many of these courses is considerably more than what would be initially expected for the distances involved because reaching many of these courses from the City requires using the 10, 210, 15 and even possibly the 57 and 71 freeways, often during the congested business commuting morning hours, and needless to say, that these freeways are getting increasingly congested especially the 10 and 15, thanks, in part, to the construction of massive housing projects along or near the freeways especially along the 15. Even courses which are only 15 to 20 miles away often involve driving times of 45 to 60 minutes as I can readily attest having played all of these courses.

Finally, I would think a part of any objective analysis would involve determining which of the proposed alternative courses would provide a reasonably comparable golf experience to the Empire Lakes Golf Course as the quality and playability of golf course varies considerably. Again, let me illustrate:

(a) While the subsection correctly identifies the Van Buren Golf Center as an executive golf course and thus not equivalent to a standard 18 hole course, it, as a clear oversight, fails to mention that the Fairmount Golf Course is only a nine hole course and also not equivalent to a standard 18 hole course. Regular golfers do not generally play executive or nine hole courses and wouldn't view them as adequate substitutes for an 18 hole full sized golf course, e.g., I haven't played an executive or nine hole course in over ten years and only would consider them if playing with young children or non golfers.

(b) As a rather surprising oversight, the subsection doesn't not mention that that two of the listed proposed alternative courses are not likely to be around as courses for very long. Paradise Knolls Golf Course is scheduled to be closed soon and redeveloped as a large retail/residential project. Also very surprisingly not mentioned is that Lewis Homes has entered into an exclusive bargaining agreement with the County of Los Angeles to purchase the Marshall Canyon Golf Course and adjoining land for redevelopment as a massive master planned community. The staff at Marshall Canyon has advised golfers that the course is likely to close this winter. I don't know which of the other proposed golf course alternatives are under consideration for purchase by Lewis Homes and other developers for closure and redevelopment, but I wouldn't be surprised if Lewis Homes is actively seeking to purchase other courses as golf courses represent opportunities for large scale development projects. Presumably, the preparer of the EIR could interview the Applicant which I must believe is well informed of such future development possibilities by itself and other competing developers. This subsection should reflect that the number of alternative courses in the near or intermediate future may be substantially pruned down as other local courses have been shuttered for redevelopment. In addition to the slated closures of the Paradise Knolls Golf Course and the

Marshall Canyon Golf Course, other local courses have already been shuttered for redevelopment, e.g. El Rancho Verde Golf Course in Fontana. I also know that in the recent past the Hidden Valley Golf Course and the Whispering Lakes Golf Course have been subject to serious developer interest.

(c) Not all golf courses are equivalent in quality and amenities. The Empire Lakes Golf Course is a high quality 18 hole course with a premier design by Arnold Palmer and has a full practice and warm up facility comprising an extensive mat and grass driving range, putting greens and practice chipping and sand shot areas. Quite a number of the proposed alternative courses do not have reasonably equivalent practice and warm up facilities or any practice and warm up facilities other than putting greens. For example, the Indian Hills Country Club, the Paradise Knolls Golf Course and the Upland Hills Country Club do not have driving ranges at all while the Los Serranos Country Club's driving range is all mats (no grass) and the Marshall Canyon Golf Course's, the Hidden Valley Golf Club's, the El Prado Golf Course's and the Jurupa Hills Country Club's driving ranges are of low quality, poorly maintained or inconveniently located. I also don't believe, with the possible exception of the Los Serranos Country Club, that any of the proposed alternative courses have lit driving ranges so that golfers with full time jobs can practice in the evenings. Also, as any interviews with golfers or the reading of golf course review websites such as Greenkeepers.com would reveal, a number of the proposed alternative courses are of a substantial lesser quality and playability than the Empire Lakes Golf Course. While a subjective view (but one that most golfers would agree with), I believe that only three of the alternative cited golf courses are of comparable or higher quality and playability than the Empire Lakes Golf Course and also have full practice facilities, and therefore would certainly be considered equivalent to the Empire Lakes Golf Course, i.e., the Sierra Lakes Golf Club (although not playable on a considerable number of days due to high winds issues and lacking a practice chipping/sandtrap area), the Oak Quarry Golf Club and the Goose Creek Golf Club. Other than for an absolutely inconvenient and seldom used driving range, the Hidden Valley Golf Club also should be considered equivalent to the Empire Lakes Golf Course (although this course is quite a commute from the City) and to be utterly fair, the Los Serranos Golf Club may also qualify as an equivalent course although one that is not very convenient as often a long and tough commute from the City. I believe I have previously expressed my reasons for the other cited courses not being either equivalent to the Empire Lakes Golf Course or convenient to residents of the City with the exception of El Prado Golf Course; El Prado is another low end golf course which is very poorly maintained, not particular convenient to the City and moreover subject to periodical shutdowns for flood control purposes as located in a flood control basin.

Section 4.12-3 (Thresholds of Significance-Parks and Recreation)

Page 4.12-25 (second full paragraph): Much of this paragraph seems to be taken from the Applicant's rosy marketing materials without further analysis. Adding the word "seamless" to "pedestrian connections" really doesn't change sidewalks into something better or innovative. And similarly, calling a street underpass the "ION" (whatever that means) and describing it as an "aesthetic amenity" doesn't make an underpass more than an underpass and a potentially dangerous and often less than hygienic

feature as anyone with experience with urban underpasses can personally attest unless the underpass is well lit, frequently cleaned and has adequate security measures. I wonder whether a person walking alone, especially late at night, is going to elect to forego the colorful ION experience and cross the street above ground.

Page 4.12-25 (third full paragraph): I am having trouble understanding, after reading the preceding two pages of the subsection entitled "Increased Demand for Parks and Recreational Facility From New Residents" which seems to state that the proposed project will not have any new large scale parks for the proposed additional 10,488 residents but just a few so called pocket parks, plazas, walking trails, etc., how the draft EIR could then broadly and emphatically conclude "Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impact related to the needs to provide new or expanded park and recreational facilities...No additional mitigation would be required." An absolute conclusion of this nature doesn't seem supported by the preceding analysis as well as being contrary to logic and ordinary common sense.

Page 4.12-25 (fourth full paragraph): Again, I have difficulty in understanding the conclusion contained in this paragraph that "Implementation of the proposed project would not require the expansion of any existing recreational facilities outside the PAI..." This seems to be a largely unsupported opinion; shouldn't there be information regarding whether the existing City park structure can support an additional 10,000 plus residents who are likely accordingly to the Applicant to be relatively young and thus heavy users of the City's parks and recreational facilities. Similarly, I find the conclusion in the next paragraph less than believable that "Implementation of the proposed project would not require the expansion of any existing recreational facilities outside PAI..."

Section 4.12-3 (Thresholds of Significance-Loss of the Empire Lakes Golf Course)

Page 4.12-26(2nd full paragraph): As previously discussed in my comment letter, the reference to 14 other golf courses within 12 miles of Empire Lakes Golf Course is rather misleading and for the most part inaccurate. At most, I believe only six of those courses are actually within 12 miles of the Empire Lakes Golf Course using driving distances (and that includes the Red Hills Country Club which is a private course not open to the public).

Page 4-12-26(2nd full paragraph): I find this paragraph to contain two rather unsupported opinions regarding the consequences of the loss of the Empire Lakes Golf Course, which opinions suggest the evident bias in favor of the Applicant of the drafters of the EIR and their awareness of the outcomes desired by the Applicant. This paragraph, firstly, contains the rather vague and broad opinion stating "When taking into consideration just the recreational benefit provided to the portion of the City's general population by Empire Lakes Golf Course, the loss of the golf course would not be considered a significant recreational impact." What analysis in the draft EIR even remotely supports this Applicant desired opinion? Don't we need to first know what portion of the City's general population utilizes the recreational benefit of the course? What distinguishes general population from population? What does "just the recreational benefit" mean and doesn't it suggest that there are additional benefits beyond recreation that should be mentioned and discussed? This paragraph, secondly, ends with another

broadly worded and basically unsupported opinion that “There may be increased demand for the use of the other golf courses in the area; however, with one exception, these are operated as private commercial entities, **and the increase in patronage would not be considered a significant impact to those uses.** Obviously, the opinion stated in bold lettering, if true, would be of significance and favorable to the Applicant which has implicitly and explicitly contended that the course is an unnecessary recreational facility for reasons less than clear to me or many other members of the public; however, more on point is the fact that the draft EIR stated this without any specific analysis showing that the limited number of comparable courses within reasonable commuting times of the City could readily absorb the additional rounds of golf resulting from the closure of the course, with such rounds being per the draft EIR’s own statistics a minimum of 53,000 rounds annually unadjusted for the ever increasing population of the City. This is a lot of rounds to be absorbed by other nearby courses, and it shouldn’t be automatically assumed that such absorption is feasible or doesn’t have adverse consequences. Also not clear on the relevance of “operated as private commercial entities.” Additionally, my observations as frequent golfer is that as a consequence of steadily increasing local population and the rising economic prosperity since the 2008 recession, golf course usage locally recently has and will continue to steadily increase. This belief is supported by various observations. First, golf course fees are being raised by most courses for the first time in several years and the availability of discounts are becoming less widespread suggesting that local courses are experiencing increased usage and revenues. Second, while not precise, I and other golfers have noticed that tee times, especially during prime times, are becoming significantly more difficult to obtain at a number of courses, and in particular, at the courses which are the most viable and comparable alternatives to the Empire Lakes Golf Course. For example, tee times have been and continue to be very difficult to obtain at Goose Creek Golf Club even though this course seldom, if ever, offers any form of discounted pricing. Tee time availability at this course is likely to become even less available upon the completion of the several hundred family housing development currently under construction immediately adjacent to the course. Similarly, prime tee times at the Sierra Lakes Golf Course and the Oak Quarry Golf Course are also increasingly difficult to obtain although admittedly not as difficult as at the Goose Creek Golf Course (which is a perennial favorite of golfers for its beautifully maintained course and outstanding management). Additionally, major residential housing projects are going up all over the local area which inevitably must add significantly to golf course demand, including, I understand, a projected huge housing project near the Sierra Lakes Golf Course (where the now closed El Rancho Verde Golf Course was located) and a monster estimated 46,000 residential unit master planned community in the Eastlake area on or near the old Chino Valley dairy preserve. Bottom line is that a far more thorough and objective analysis of projected golf usage in the area needs to be reflected in the draft EIR which is forward looking rather than reflecting out-of-date statistics from the depths of the recent recession.

Page 4.12-25 (last paragraph): I question whether the previous analysis of the draft EIR really supports the incredibly broadly expressed conclusion/opinion that “The community benefit provided by these facilities, including a Joint Used Public Facility to be used by the Community Services, Library Services and Police departments, along with the payment of required development impact and mitigation fees, would ensure that the recreation impact associated with the removal of the golf course is less than significant.” The facilities referred to in the above quoted sentence is the proposed 25,000 square foot

community building which is being built to provide the additional police, library and community services required by the project and is highly unlikely to be used by the residents of the City outside of the project in significant amounts as they already have these services elsewhere. Also highly unlikely in reality is that the small open spaces and the sidewalks in the proposed project are really likely to be used in any material way by City residents from outside the project as additional recreational sources as I don't see any references to parking for the general public nor frankly do I believe that City residents are going to flock to the extreme southern portion of the City to walk through an apartment complex for recreational purposes. Additionally, to claim that the collection of additional fees from the Applicant is going to mitigate recreation detriments assumes that such fees will be promptly and wisely spent on recreational facilities and services benefitting more than the project's residents which is questionable as no information is presented regarding the proposed usage of such fees, and just witness, the sad 25 year saga of Central Park.

Page 4.12-27 (Impacts 12.5, 12.6 and 12.7): How does the conclusions under these Impacts correlate with the seemingly contradictory statements in the first paragraph of "Parks and Recreation" on page 4.12-29 especially the last sentence which states, "Therefore, future residential development in the City, and including other proposed residential developments such as the proposed Specific Plan Amendment, would contribute to the cumulative need for more recreational open space and park facilities generated by the increase in residents?" Where is this additional recreational open space going to come from and isn't removing 160 acres of the City's remaining 420 acres of open space only likely to exacerbate this shortfall.

Section 4.12.6 (Mitigation Measures)

Page 4.12.30: Given the preceding discussion in Section 4.12, I am confused as to how it is possible to conclude "No significant impacts related to public services and recreation have been identified; therefore, no mitigation is required."

Section 4.12.8 (References)

General Comment: The references related to the golf course analysis of Section 4.12 seem rather skimpy and superficial. No studies or reports relating to golf are cited, and it seems that the references for the analysis consist only of telephone inquiries to golf course employees at only five courses (Oak Quarry, Whispering Lakes, Marshall Canyon, Upland Hills and Paradise Knolls), of which two such inquiries were made to golf course starters which positions are generally not considered management positions and often held by part time employees as well as some undisclosed emails between the general manager of the Empire Lakes Golf Course and an officer of the Applicant and the general manager of the Sierra Lakes Golf Course and an officer of the Applicant. The contents of these emails is not disclosed in the draft EIR, and it is worth noting that the information supplied by these general managers may not be entirely objective as the general manager of the Empire Lakes Golf Course, I believe, is the son of the selling owner of the course, and general manager of the Sierra Lakes Golf Course is essentially an employee of the Applicant since the Applicant owns the course and manages the course through its golf course management subsidiary, Donovan Golf.

Section 5.3 (Project Objectives)

Page 5-3: Regarding the second objective, shouldn't it be stated at an appropriate section of the EIR that locating the proposed project near existing light industry which surrounds the project site may be counterproductive to the objective of maximizing housing in the proximity of existing employment, for as noted by owners of businesses in the area of the project site at the November Workshop, they are very concerned that the project will adversely impact their businesses and possibly force relocation, e.g., inevitably the residents near industrial sites demand noise and truck abatement rules which make running a business more difficult and expensive. Also as an aside, the choice of language of this objective is a bit biased, e.g., really "repurpose the existing golf course" rather than "close the existing golf" and describing the area as "highly active" without clarification of how this area is more active than other areas of the City.

Section 5.5.1 (Alternatives Considered But Not Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis-Alternative Sites)

General Comment: I am very troubled by the rather quickly made and definitive rejection of the no-alternative site alternative using reasoning which at times is incomplete, speculative, sophistic and at least in my view not entirely consistent with observable facts.

General Comment: To a large degree, the no-alternative site alternative conclusion/opinion implicitly assumes that a crucial feature of the proposed project is its close proximity to the Metrolink station permitting residents to walk to the station. As previously noted, this crucial assumption in support of the proposed project is dependent on a series of underlying and currently unsupported additional assumptions including, but not limited to: (i) a significant number of residents will utilize the Metrolink because of its proximity who would otherwise not utilize the Metrolink if the station was not immediately adjacent to the proposed project and not within walking distance; (ii) a significant number of residents will walk to the Metrolink station who would not walk to the station if residing in another nearby residential area if such area was more than the distance between the station and the furthest located residence in the proposed project; (iii) Metrolink has the capacity to handle the assumed substantial increase in ridership due to the proposed project and (iv) residents in already nearby existing apartments complexes don't walk to or otherwise use Metrolink in meaningful numbers.

Page 5-5 (2nd and third full paragraphs): These two paragraphs basically argue that the no-alternative site alternative should not merit consideration in the draft EIR because any alternative site would have the same adverse impacts as the proposed site. This is essentially true except for the glaring omission that alternative sites would not require the loss of the existing 160 acres (or possibly about 148 acres if the driving range is excluded) of irreplaceable and conveniently located "open space" as well as incidentally not requiring the destruction of the Empire Lakes Golf Course.

Page 5-6 (1st full paragraph). The first sentence should be clarified to make clear that it doesn't state the Applicant doesn't own other land in the City but simply states that in the opinion of the preparers of the draft EIR (or perhaps the Applicant's or another unidentified person's opinion) that the Applicant

doesn't own land in the City that would accommodate the proposed project and meet the project objectives. It is probably true that if a specific requirement of the proposed project is a space greater than 160 acres (which seems rather arbitrary given that that is the exact size of the golf course), then there may not be any alternative sites, but if again the appropriate requirement is only that an alternative site be sufficient to permit the construction of a residential development reasonably satisfying the stated project objectives, then I believe the draft EIR needs to list and analyze other parcels of undeveloped land owned (or considered or available for purchase) by the Applicant in the southern one third of the City for suitability prior to reaching the conclusion/opinion contained in the first sentence of this paragraph.

Section 5.6 (Alternative Analysis)

Page 5-8. Could there be clarification of the "New Jobs Created" listing in Table 5-1? Are those jobs related to the construction of the project or some theoretical formula that assumes that additional residential square footage automatically creates jobs? What would be the nature of these jobs? Are these jobs likely to have sufficient income to enable the job holders to reside in the proposed project?

Section 5.6.1 (Alternative 1: No Project)

Page 5-9 (last full paragraph): I would think it should be noted that Alternative 1: No Project would provide an opportunity for the City to consider alternatives to the golf course over a several year period that would be consistent with existing open space zoning rather than selecting the very first proposed alternative to the golf course, i.e., the Applicant's housing project. Once the land is rezoned for residential development, this precious open space disappears forever. Once the golf course is gone, the City will never have an opportunity to have a conveniently located golf course in the city as no land for new course exists in the City as the costs for building a totally new golf course likely would be economically prohibitive.

Page 5-10 (2nd full paragraph): For objectivity, "reflective of the current golf course industry, which is declining" should be deleted from the first sentence as not appropriate. Furthermore, as previously discussed in this comment letter, the opinion reflected in the clause reading, "reflective of the current golf course industry, which is declining" is overly general, retrospective rather than forward looking, not necessarily true currently and highly unlikely to be true locally in the future (national trends for golf are not reflective of local trends in areas with rapidly increasing populations). And who exactly is the owner of the course? Isn't the Applicant going to become the owner as of March 15, 2016 independent of the pending City approval processes? This is what the Applicant's representative at the December community meeting stated. Have the preparers of the EIR inquired of the Applicant whether the Applicant's own golf management company, Donovan Golf, is going to manage the course until resolution of pending development applications? The current management of the golf course is telling its patrons that the course is not closing upon the change of ownership on March 15, 2016 but will continued to be operated at least temporarily by the new owner, i.e., the Applicant. This also seems like a reasonable assumption as continued operation of the course is a source of revenue for the new owners until resolution of the Applicant's pending development applications.

Page 5-22: Regarding the statement, “The golf course would remain and would continue to be accessible only to golf course patrons.” under “4. Provide a continuous multi modal....,” as previously noted, the concept of golf course patrons includes more than golfers paying to play golf. The Empire Lakes Golf Course, like many other golf courses, hosts various social and business events using its meeting facilities, including weddings, as golf courses with their scenic outdoor vistas are popular wedding sites. Additionally, it should be noted that like many golf courses, the putting greens and chipping/sandtrap practice areas are open to the public without the payment of a fee.

Page 5-22: Regarding the statement “It is possible that continued operation of the golf course under both No Project alternatives would not yield a reasonable rate of return” under “6. Develop an attractive, viable project that yields a reasonable rate of return”, this is a misleading statement without additional information and clarification. Since the Applicant has already bought the site allegedly without any assurances, informal or otherwise, from City officials that the zoning change from open space to high density residential and the proposed project itself would be approved, it must be assumed that Applicant would have paid no more than current fair market value for the site based on either uses consistent with its existing “open space” zoning or consistent with the risk of the requested zoning change not being approved. If the site is so priced, then there is a strong likelihood that the site would still return a reasonable rate of return without the project, i.e., continued use as a golf course. The Park family as the sellers of the Empire Lakes Golf Course would bear all or almost all of any decrease in the value of the site arising from the golf course not meeting previous financial expectations. If the Applicant purchased the site based on a fair market value as high density residential property, it probably won’t achieve a reasonable return on investment if Applicant’s proposed project does not occur; however, this scenario shouldn’t be considered under any analysis of objective no. 6 as the Applicant should bear the full risk of paying for the site based on an usage that hasn’t yet been approved by the City. It is pure bootstrapping to argue that the Applicant can only earn a reasonable return on investment if the site is developed as the Applicant desires when the Applicant paid, for example, hypothetically, \$50,000,000 for the site based on its worth as a site of high or medium density residential usage when the site as currently zoned is only valued much lesser amount, say, hypothetically \$25,000,000.

Section 6.0 (Other CEQA Considerations)

Page 6.3: As previously commented upon, the draft EIR constantly emphasizes the public transit oriented unique nature of the proposed project by being adjacent to the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station as inevitably leading to significant usage of the Metrolink by project residents with such residents walking rather than driving to the Metrolink. For example, in the second full paragraph on this page, a representative statement of that viewpoint reads, “The location of the project site adjacent to the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station provides a unique opportunity for development of a dense urban community near transit.” However, the draft EIR provides little discussion of or reasoned support for this perceived viewpoint and opinion. No analysis is presented on the expected usage of the project’s residents of Metrolink. Nor is an analysis presented supporting the broad assumption that residents would actually walk to Metrolink rather than drive the short distance to the station, especially since the walking convenience of the station varies depending on which residence area a project resident resides

in. The term, “adjacent” is ambiguous in the context of the project, as only a few residential areas in the project are truly adjacent to the Metrolink station while many residential areas in the project are merely adjacent to the residential areas which are actually adjacent to the Metrolink station. Also no analysis is presented as to what the actual threshold proximity to the station, in time or distance, is required to cause residents to walk to the station in significant numbers. There are currently apartment complexes quite close to the station being adjacent to the golf course; has any attempt been made to determine what the usage of Metrolink is by the residents of these existing complexes and the means by which they commute to the station? Also, the location of the proposed project is only unique in the sense that it may be somewhat closer to the station than other nearby residential projects, which is a rather broad concept of uniqueness. Finally, I also note that other residential projects in the City can be constructed or made to be public transit friendly merely by providing shuttle vehicle services for persons residing in such projects desiring to utilize Metrolink. Much of the project’s transit friendliness is based on the unsupported underlying assumption that proximity of the station to the project automatically will cause meaningful additional usage of the Metrolink for commuting purposes.

Page 6.3: The last full paragraph ends with a sentence reading, “The proposed project is not, therefore, considered to be growth inducing with respect to removal of obstacles of growth.” I have read this paragraph and sentence several times, and frankly, I still can’t figure out the meaning of this sentence and its relevance.

Smith, Michael

From: Hiker Guy <steve.carn@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2016 9:04 AM
To: Smith, Michael
Subject: Re: Empire Lakes development inquiry

Hi Mike,

Thank you for the response. I appreciate the information in the DEIR. I noticed this line in the report:

"During the aquatic survey conducted on May 19, 2015, three fish species were observed in each of the ponds: mosquito fish (*Gambusia affinis*), bluegill (*Lepomis macrochirus*) and largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*)."

As the largemouth bass and bluegill are popular gamefish for anglers, would the city consider relocating these fish to another local body of water, such as Cucamonga-Guasti Regional Park? I am aware this occurred with the similar drainage and renovation of local Red Hill Park ([link](#)). I've spoken with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and they are interested in helping out. The contact point person is Mike Giusti, senior environmental scientist, and he can be reached at Mike.Giusti@wildlife.ca.gov

I hope the city of Rancho Cucamonga can take this opportunity to help improve fishing opportunities at existing parks. Would be happy to help recruit volunteers if any were needed for such a relocation effort. I believe in the past the city used AquaBio Environmental Technologies for relocation efforts too.

Thanks again!

On Thu, Feb 4, 2016 at 7:49 PM, Smith, Michael <Michael.Smith@cityofrc.us> wrote:

Hello, Steve

Per your request, this is the link to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) >>>
<https://www.cityofrc.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=25341>

This is the link to the City's webpage that has a general overview of the project >>>
https://www.cityofrc.us/cityhall/planning/current_projects/empire_lakes_specific_plan_project/default.asp

Also, at the bottom of the webpage there are additional links to documents related to the project.

If you have any questions, let me know.

Thanks.

Mike Smith

Senior Planner

City of Rancho Cucamonga

10500 Civic Center Drive

Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

(909) 477-2750 ext. 4317

michael.smith@cityofrc.us

From: Hiker Guy [mailto:steve.carn@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2016 9:00 AM

To: Smith, Michael

Subject: Empire Lakes development inquiry

Dear Mike Smith,

I live near Empire Lakes and recently received a flyer discussing the development of the Empire Lakes Golf Course. Has there been an environmental impact assessment done already for the development, and if so, where may I view it? The golf course ponds hold numerous fish and the grounds have a lot of wild animals (we routinely hear packs of coyotes on the course at night), and was wondering what the plan was for them.

Thank you!

EMPIRE LAKES
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
SCH NO. 2015041083

PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED UNDER SEPARTE COVER

EXHIBIT CC

Staff Recommended Text Revisions in the Proposed Amended Specific Plan

1. Pedestrian Crossings - Insert text that addresses the following:

Pedestrian crossings shall be provided at street intersections and at mid-block locations at intervals that are no greater than 350 feet apart in order to reinforce the pedestrian intent of the project.

2. Gates and Fences - Insert text that addresses the following:

Gates and fences shall not be permitted anywhere within Empire Lakes, except where required by Building Code and/or to secure private spaces/amenities to facilitate and encourage walking and bicycle use throughout the project, minimize physical barriers to regular and emergency access, and prevent housing developments (single-family residential tracts, condominium/apartment complexes, etc.) within Empire Lakes from becoming isolated and enclosed 'sub-communities'.

3. Joint Use Public Facility - Insert text that addresses the following:

A "Joint Use Public Facility" (alternately referred to as a "Municipal Joint Use Facility") of up to 25,000 square feet in floor area is required as a mitigation of impacts to public services. In furtherance of this mitigation, the applicant shall:

- a. Dedicate 1.75 acres (net) parcel of land which includes a fine graded pad for development for the "Joint Use Public Facility" to address the increase in demand for public services such as police, library, and parks/recreation. This land shall be generally located at the intersection of The Vine and 7th Street. The dedication shall occur after the completion by the applicant of full public improvements and include all utilities stubbed to the property line.
- b. Pay an initial deposit amount equal to the greater of \$11,000,000 or the actual impact fees collected, to the City (or fund through a similar financial mechanism acceptable to the City) upon issuance of the first building permit within the Empire Lakes project. The final contribution shall include an annual, compounded, 3 percent cost inflation escalator up to the start of construction of the facility. Development Impact Fees (DIF) for police, library, and parks facilities collected for all construction in the development shall be credited to the applicant as an offset to the initial \$11,000,000 cash deposit plus all accrued interest until the facility begins construction.

Construction of this facility shall be required to be completed by the time of the issuance of the building permit for the 2,000th residential dwelling unit. The final size, site layout, operational requirements, and design features of the facility will be subject to the City's review and approval.

4. Phasing - Insert text that addresses the following:

All phases of the project should have connectivity to the Metrolink station in order to fulfill the intent of the project. To ensure direct access to the station from Phase 1 (while either Phases 2 and 3 are being graded and/or under construction, or are dormant/inactive due to market conditions), the construction of the segments of both The Vine and 7th Street, between 4th

Street and the existing intersection of Anaheim Place and 7th Street near the Metrolink station, shall be completed prior to occupancy of the first unit in Phase 1 to the satisfaction of the City.

5. Circulation – Drive Aisles – Insert text that addresses the following:

The drive aisle network shall be required to follow a grid pattern with multiple direct, 'straight line' travel routes between destinations (similar to the street network) with direct connections to the street network (particularly The Vine). Furthermore, multiple points of vehicle access to The Vine from each development within Empire Lakes shall be provided.