Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update Final Program Environmental Impact Report Response to Comments SCH No. 2000061027

Prepared for

City of Rancho Cucamonga (Lead Agency)
Planning Department
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Contact: James R. Troyer, Planning Director

Prepared by

BonTerra Consulting
151 Kalmus Drive, Suite E-200
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Contact: Jennifer Marks, Project Manager

May 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

Section 1.0 Introduction 1-1

Section 2.0 List of Respondents.....2-1

Section 3.0 Responses to Environmental Comments 3-1

Section 4.0 Errata 4-1

This page intentionally left blank

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to present public comments and responses to comments received on Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) (SCH #2000061027) for the Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update. The Draft PEIR was released for public review and comment by the City of Rancho Cucamonga on February 16, 2010. The public review period ended on April 1, 2010.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15088, the City of Rancho Cucamonga, as the lead agency, has evaluated all substantive comments received on the Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update Draft PEIR, and has prepared written responses to these comments. This document has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and represents the independent judgment of the lead agency.

The Final PEIR for the project consists of Draft PEIR and its technical appendices; the Responses to Comments included herein; other written documentation prepared during the PEIR process; the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) and those documents which may be modified by the City Council at the time of certification. The City Council will also consider adoption of a Statement of Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations as part of the approval process for the proposed project.

This Response to Comments document is organized as follows:

Section 1 provides a brief introduction to this document.

Section 2 identifies the Draft PEIR respondents.

Section 3 provides responses to comments received on the Draft PEIR. Responses are provided in the form of individual responses to comment letters received. Comment letters are followed immediately by the responses to each letter.

This page intentionally left blank

SECTION 2.0 LIST OF RESPONDENTS

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15132, the following is a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies that submitted comments on the Draft EIR received as of close of the public review period on April 1, 2010. Comments have been numbered and responses have been developed with corresponding numbers.

Letter No.	Respondent	Date of Correspondence	Page No.
State Agencies			
1	California Energy Commission	February 26, 2010	3-5
2	California Energy Commission	March 9, 2010	3-9
3	State Mining and Geology Board	March 18, 2010	3-13
4	Department of Toxic Substances Control	March 29, 2010	3-19
5	Department of Conservation	April 5, 2010	3-25
6	State Clearinghouse	April 7, 2010	3-29
County Agencies			
7	County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works	March 31, 2010	3-41
Special Districts/Regional Governments			
8	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	March 10, 2010	3-47
9	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	March 15, 2010	3-51
10	City of Ontario	March 29, 2010	3-55
11	South Coast Air Quality Management District	April 1, 2010	3-61
Individuals			
12	Pacific Communities Builder, Inc.	March 3, 2010	3-71

This page intentionally left blank

SECTION 3.0 RESPONSES TO ENVIRONMENTAL COMMENTS

This section includes responses to all substantive environmental issues raised in comments received on the Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update Draft PEIR. Comments submitted on the Draft PEIR included questions about conclusions identified in the Draft PEIR; findings and methodology for preparation of the technical analyses; and comments about community and regional issues. The Final PEIR provides responses to comments on significant environmental points and does not respond to the comments on the merits of the project, nor does it attempt to resolve regional issues requiring full countywide input and consideration. When comments did not address the completeness or adequacy of the environmental documentation, or did not raise environmental issues, the receipt of the comment is noted; no further response is provided as CEQA does not require a response in these instances.

This section is formatted so that each comment letter is followed immediately by the corresponding responses.

This page intentionally left blank

STATE AGENCIES

This page intentionally left blank

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *Governor*

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512
www.energy.ca.gov

Letter 1

February 26, 2010

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA
MAR 01 2010
RECEIVED - PLANNING

James Troyer
City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Dear Mr. Troyer:

The California Energy Commission has received the City of Rancho Cucamonga's Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Report titled Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update Project, SCH 2000061027 that was submitted on 2/22/2010 for comments due by 4/1/2010. After careful review, the Energy Commission has found the following:

We would like to assist in reducing the energy usage involved in your project. Please refer to the enclosed Appendix F of the California Environmental Quality Act for how to achieve energy conservation. 1

In addition, the Energy Commission's *Energy Aware Planning Guide* is also available as a tool to assist in your land use planning. For further information on how to utilize this guide, please visit www.energy.ca.gov/energy_aware_guide/index.html.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review/comment on your project. We hope that our comments will be helpful in your environmental review process.

If you have any further questions, please call Gigi Tien at (916) 651-0566.

Sincerely,

Bill Pfanner

BILL PFANNER
Supervisor, Local Energy & Land Use Assistance Unit
Special Projects Office
Fuels and Transportation Division
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, MS 23
Sacramento, CA 95814

Enclosure

Appendix F
ENERGY CONSERVATION

I. Introduction

The goal of conserving energy implies the wise and efficient use of energy. The means of achieving this goal include:

(1) decreasing overall per capita energy consumption,
(2) decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and
(3) increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

In order to assure that energy implications are considered in project decisions, the California Environmental Quality Act requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy.

Energy conservation implies that a project's cost effectiveness be reviewed not only in dollars, but also in terms of energy requirements. For many projects, lifetime costs may be determined more by energy efficiency than by initial dollar costs.

II. EIR Contents

Potentially significant energy implications of a project should be considered in an EIR. The following list of energy impact possibilities and potential conservation measures is designed to assist in the preparation of an EIR. In many instances, specific items may not apply or additional items may be needed.

A. Project Description may include the following items:
   1. Energy consuming equipment and processes which will be used during construction, operation, and/or removal of the project. If appropriate, this discussion should consider the energy intensiveness of materials and equipment required for the project.
   2. Total energy requirements of the project by fuel type and end use.
   3. Energy conservation equipment and design features.
   4. Initial and life-cycle energy costs or supplies.
   5. Total estimated daily trips to be generated by the project and the additional energy consumed per trip by mode.

B. Environmental Setting may include existing energy supplies and energy use patterns in the region and locality.

C. Environmental Impacts may include:
   1. The project's energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project's life cycle including construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. If appropriate, the energy intensiveness of materials may be discussed.
   2. The effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional capacity.
   3. The effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy.
   4. The degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards.
   5. The effects of the project on energy resources.
   6. The project's projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives.

D. Mitigation Measures may include:
   1. Potential measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. The discussion should explain why certain measures were incorporated in the project and why other measures were dismissed.
   2. The potential of siting, orientation, and design to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy.
   3. The potential for reducing peak energy demand.
   4. Alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems.
   5. Energy conservation which could result from recycling efforts.

E. Alternatives should be compared in terms of overall energy consumption and in terms of reducing wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.

F. Unavoidable Adverse Effects may include wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during the project construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal that cannot be feasibly mitigated.

G. Irreversible Commitment of Resources may include a discussion of how the project preempts future energy development or future energy conservation.

H. Short-Term Gains versus Long-Term Impacts can be compared by calculating the energy costs over the lifetime of the project.

I. Growth Inducing Effects may include the estimated energy consumption of growth induced by the project.

Letter 1 California Energy Commission
Bill Pfanner, Supervisor, Local Energy & Land Use Assistance Unit
February 26, 2010

Response to Letter 1

1. Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines describes the energy conservation information and analyses that should be included in an environmental impact report (EIR) and states that emphasis should be placed on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. For purposes of the 2010 General Plan Update Program EIR, energy efficiency was analyzed on a programmatic level due to the lack of a project-specific development proposal. Energy efficiency was discussed in terms of impacts to electricity and natural gas infrastructure (Draft Program EIR, Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, pages 4.17-3, 4.17-15, and 4.17-21) as well as climate change impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions (Draft Program EIR Section 4.5, Climate Change).

Future development and redevelopment projects associated with buildout of the 2010 General Plan Update would result in increased demand for energy in the form of electricity and natural gas. The 2010 General Plan Update Resource Conservation Chapter sets forth goals and related policies intended to achieve reductions in energy use through implementation of efficiency measures, including encouraging alternative energy sources such as solar and wind energy (Policies RC-4.2 and RC-4.3) and photovoltaic street lighting (Policy RC-5.2). Additionally, the 2010 General Plan Update promotes the reduction of fuel consumption through transit-oriented development and replacing current City vehicles with new, alternative fuel vehicles on an as-needed basis (Policy RC-5.3).

In addition to implementing applicable goals and policies as stated in the 2010 General Plan Update related to energy efficiency, future development and redevelopment would be required to meet the service requirements of electricity and natural gas providers, which would ensure that a less than significant impact related to the provision of power would result (SC 4.17-4). Once the proposed 2010 General Plan Update is approved, future projects developed in the City of Rancho Cucamonga would also be required to comply with all State Energy Efficiency Standards and City codes in effect at the time of application and building permits (Program EIR, page 4.17-7). Commonly referred to as Title 24, these standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. Title 24 covers the use of energy-efficient building standards, including ventilation, insulation, and construction and the use of energy saving appliances, conditioning systems, water heating, and lighting. Because the future development and redevelopment associated with the 2010 General Plan Update would be required to adhere to standards contained in Title 24 in addition to requirements set forth by the respective utility providers, implementation of the 2010 General Plan Update would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

This page intentionally left blank

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *Governor*

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512
www.energy.ca.gov

Letter 2

March 9, 2010

James Troyer
City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Dear Mr. Troyer:

The California Energy Commission has received the City of Rancho Cucamonga's General Plan Update titled Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update Project, SCH 2000061027 that was submitted on 2/17/2010 for comments due by 4/5/2010. After careful review, the Energy Commission has found the following:

We would like to assist in reducing the energy usage involved in your project. Please refer to the enclosed Appendix F of the California Environmental Quality Act for how to achieve energy conservation. 1

In addition, the Energy Commission's *Energy Aware Planning Guide* is also available as a tool to assist in your land use planning. For further information on how to utilize this guide, please visit www.energy.ca.gov/energy_aware_guide/index.html.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review/comment on your project. We hope that our comments will be helpful in your environmental review process.

If you have any further questions, please call Gigi Tien at (916) 651-0566.

Sincerely,

Bill Pfanner

BILL PFANNER
Supervisor, Local Energy & Land Use Assistance Unit
Special Projects Office
Fuels and Transportation Division
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, MS 23
Sacramento, CA 95814

Enclosure

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

MAR 15 2010

RECEIVED - PLANNING

Appendix F
ENERGY CONSERVATION

I. Introduction

The goal of conserving energy implies the wise and efficient use of energy. The means of achieving this goal include:

(1) decreasing overall per capita energy consumption,
(2) decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and
(3) increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

In order to assure that energy implications are considered in project decisions, the California Environmental Quality Act requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy.

Energy conservation implies that a project's cost effectiveness be reviewed not only in dollars, but also in terms of energy requirements. For many projects, lifetime costs may be determined more by energy efficiency than by initial dollar costs.

II. EIR Contents

Potentially significant energy implications of a project should be considered in an EIR. The following list of energy impact possibilities and potential conservation measures is designed to assist in the preparation of an EIR. In many instances, specific items may not apply or additional items may be needed.

A. Project Description may include the following items:
   1. Energy consuming equipment and processes which will be used during construction, operation, and/or removal of the project. If appropriate, this discussion should consider the energy intensiveness of materials and equipment required for the project.
   2. Total energy requirements of the project by fuel type and end use.
   3. Energy conservation equipment and design features.
   4. Initial and life-cycle energy costs or supplies.
   5. Total estimated daily trips to be generated by the project and the additional energy consumed per trip by mode.

B. Environmental Setting may include existing energy supplies and energy use patterns in the region and locality.

C. Environmental Impacts may include:
   1. The project's energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project's life cycle including construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. If appropriate, the energy intensiveness of materials may be discussed.
   2. The effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional capacity.
   3. The effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy.
   4. The degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards.
   5. The effects of the project on energy resources.
   6. The project's projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives.

D. Mitigation Measures may include:
   1. Potential measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. The discussion should explain why certain measures were incorporated in the project and why other measures were dismissed.
   2. The potential of siting, orientation, and design to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy.
   3. The potential for reducing peak energy demand.
   4. Alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems.
   5. Energy conservation which could result from recycling efforts.

E. Alternatives should be compared in terms of overall energy consumption and in terms of reducing wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.

F. Unavoidable Adverse Effects may include wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during the project construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal that cannot be feasibly mitigated.

G. Irreversible Commitment of Resources may include a discussion of how the project preempts future energy development or future energy conservation.

H. Short-Term Gains versus Long-Term Impacts can be compared by calculating the energy costs over the lifetime of the project.

I. Growth Inducing Effects may include the estimated energy consumption of growth induced by the project.

Letter 2 California Energy Commission
Bill Pfanner, Supervisor, Local Energy & Land Use Assistance Unit
March 9, 2010

Response to Letter 2

1. This letter is a duplicate of Letter 1. Please refer to the Response to Letter 1.

This page intentionally left blank

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY — ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, GOVERNOR

Letter 3

STATE MINING AND GEOLOGY BOARD

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

801 K Street • Suite 2015 • Sacramento, California 95814

PHONE: 916 / 322-1082 • FAX: 916 / 445-0738 • TDD: 916 / 324-2555 • INTERNET: conservation.ca.gov/smgb

ERIN D. GARNER, CHAIR
CHARLIE WYATT, VICE CHAIR

BRIAN BACA
JOHN LANE
BENJAMIN LICARI

KATHY LUND
BARBARA LUNDBURG
ROBERT TEPEL

March 18, 2010

VIA REGULAR MAIL

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

MAR 24 2010

RECEIVED - PLANNING

Mr. James Troyer
Planning Director
City of Rancho Cucamonga Planning Department
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Re: Comment on Draft Resource Conservation Element, Mineral Resource Management Policies Amendments, City of Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernardino County

Dear Mr. Troyer:

On behalf of the State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB), I am pleased to have the opportunity to review the Draft Resource Conservation Element for the City of Rancho Cucamonga, County of San Bernardino, dated February 2010, which incorporates the City's Mineral Resource Management Policies (MRMP).

Mineral Resource Management Policies (MRMP)

The purpose and intent of the MRMP are to ensure the continued availability of important mineral resources, while regulating surface mining operations as required by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 (Public Resources Code Section 2710, et seq.), and the State Mining and Geology Board's (SMGB) regulations. When drafts MRMP are received for review, they are examined for **Content, Clarity,** and **Conflict**. The review is conducted by the Executive Officer. If necessary, additional technical and legal advice may be sought from the California Geological Survey (CGS) or from the Attorney General's Office.

Content: MRMPs are examined to determine if all SMARA requirements are addressed and contained.

Clarity: Contents of the MRMPs are examined to determine if they are clearly stated or might be construed in more than one way, which might lead to later confusion.

Conflict: Contents are examined to determine that they are not in conflict with statute, nor are in conflict internally with other portions of the MRMPs.

Mission of the State Mining and Geology Board is to Represent the State's Interest in the Development, Utilization and Conservation of Mineral Resources; Reclamation of Mined Lands; Development of Geologic and Seismic Hazard Information; and to Provide a Forum for Public Redress

Mr. James Troyer
March 18, 2010
Page 2

The Staff Review offers two types of review comments: **Recommendations** and **Suggestions**. These comments are not binding and are offered as a constructive service.

> Recommendations are comments that should be followed if the MRMP are to be acceptable to the SMGB. These recommendations relate to serious omissions in content or statements in conflict with SMARA or the SMGB's Regulations.
>
> Suggestions are comments that are made to improve the clarity of statements, usually by making them more complete or by offering references.

General Comments

As required pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 2762 and 2763, MRMP within General Plans need to address the justification for the loss of mineral resources within its jurisdiction. The Notice, however, provides inadequate justification, since it fails to consider the importance of these minerals to their County's area of jurisdiction. Prior to proceeding with this proposed project, it is strongly recommended that the General Plan address the justification for the loss of this mineral resource as required by State law under PRC Sections 2762 and 2763.

The potential loss of available, permitted aggregate resources from the mineral resource areas may have a strong deleterious effect on the City and San Bernardino County area. In its most recent and comprehensive study of *Aggregate Availability in California (2006), Map Sheet 52*, CGS has found that only about 24 percent of the projected construction aggregate demand over the next 50 years for the areas will be met by currently permitted resources. This is a significant shortfall in construction grade aggregate resource availability, and represents a sharp downward trend from the 37 percent availability in 2002.

To assist the City in addressing these issues, CGS recently published Special Report 206 titled "*Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Claremont-Upland Production-Consumption Region, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, California*." The SMGB based on recommendations from the State Geologist and public input, prioritizes areas to be classified and/or designated, and accepted this report at its December 11, 2008, regular business meeting. CGS Special Report 206 updated information previously presented in a classification report on Portland cement concrete-grade (PCC) aggregate in the San Bernardino Production-Consumption (P-C) Region first published in 1984. The previous report was published by the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG; now CGS) as Special Report 143, Part VII (SR 143, Part VII) – *Mineral Land Classification of the Greater Los Angeles Area, Part VII, Classification of Sand and Gravel Resources Areas, San Bernardino Production-Consumption Region.* 1

As you may be aware, the State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB), along with the California Geological Survey (CGS), work closely to establish policy for the conservation and development of mineral resources throughout the state. Absence of emphasis on the protection of such resources sidesteps the impending exhaustion of permitted aggregate reserves in the City's near-term future.

Mr. James Troyer
March 18, 2010
Page 3

Specific Comments

The following specific comments are offered:

Page RC8. Second paragraph under *Mineral Resources Areas*: It is stated on page RC8 that "*The CGS has calculated the Claremont-Upland Production-Consumption Region will require 300 million tons of construction aggregate to fulfill local building demands through the year 2056.*" The 50-year projected need of "300-million tons" provided in this section is from Map 52, which is now out-of-date since publication of Special Report 202 titled "*Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Claremont-Upland Production-Consumption Region, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, California.*" The updated 50-year projection for construction aggregate is actually on the order of 240 million tons. 2

Page RC8. Second paragraph under *Mineral Resources Areas*: It is also stated in this paragraph that "Current reserves in the Region, including property owned or leased for which permission for extraction has been granted, totals approximately 537.9 million tons." This statement seems to use the term "reserves" to mean "resources." Also, 537,9 million tons is neither an aggregate "reserve" of "resource" figure from any of the published CGS's reports. Special Report 202 provides the aggregate "reserves" for the Region calculated to be 121 million tons, and the "resources" calculated to be 451 million tons. 3

Page RC12. Third paragraph under *Mineral Resources Areas*: This section states "*The City [Rancho Cucamonga] has determined that urban uses shall have priority over aggregate recovery in areas not already disturbed by such activities.*" This statement is in disagreement to the response of the City as required by the SMGB pursuant to SMARA. The City of Rancho Cucamonga has several unmined aggregate resource areas that have been designated by the SMGB within the City and its sphere of Influence. These areas "*...shall be included as a part of the state policy..., and the specific goals and policies to protect against the premature incompatible development of the area.*" Furthermore, Public Resources Code Section 2790 requires the City to adopt mineral policies in its General Plan that emphasize the conservation and development of identified mineral deposits. For example, the City could consider, at minimum, the following: 4

Goal No. 1: Encourage the responsible mining of local deposits of construction aggregate consistent with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975.

Goal No. 2: Protect those mineral deposits designated to be regionally significant by the SMGB through appropriate zoning and buffering from incompatible adjacent land uses.

Goal No. 3: Permit a sufficient volume of local construction aggregate reserves to meet the projected 50-year demand of the population of western San Diego County.

-oOo-

Mr. James Troyer
March 18, 2010
Page 4

As you continue your process of revision and come to a point where you have a complete document ready for the approval of your Board of Supervisors, that document should be resubmitted to the SMGB's office in Sacramento for final review prior to a recommendation that it is in compliance with the SMARA and the SMGB's regulations. The MRMP could then be formally recognized by the SMGB at the first regular business meeting scheduled after receipt of that document.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the City of Rancho Cucamonga's revised MRMP in the Draft Resource Conservation Element within the February 2010 Draft General Plan. We ultimately look forward to the receipt and review of a complete document that addresses the suggestions indicated above.

The SMGB appreciates the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Draft General Plan, and would appreciate being included on future notices concerning this matter. Should you have any questions regarding the contents of this correspondence, or if I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Stephen M. Testa
Executive Officer

cc: Dr. John G. Parrish, State Geologist and Director of the California Geological Survey (CGS)
John Clinkenbeard, Supervising Engineering Geologist, CGS
Rick Thalhammer, Deputy Attorney General
Rebecca Salazar, Department of Conservation
James Pierce, Department of Conservation

Letter 3 State Mining and Geology Board
Stephen M. Testa, Executive Officer
March 18, 2010

Response to Letter 2

1. Pages 4.11-6 and 4.11-7 of the Draft Program EIR analyze impacts related to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State. As stated in the Draft Program EIR, it is acknowledged that development pursuant to the 2010 General Plan Update would preclude mining operations within specific areas of the City designated for future development or adjacent to future development. This impact, as well as the cumulative impact related to loss of mineral resources, is identified as significant and unavoidable, although several 2010 General Plan Update policies from the draft Resource Conservation Element are identified to protect aggregate mineral resources while allowing continued development within the City of Rancho Cucamonga. Specifically and as stated on page 4.11-8 and 4.11-9 of the Draft Program EIR, Goal RC-7 calls for the protection of aggregate mining resources and is supported by "policies to consider the value of the resources prior to approval of development (Policy RC-7.1), to minimize impacts on adjacent sensitive uses (Policy RC-7.2), to allow for future restoration of mined lands (Policy RC-7.3), to terminate designation of areas suitable for urban uses (Policy RC-7.4), and to include the presence of aggregate resources into property titles (Policy RC-7.5)." Compliance with these policies demonstrates the intended protection of mineral resources. Per 2010 General Plan Update policies, mining operations will continue to be an allowable use until such time that a development proposal is received and reviewed by the City. At such time, available options include allowing for mining operations to continue or to allow for such activities to be replaced by urban development. As stated on page 4.11-7 of the Draft Program EIR, "the City is expected to balance the need for local mineral resources with building over these resources".

2. The commenter noted that an updated 50-year projection for construction aggregate is currently available. The updated projection is approximately 60 million tons less than what was identified in the 2010 General Plan Update. For purposes of discussion and analysis, using the larger projection represents a more conservative analysis approach. Therefore, any analysis based on the more conservative number identified in the 2010 General Plan Update would represent a worst-case scenario and the actual situation would be better than discussed in the 2010 General Plan Update. The data in the 2010 General Plan Update has been revised to reflect more recent data available from the State Mining and Geology Board. This revision does not render the existing Program EIR analysis inadequate or legally indefensible.

3. The reference on page 4.11-3 of the Draft Program EIR to the 2010 General Plan Update figure of 537.9 million tons of aggregate resources within the Claremont-Upland and San Bernardino Production-Consumption regions has no bearing on the analysis contained in the EIR. This potential inconsistency does not render the Program EIR inadequate or legally indefensible.

4. Refer to Response 1, above.

This page intentionally left blank

Letter 4

Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental Protection

Department of Toxic Substances Control

Maziar Movassaghi
Acting Director
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

March 29, 2010

Mr. James Troyer
City of Rancho Cucamonga Planning Department
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730

NOTICE OF COMPLETION AND A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR RANCHO CUCAMONGA 2010 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT (SCH # 2000061027)

Dear Mr. Troyer:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your submitted EIR document for the above-mentioned project. As stated in your document: "A general plan expresses the community's development goals and embodies public policies relative to the distribution of future land uses, both public and private. The Rancho Cucamonga General Plan Update proposes to establish the overall development capacity for the City and its Sphere of Influence and will serve as a long-range policy document for determining the appropriate look, feel, and experience of the City.

The proposed General Plan Update will address six of the seven State-mandated General Plan elements and other issues that is important to the community. The proposed General Plan Update contains the following elements (referred to as "Chapters"):

Managing Land Use, Community Design, Historic Resources, and Public Art
Community Mobility
Economic Development
Community Services
Resource Conservation
Public Facilities and Infrastructure
Public Health and Safety

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

MAR 30 2010

RECEIVED - PLANNING

Printed on Recycled Paper

Mr. James Troyer
March 29, 2010
Page 2

Summaries of the content and purpose of each of the chapters are provided below. The City is currently updating its General Plan Housing Element; however, this update is independent of this General Plan Update process".

Based on the review of the submitted document DTSC has comments as follows:

1. The draft EIR needs to identify and determine whether current or historic uses in the Project area have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances. } 1

2. The draft EIR should evaluate whether conditions at any sites in the Project Area pose a threat to human health or the environment. Following are the databases of some of the regulatory agencies:

   - National Priorities List (NPL): A list is maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA).
   - CalSites: A Database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.
   - Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS): A database of RCRA facilities that is maintained by U.S. EPA.
   - Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A database of CERCLA sites that is maintained by U.S.EPA.
   - Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): A database provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board which consists of both open as well as closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations.
   - GeoTracker: A List that is maintained by Regional Water Quality Control Boards.
   - Local County and City maintain lists for hazardous substances cleanup sites and leaking underground storage tanks.

   } 2

3. Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during any construction or demolition activities. If necessary, a health risk assessment overseen and approved by the appropriate government agency should be conducted by a qualified health risk assessor to determine if there are, } 3

Mr. James Troyer
March 29, 2010
Page 3

have been, or will be, any releases of hazardous materials that may pose a risk to human health or the environment. 3 cont.

4. If it is determined that hazardous wastes are, or will be, generated by the proposed operations, the wastes must be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5). If it is determined that hazardous wastes will be generated, the facility should also obtain a United States Environmental Protection Agency Identification Number by contacting (800) 618-6942. Certain hazardous waste treatment processes or hazardous materials, handling, storage or uses may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Information about the requirement for authorization can be obtained by contacting your local CUPA. 4

5. DTSC can provide guidance for cleanup oversight through an Environmental Oversight Agreement (EOA) for government agencies, or a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) for private parties. For additional information on the EOA or VCA, please see www.dtsc.ca.gov/ SiteCleanup/Brownfields, or contact Ms. Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi, DTSC's Voluntary Cleanup Coordinator, at (714) 484-5489. 5

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (714) 484-5472 or at ashami@DTSC.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Al Shami
Project Manager
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, California 95812-3044
state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

Mr. James Troyer
March 29, 2010
Page 4

cc: CEQA Tracking Center
Department of Toxic Substances Control
Office of Environmental Planning and Analysis
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor, M.S. 22-2
Sacramento, California 95814
Adelacr1@dtsc.ca.gov

CEQA # 2816

Letter 4 Department of Toxic Substances Control

Al Shami, Project Manager
March 29, 2010

Response to Letter 2

1. As discussed in the Draft Program EIR (pages 4.8-17 through 4.8-19), Laguna Geosciences performed a database search in 2009 as part of the Special Studies – Hazardous Materials Analysis. According to this report, 46 facilities were identified as having a high potential for, or known release of, hazardous substances into the ground, groundwater, or surface waters. However, as additionally stated in the Draft Program EIR, compliance with standard conditions related to the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (SC 4.8-1), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (SC 4.8-2), the California Hazardous Waste Control Act (SC 4.8-3, the California Accidental Release Prevention Program (SC 4.8-5), and any regulations set forth by the San Bernardino County Fire Department (SCs 4.8-3 and 4.8-4) would ensure that future development on or near any of these sites would not pose a significant threat to human health or the environment.

2. As discussed above, a database search was prepared for the 2010 General Plan Update Study Area which is included as Appendix F to the Draft Program EIR. As noted in Section 4.1 of Appendix F, the environmental database search included the databases of all the regulatory agencies cited in the comment letter, in addition to several other databases.

3. As discussed in Response 1, above, future development and redevelopment projects would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to hazardous materials. In addition to the above, the Draft Program EIR states that future projects must comply with (1) the *California Code of Regulations* (Title 8, Section 1532.2) related to the removal of lead-based paint or other materials containing lead and (2) the *California Health and Safety Code* (Section 39650 et seq.) and the *California Code of Regulations* (Title 8, Section 1529) related to asbestos emissions and asbestos-related demolition or construction activities. Because the Draft Program EIR includes a program-level analysis, it is expected that individual development and redevelopment applications and the need for additional environmental analysis would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. A health risk assessment may need to be prepared if it is deemed necessary or appropriate based on the individual project application.

4. As stated in the Draft PEIR on pages 4.8-6 and 4.8-13 (SC 4.8-3), future development and redevelopment shall comply with the California Hazardous Waste Control Act. In addition to compliance with this regulation, all future development and redevelopment projects will comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to hazardous wastes, including those set forth by the San Bernardino County Fire Department, acting as the Certified Unified Program Agency.

5. The commenter provided a contact related to future guidance for cleanup oversight. Comment is noted.

This page intentionally left blank

Apr-05-2010 14:23 From-DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCE PROTECTION 19163273430 T-163 P.001/002 F-332

NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCE PROTECTION

801 K STREET • MS 18-01 • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

PHONE 916 / 324-0850 • FAX 916 / 327-3430 • TDD 916 / 324-2555 • WEBSITE conservation.ca.gov

Letter 5

April 5, 2010

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

APR 07 2010

RECEIVED - PLANNING

VIA FACSIMILE (909) 477-2848
James Troyer, AICP
City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91729

Dear Mr. Troyer:

Subject: City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report - **SCH# 2000061027**

The Department of Conservation's (Department) Division of Land Resource Protection (Division) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the referenced project. The Division monitors farmland conversion on a statewide basis and administers the California Land Conservation Williamson (Williamson) Act and other agricultural land conservation programs. We offer the following comments and recommendations with respect to the project's impacts on agricultural land and resources.

Project Description

The purpose of the City of Rancho Cucamonga (City) 2010 General Plan Update project is the comprehensive revision of the General Plan document. The City is located in southwestern San Bernardino County. There are no lands under Williamson Act contracts in the City. However, build-out of the 2010 General Plan Update Study Area would convert 196.26 acres of Important Farmland to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the Division recommends that any subsequent CEQA document address the following item to provide a comprehensive discussion of potential impacts of the project on agricultural land and activities.

Mitigation Measures

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

The Department of Conservation's mission is to balance today's needs with tomorrow's challenges and foster intelligent, sustainable, and efficient use of California's energy, land, and mineral resources.

Apr-05-2010 14:23 From-DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCE PROTECTION 19163273430 T-163 P.002/002 F-332

Mr. James Troyer
April 5, 2010
Page 2 of 2

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

Mitigation via agricultural conservation easements can be implemented by at least two alternative approaches: the outright purchase of easements or the donation of mitigation fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements. The conversion of agricultural land should be deemed an impact of at least regional significance. Hence the search for replacement lands should be conducted regionally or statewide, and not limited strictly to lands within the project's surrounding area.

The Department also has available a listing of approximately 30 "conservation tools" that have been used to conserve or mitigate project impacts on agricultural land. This compilation report may be requested from the Division at the email address or phone number below. General information about agricultural conservation easements, the Williamson Act, and provisions noted above is available on the Department's website:

http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/index.htm

Of course, the use of conservation easements is only one form of mitigation that should be considered. Any other feasible mitigation measures should also be considered. 1 cont.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on this DEIR. If you have questions regarding our comments, or require technical assistance or information on agricultural land conservation, please contact Elliott Lum, Environmental Planner, at 801 K Street, MS 18-01, Sacramento, CA 95814; phone: (916) 324-0869; email: Elliott.Lum@conservation.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Dan Otis
Program Manager
Williamson Act Program

cc: State Clearinghouse

Letter 5 Department of Conservation
Dan Otis, Program Manager
April 5, 2010

Responses to Letter 3

1. As stated on page 4.2-7 of the Draft Program EIR, "future development under the proposed Land Use Plan would lead to the conversion of 196.26 acres of Important Farmland to non-agricultural uses". In order to reduce the significance of this impact, a new mitigation measure has been added to the Draft Program EIR. However, it should be noted that despite the addition of MM 4.2-1 (identified below), the level of significance would continue to be significant and unavoidable. The following revisions to the text have been made to the Draft PEIR. ~~**Bold, strikeout text**~~ is used to show deleted wording and ***bold, italic text*** is used to show wording that has been added.

Page 1-9, Table ES-1

SECTION 4.2 – AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES		
Farmland Resources Future Development under the proposed Land Use Plan would lead to the conversion of 196.26 acres of Important Farmland into non-agricultural uses.	~~**No measures are identified.**~~ ***MM 4.2-1*** ***Should a future project propose to develop designated Important Farmlands (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and/or Farmland of Local Importance) pursuant to the current Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program map, the Project Applicant shall implement measure(s) to reduce impacts related to the loss of farmland to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. Feasible mitigation measures may include, but not be limited to, the 1) purchase of land within a permanent agricultural conservation easement, as approved by the Planning Director, of at least equal quality and size as partial compensation for the direct loss of agricultural land; 2) donation of mitigation fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements; or 3) direct conservation of a portion of designated Important Farmlands on the future project site. Should a project contribute to growth-inducing or cumulative impacts related to the loss of agricultural land, adequate compensation values in the form of permanent agricultural conservation easements shall be evaluated on a project-specific basis.***	Significant and Unavoidable.

Page 4.2-6, Fifth Paragraph

Since the existing vineyards are small, scattered operations that do not support any larger-scale agricultural uses and since they represent less than one percent of the total Important Farmland in the County, their conversion to urban land uses is not expected to have a major impact on the County's crop value. However, future development associated with buildout of the proposed 2010 General Plan

Update pursuant to the proposed Land Use Plan (refer to Exhibit 3-3 in Section 3.0, Project Description) would result in the conversion of these farmland areas to non-agricultural uses, thus creating a significant impact. ***Implementation of MM 4.2-1 would reduce impacts related to conversion of farmlands; however, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.*** ~~**There are no feasible mitigation measures to address this impact under the proposed land use plan; therefore, buildout of the proposed 2010 General Plan Update would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to the conversion of farmland.**~~

Page 4.2-7, Second Paragraph

Impact 4.2a Future development under the proposed Land Use Plan would lead to the conversion of 196.26 acres of Important Farmland into non-agricultural uses. ***Implementation of MM 4.2-1 would reduce impacts related to conversion of farmlands; however, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.*** ~~**No mitigation is available under the proposed land use plan; therefore, this loss of farmland would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.**~~

Page 4.2-8, Subsection 4.2.8

4.2.8 MITIGATION MEASURES
~~**No mitigation measures are available to reduce the identified impacts to agricultural resources.**~~

MM 4.2-1 ***Should a future project propose to develop designated Important Farmlands (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland and/or Farmland of Local Importance) pursuant to the current Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program map, the project applicant shall implement measure(s) to reduce impacts related to the loss of farmland to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. Feasible mitigation measures may include, but not be limited to, the 1) purchase of land within a permanent agricultural conservation easement, as approved by the Planning Director, of at least equal quality and size as partial compensation for the direct loss of agricultural land; 2) donation of mitigation fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements; or 3) direct conservation of a portion of designated Important Farmlands on the future project site. Should a project contribute to growth inducing or cumulative impacts related to the loss of agricultural land, adequate compensation values in the form of permanent agricultural conservation easements shall be evaluated on a project-specific basis.***

4-07-2010 16:09 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE P.001/008

Letter 6

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

Cynthia Bryant
Director

Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse

Facsimile Transmittal

Date: 4-7-10

Fax Number: 909-477-2847

To: JAMES TROYER

From: LAUREEN GILMORE

Instructions: PER YOUR REQUEST.

CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA
APR 07 2010
RECEIVED - PLANNING

State Clearinghouse Fax: 916-323-3018

Number of Pages
Including cover sheet

9

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044
TEL (916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

APR-07-2010 16:09 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE P.002/008

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
GOVERNOR

CYNTHIA BRYANT
DIRECTOR

April 7, 2010

James Troyer
City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91729

Subject: Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update
SCH#: 2000061027

Dear James Troyer:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on April 5, 2010, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

> "A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. 1

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Acting Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

APR-07-2010 16:10 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE P.003/008

Form A

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613 | SCH # 2000061027

For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Project Title: Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update

Lead Agency: City of Rancho Cucamonga | Contact Person: James Troyer

Street Address: 10500 Civic Center Drive | Phone: (909) 477-2750

City: Rancho Cucamonga | Zip: 91729 | County: San Bernardino

Project Location: City of Rancho Cucamonga is located in the Inland Empire in southwester San Bernardino County.

County: San Bernardino | City/Nearest Community: Rancho Cucamonga | Total Acres: 24,442

Cross Streets: | Zip Code: 91730

Assessor's Parcel No.: various | Section: | Twp: | Range: | Base:

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy. #: I-15, SR-210 | Waterways: Day Creek, Deer Creek, Etiwanda Creek

Airports: LA/Ontario | Railways: BNSF | Schools: various

Document Type:

CEQA: ☐ NOP ☐ Early Cons ☐ Neg Dec ☐ Mit Neg Dec | ☒ Draft EIR ☐ Supplement to EIR (Note prior SCH #) ☐ Subsequent EIR (Note prior SCH #) ☐ Other

NEPA: ☐ NOI ☐ EA ☐ Draft EIS ☐ FONSI

Other: ☐ Joint Document ☐ Final Document ☐ Other:

RECEIVED FEB 16 2010 STATE CLEARING HOUSE

Local Action Type:

☒ General Plan Update ☐ General Plan Amendment ☐ General Plan Element ☐ Community Plan | ☐ Specific Plan ☐ Master Plan ☐ Planned Unit Development ☐ Site Plan | ☐ Rezone ☐ Prezone ☐ Use Permit ☐ Land Division (subdivision, etc.) | ☐ Annexation ☐ Redevelopment ☐ Coastal Permit ☐ Other:

Development Type:

☐ Residential: Units Acres
☐ Office: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
☐ Commercial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
☐ Industrial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
☐ Educational
☐ Recreational

☐ Water Facilities: Type MGD
☐ Transportation: Type
☐ Mining: Mineral
☐ Power: Type MW
☐ Waste Treatment: Type MGD
☐ Hazardous Waste: Type
☐ Other:

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

☒ Aesthetics/Visual
☒ Agricultural Land
☒ Air Quality
☒ Archaeological/Historical
☒ Biological Resources
☐ Coastal Zone
☒ Drainage/Absorption
☒ Economic/Jobs
☒ Fiscal
☒ Flood Plain/Flooding
☒ Forest Land/Fire Hazard
☒ Geologic/Seismic
☒ Minerals
☒ Noise
☒ Population/Housing Balance
☒ Public Services/Facilities
☒ Recreation/Parks
☒ Schools/Universities
☒ Septic Systems
☒ Sewer Capacity
☒ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading
☒ Solid Waste
☒ Toxic/Hazardous
☒ Traffic/Circulation
☒ Vegetation
☒ Water Quality
☒ Water Supply/Groundwater
☒ Wetland/Riparian
☒ Growth Inducement
☒ Land Use
☒ Cumulative Effects
☒ Other: GHG

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

The City is currently an urbanizing community with zoning and land uses consistent with the 2001 General Plan.

Project Description: *(please use a separate page if necessary)*

The proposed 2010 General Plan Update is a comprehensive revision of the General Plan document which addresses six of the seven State-mandates General Plan elements with the Housing Element to be updated as a separate, stand-alone document.

State Clearinghouse Contact: (916) 445-0613 SL

State Review Began: 2.17 - 2010

SCH COMPLIANCE 4.5 - 2010

Please note State Clearinghouse Number (SCH#) on all Comments

SCH#: 2000061027

Please forward late comments directly to the Lead Agency

AQMD/APCD 33/26

(Resources: 2,20)

Project Sent to the following State Agencies

X Resources
___ Boating & Waterways
___ Coastal Comm
___ Colorado Rvr Bd
X Conservation
X Fish & Game # 6
___ Delta Protection Comm
___ Cal Fire
X Historic Preservation
X Parks & Rec
___ Central Valley Flood Prot.
___ Bay Cons & Dev Comm
X DWR
X Cal EMA

Bus Transp Hous
X Aeronautics
X CHP
X Caltrans # 8
___ Trans Planning
X Housing & Com Dev
___ Food & Agriculture
___ Health Services

State/Consumer Svcs
___ General Services

Cal EPA
___ ARB – Airport Projects
___ ARB – Transportation Projects
___ ARB – Major Industrial Projects
___ Resources, Recycling and Recovery
___ SWRCB: Div. Financial Assist.
___ SWRCB: Wtr Quality
___ SWRCB: Wtr Rights
X Reg. WQCB # 8
X Toxic Sub Ctrl-CTC

Yth/Adlt Corrections
___ Corrections

Independent Comm
___ Energy Commission
X NAHC
___ Public Utilities Comm
___ State Lands Comm
___ Tahoe Rgl Plan Agency

___ Conservancy

___ Other:

APR-07-2010 16:10 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE P.004/008

NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCE PROTECTION

801 K STREET • MS 18-01 • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

PHONE 916 / 324-0850 • FAX 916 / 327-3430 • TDD 916 / 324-2555 • WEBSITE conservation.ca.gov

April 5, 2010

VIA FACSIMILE (909) 477-2848
James Troyer, AICP
City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91729

Clear 4-5-10 e

RECEIVED
APR - 5 2010
STATE CLEARING HOUSE

Dear Mr. Troyer:

Subject: City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010 General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report - **SCH# 2000061027**

The Department of Conservation's (Department) Division of Land Resource Protection (Division) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the referenced project. The Division monitors farmland conversion on a statewide basis and administers the California Land Conservation Williamson (Williamson) Act and other agricultural land conservation programs. We offer the following comments and recommendations with respect to the project's impacts on agricultural land and resources.

Project Description

The purpose of the City of Rancho Cucamonga (City) 2010 General Plan Update project is the comprehensive revision of the General Plan document. The City is located in southwestern San Bernardino County. There are no lands under Williamson Act contracts in the City. However, build-out of the 2010 General Plan Update Study Area would convert 196.26 acres of Important Farmland to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the Division recommends that any subsequent CEQA document address the following item to provide a comprehensive discussion of potential impacts of the project on agricultural land and activities.

Mitigation Measures

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

The Department of Conservation's mission is to balance today's needs with tomorrow's challenges and foster intelligent, sustainable, and efficient use of California's energy, land, and mineral resources.

APR-07-2010 16:11 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE P.005/008
FROM-DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCE PROTECTION 19163273430 T-161 P.002/002 F-331

Mr. James Troyer
April 5, 2010
Page 2 of 2

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

Mitigation via agricultural conservation easements can be implemented by at least two alternative approaches: the outright purchase of easements or the donation of mitigation fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements. The conversion of agricultural land should be deemed an impact of at least regional significance. Hence the search for replacement lands should be conducted regionally or statewide, and not limited strictly to lands within the project's surrounding area.

The Department also has available a listing of approximately 30 "conservation tools" that have been used to conserve or mitigate project impacts on agricultural land. This compilation report may be requested from the Division at the email address or phone number below. General information about agricultural conservation easements, the Williamson Act, and provisions noted above is available on the Department's website:

http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dirp/index.htm

Of course, the use of conservation easements is only one form of mitigation that should be considered. Any other feasible mitigation measures should also be considered.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on this DEIR. If you have questions regarding our comments, or require technical assistance or information on agricultural land conservation, please contact Elliott Lum, Environmental Planner, at 801 K Street, MS 18-01, Sacramento, CA 95814; phone: (916) 324-0869; email: Elliott.Lum@conservation.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Dan Otis
Program Manager
Williamson Act Program

cc: State Clearinghouse

APR-07-2010 16:11 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE P.006/008

Department of Toxic Substances Control

Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental Protection

Maziar Movassaghi
Acting Director
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

March 29, 2010

Clear
4.5.10
e

RECEIVED
MAR 29 2010
STATE CLEARING HOUSE

Mr. James Troyer
City of Rancho Cucamonga Planning Department
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730

NOTICE OF COMPLETION AND A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR RANCHO CUCAMONGA 2010 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT (SCH # 2000061027)

Dear Mr. Troyer:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your submitted EIR document for the above-mentioned project. As stated in your document: "A general plan expresses the community's development goals and embodies public policies relative to the distribution of future land uses, both public and private. The Rancho Cucamonga General Plan Update proposes to establish the overall development capacity for the City and its Sphere of Influence and will serve as a long-range policy document for determining the appropriate look, feel, and experience of the City.

The proposed General Plan Update will address six of the seven State-mandated General Plan elements and other issues that is important to the community. The proposed General Plan Update contains the following elements (referred to as "Chapters"):

Managing Land Use, Community Design, Historic Resources, and Public Art
Community Mobility
Economic Development
Community Services
Resource Conservation
Public Facilities and Infrastructure
Public Health and Safety

Printed on Recycled Paper

Summaries of the content and purpose of each of the chapters are provided below. The City is currently updating its General Plan Housing Element; however, this update is independent of this General Plan Update process".

Based on the review of the submitted document DTSC has comments as follows:

1. The draft EIR needs to identify and determine whether current or historic uses in the Project area have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances.

2. The draft EIR should evaluate whether conditions at any sites in the Project Area pose a threat to human health or the environment. Following are the databases of some of the regulatory agencies:

   - National Priorities List (NPL): A list is maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA).
   - CalSites: A Database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.
   - Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS): A database of RCRA facilities that is maintained by U.S. EPA.
   - Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A database of CERCLA sites that is maintained by U.S.EPA.
   - Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): A database provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board which consists of both open as well as closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations.
   - GeoTracker: A List that is maintained by Regional Water Quality Control Boards.
   - Local County and City maintain lists for hazardous substances cleanup sites and leaking underground storage tanks.

3. Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during any construction or demolition activities. If necessary, a health risk assessment overseen and approved by the appropriate government agency should be conducted by a qualified health risk assessor to determine if there are,

APR-07-2010 16:12 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE P.008/008

Mr. James Troyer
March 29, 2010
Page 4

cc: CEQA Tracking Center
Department of Toxic Substances Control
Office of Environmental Planning and Analysis
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor, M.S. 22-2
Sacramento, California 95814
Adelacr1@dtsc.ca.gov

CEQA # 2816

TOTAL P.008

Letter 6 State Clearinghouse
Scott Morgan, Acting Director
April 7, 2010

Responses to Letter 6

1. The State Clearinghouse acknowledged receipt of the Draft Program EIR and the close of the comment period. Enclosed letters include Department of Toxic Substances Control and Department of Conservation, both of which are addressed separately (Comment Letters 4 and 5, respectively).

This page intentionally left blank

COUNTY AGENCIES

This page intentionally left blank