

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW
PROCEEDINGS

1

THE VILLAGES OF LAKEVIEW

2

3

4 MS. DUTCHER: Good afternoon, gentlemen and ma'am.
5 Gentlemen, here we go again. Special interest
6 developer is laying out a development just like the
7 ones that blew the air in the bubble that destroyed
8 our economy, especially at the epicenter of Riverside
9 County. If you don't remember, let me remind you,
10 this Board permitted our county to be one of the top
11 three in the nation to allow high density development
12 building thousands of homes that average Americans
13 could not afford. Families were bankrupted, thousands
14 of small businesses were bankrupted and the County is
15 very, very close to bankruptcy and the taxpayers are
16 run dry. Again, now, you are allowing that same
17 process to start all over. You are all over again
18 ignoring the fact that Riverside County does not have,
19 nor will it have in the foreseeable future, the kind
20 of employment base that can support this kind of
21 development. That's a fact.

22 You told us in 2006 that thousands of new jobs
23 were going to be created at March Global Port. VHL
24 didn't last three years. And the jobs were, as we
25 said they were going to be, low paying and too few.

2

1 Now we hear there's going to be a medical center and a
2 hospital that will bring in hundreds, if not thousands
3 of high paying jobs, that's not true. That's more pie
4 in the sky. There are four local hospitals that are

The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
5 bankrupt. There's going to be unemployment associated
6 with those bankruptcies. The average wage in this
7 county is so low that most won't be able to pay for
8 the costs of the medical care at that medical center,
9 yet you tout this as a boon to local residents. This
10 development is in the wrong place.

11 You have not adequately resolved in the EIR
12 identified critical problems, the lack of jobs in this
13 area which will persist for many decades. There is
14 not adequate water for the current residents. There
15 are wildly inadequate roads to disperse the residents
16 from this development. We're going to be adding
17 through this one project, not to mention the several
18 more that are going to be coming into this area to
19 40,000 residents. The air is already toxic with
20 diesel and with jet fuels. UCLA reports higher than
21 normal, very much higher than normal lung and heart
22 problems directly related to toxic air in this
23 community, which is a crime. The San Jacinto river
24 basin is a basin. You are approving with cumulative
25 impacts the conditions of thousands more people in a

3

1 sensitive basin which will tremendously exacerbate
2 already toxic conditions with more bad air.

3 You have contaminated local water, as the paper
4 just presented today. You have grossly inadequate
5 water to meet the needs of the residents who are
6 already here. There is inadequate health care here.
7 There's inadequate jobs. There's grossly inadequate

8 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
school facilities. We have among the worst outcomes
9 in education in the nation. We have inadequate,
10 horribly stressed courts and jail systems, and we have
11 inadequate county services to meet the health and
12 welfare needs in that particular sector especially.
13 This density at this particular area will make already
14 deadly problems even worse.

15 I'm going to point out to you something that's
16 so obvious that nobody mentions. Northern California
17 has had a controlled growth policy for years. Their
18 economy is far superior than ours. Their housing
19 values have been far better than ours and continue to
20 be better than ours in Southern California.

21 If you look at the growth that was allowed in Las
22 Vegas and in Phoenix you can see the disaster that has
23 fallen from that. Why can't you see that that's true
24 here? If we develop a more reasonable, controlled
25 growth approach that solved problems before they

4

1 became toxic, we would be able to sustain a good
2 quality of life in this community, which we are
3 losing. In your demographics, which I pointed out
4 last time, we're losing people in this community that
5 are high educated people who have the ability to move
6 someplace else, that's a -- that's a -- my parents
7 were born here. It's a horrible thing to do to us.

8 You don't have actual facts. You talk about
9 conclusions. You say, well, the objectives, those
10 aren't objectives, there's no facts. What I'm saying

11 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
12 is all a public record and they are all facts, they
13 can be supported. We have contaminated water,
14 inadequate water, inadequate jobs, inadequate schools,
15 toxic air, inadequate county services. If you don't
16 act responsibly now, what kind of tomorrow is in store
17 for us, more of what 2007 brought us? It's time to
18 stop now. Thank you.

19 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony,
20 Ms. Dutcher. Next speaker will be Deborah O'Brien,
21 followed by Susan Nash, followed by Joyce Schwartz.

22 MS. O'BRIEN: Good afternoon. My name is Deborah
23 O'Brien and I've lived in Nuevo for 24 years. Over
24 the last six years the Lewis Corporation has met
25 numerous times with friends of Nuevo, of which I am a
board member. Other community groups have held open

5

1 meetings with the general public of Lakeview, Nuevo
2 and Juniper Flats. At all these meetings a common
3 concern has been expressed, how will this planned
4 community of 11,000 homes affect the rural lifestyle
5 of the present community?

6 Five years ago, friends of Nuevo sponsored a
7 community survey which was mailed to every address in
8 the 92567 zip code. The results indicated that the
9 majority of the residents wanted to maintain the rural
10 lifestyle they had bought into when they purchased
11 their properties. The results became the major
12 foundation of the Lakeview, Nuevo design guidelines
13 which were initiated and approved by this Board. The

14 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
15 guidelines were intended to protect the rural
16 lifestyle of the present community. They called for a
17 transition of densities from lower, along the edges of
18 new development to match the existing community to
19 high in the interior.

19 Along the entire border of the Villages of
20 Lakeview the density goes from the existing half acre
21 and larger lots to four to eight units per acre or
22 more. That is not the transition the community had
23 expected when the guidelines were approved.

24 The extended life of this project is also a
25 concern. The construction may be drawn out over a

6

1 period of five to 50 years. A large portion of the
2 homes will be built before any of the public amenities
3 will be constructed. If your plan is for us to become
4 an incorporated city in the future, then we would --
5 could be left without a commercial tax base until the
6 near completion of this project. We will be a dense,
7 urban bedroom community isolated from the very things
8 that would enable us to determine our own density.
9 Friends of Nuevo ask you to send the Villages of
10 Lakeview back to planning and the Planning Commission
11 to resolve these concerns.

12 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony,
13 Ms. O'Brien. Susan Nash has an additional three
14 minutes from Tom Pollock for a total of six minutes,
15 followed by Joyce Schwartz followed by (inaudible).

16 MS. NASH: Thank you. My name is Susan Nash and

The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
17 I don't have my reading glasses with me, I have my
18 sunglasses instead but I think I'm fine.

19 First of all, I would like to talk about the 500
20 foot buffer. There's been no SEQUA analysis of it,
21 it's going to be full of stuff. And to say that the
22 wildlife area doesn't have a road that it can close
23 off and keep people off the wildlife area and Lewis
24 Homes is going to provide this service, for the State
25 of California to decide who goes onto the wildlife

7

1 area is beyond absurd.

2 There are several landmines, 11 that I have
3 identified right now in my letter that I submitted
4 yesterday. The truth about the extraordinary general
5 plan amendment findings required are found in Appendix
6 B, they are not in the EIR, they are not anywhere.

7 When I came to this meeting here in 2006,
8 June 23rd, everybody said, and I've cited from the
9 transcript that's in Appendix B, that the findings
10 would be made in the EIR. The EIR doesn't even tell
11 us that this is an extraordinary general plan
12 amendment rather than regular five-cycle general plan
13 amendment. It doesn't talk about the findings that
14 need to be made, it does not address the findings, it
15 simply mentions the Board agenda item that's here in
16 2006 as if those findings have already been made.
17 This is a complete, deliberate deception on the part
18 of the County for the general plan process. This
19 meeting must be continued. This general plan

20 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
amendment must be continued. The findings for an
21 extraordinary plan amendment must be made or else the
22 Board must decide that the general plan amendment has
23 to go with the five-year cycle.

24 Number two: All Lewis has said and all the RCA
25 said was that payment of money covers one hundred

8

1 percent of the mitigation to the San Jacinto wildlife
2 area, period. The 500 foot buffer they don't need to
3 evaluate because we don't have to comply with CEQA.
4 We disagree with that. They did say that they did
5 have to comply with the Urban Wildlife's interface but
6 as shown on my analysis in the letter that what they
7 suggest for the Wildlife's interface doesn't even
8 begin to meet the requirements in the MSHCP. CEQA
9 has to be complied with, all the impacts to the
10 wildlife area have to be analyzed, evaluated under
11 CEQA. They're saying we can ignore CEQA, we think
12 they are wrong.

13 None of the EIR is valid when we have no idea
14 when this project is going to be built. That is the
15 biggest problem with it. You're going to have to come
16 back in ten or 20 years when Mr. Lewis decides it's
17 economically feasible and do another EIR. So this is
18 a whole big waste of everybody's time and money. It's
19 completely irresponsible to approve an EIR when you
20 have no clue whatsoever when housing prices might get
21 back to August 2007 levels, if ever, or some figure
22 that Mr. Lewis decides.

23 Where is the development agreement? It's
24 mentioned dozens of times and it's mentioned -- it
25 talks about many, many important things. If there's

9

1 no development agreement we don't know what is
2 actually going to happen with this project, especially
3 regarding money.

4 The water supply is a huge problem. The 2009
5 water plan is out. I've provided you a copy of the
6 highlights from the water plan. It shows that by the
7 time this project is built, the whole scenario for
8 water availability in the state is going to be quite
9 different. It presents three scenarios and we have no
10 idea which one of those. All of the water assessment
11 plans and everything else that are in this EIR will be
12 outdated by decades, possibly by the time this plan is
13 approved.

14 Where are the findings of overridden consideration
15 for the eight significant impacts? What's happened to
16 the Village Refinement Plan? We were told orally by
17 Mr. Straight after spending two planning commission
18 meetings going into detail with the Develop Refinement
19 Plan, which actually cites the wrong code sections and
20 is very confusing legally what it means, that it was
21 out but it's still in the EIR. And then, the Planning
22 Commission was told that the conditions of approval
23 override what's in the EIR so we don't need to take it
24 out of the EIR. I don't think that's correct.

25 What are the real fiscal impacts to this county?

1 We have no idea. We know if it was built today it
2 would have a negative fiscal impact. We have no clue.
3 As Mrs. Dutcher talked about, the County is in real
4 trouble and who knows what kind of trouble. It's
5 going to be two or three decades from now when all of
6 us will be gone, and what are we going to settle the
7 next Board of Supervisors with? Why does the EIR
8 assume that the Mid-county Parkway still exists, that
9 EIR has been withdrawn? There is no basis for making
10 the findings. Within 2006 were suggested to be made
11 because the Mid-County Parkway alignment had been set
12 in stone with the EIR. That's been withdrawn. We
13 don't know where the County --

14 SUPERVISOR: Ms. Nash, you need to quickly
15 summarize, okay, because your time is just about up.

16 MS. NASH: Also, the Mid-County Parkway cannot be
17 used to justify the transportation element of this
18 EIR. Thank you very much.

19 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony. Next
20 speaker is Joyce Schwartz followed by Quentin
21 Stoutenberg followed by George Haig.

22 MS. SCHWARTZ: Good afternoon. In my comments to
23 the GPAC and Planning Commission I've asked how this
24 area is ever supposed to be able to incorporate as
25 proposed in the future City of Lakeview discussed by

1 the County when the project does not include
2 sufficient infrastructure for us ever to incorporate.

3 The applicant's response was simple and clear.
4 It is not economically feasible for him to build
5 sufficient commercial / industrial office space, so he
6 simply will not. The County staff report states that
7 this area is not under this sphere of influence of
8 either Perris or San Jacinto, yet the applicant's
9 response is to state that Nuevo would simply be
10 annexed by Perris or San Jacinto. This project
11 doesn't meet any of the criteria set forth in the
12 California Regional Blueprints Program, SB3-75
13 Sustainable Community Strategies. As repeatedly
14 stated by the Planning Commission it is not green
15 enough.

16 The applicant has repeatedly failed to address
17 and meet recommendations put forward by the
18 commissioners to build for sale low income housing,
19 provide adequate jobs to housing ratios and has failed
20 to meet the criteria set forth in Riverside County
21 Lakeview/Nuevo design guidelines, especially regarding
22 the rural urban interface. The overall density of the
23 project is inappropriate for this area and provides no
24 transition from the existing low density rural houses
25 to the proposed high density, multi-family units.

12

1 As I stated before the Planning Commission when
2 they applauded Mr. Lewis for his attempts to master
3 plan, I support the concept of master planning but I

4 believe this project fails it. From its excessive
5 timelines to the inappropriateness of the building of
6 the dense urban city limits (inaudible). The EIR
7 makes no mention of mitigating the significant impacts
8 this project and its high density would have on the
9 items listed, as well as the safety of the equestrian
10 community, the loss of significant agricultural and
11 biological resources. This is clearly unmitigable and
12 unacceptable. We have met with Lewis'
13 representatives, we've presented extensive information
14 to them regarding dark sky-lighting. We asked that
15 all exterior lighting must be fully or partially
16 shielded to meet or exceed all of the standards of
17 County Ordinance 655 in order to preserve the dark
18 skies of the existing community.

19 I question the terminology used in various
20 documents to refer to the mountains surrounding
21 Mt. Rudolph. In the EIR they are referred to as the
22 Lakeview Mountains, yet in the Notice of Public
23 Hearing they are called the Juniper Flats Mountains.
24 This is deceptive and misleads the public about the
25 location of the project. Approved identifiers such as

13

1 those provided by the U.S. Geological Survey must be
2 used in a consistent manner in order to disseminate
3 accurate information. I asked the Board to consider
4 the alternatives to this project, to review the
5 comments and suggestions made by Commissioner Roth at
6 the Planning Commission Hearing December 2nd, where he

7 recommended a gradual transition of density from rural
8 to urban.

9 I urge you to require the applicant to comply
10 with the actual wording of the design guidelines for
11 community interfacing and to reduce the overall
12 density to make any proposed development consistent
13 with the existing RCIP and preserve and protect the
14 existing community and its residents. Thank you.

15 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony,
16 Ms. Schwartz. Quentin Stoutenberg followed by George
17 Haig followed by Sam Powell.

18 MR. STOUTENBURGH: Good afternoon. My name is
19 Clinton Stoutenburgh. I live at 22450 WYBENGA Lane in
20 the beautiful placid area of Nuevo. To quote or at
21 least paraphrase a couple of the commissioners in
22 their earlier hearings: Nice project, wrong place.
23 The GPAC did not pass the general plan amendment
24 because they listened to the testimony and looked at
25 the evidence. I wonder if our speaking here makes any

14

1 difference if you pay attention to the testimony and
2 looked at the evidence.

3 Several things I'm going to say have already been
4 mentioned. The water survey assessment, based on
5 outdated data, goes in circles, and when it ends up it
6 says if we run out of water due to development we'll
7 buy more from EMWD. Where does the water come from?
8 They don't address that at all. My main concern is
9 what was mentioned earlier, I bought to live in a

10 rural area. If you urbanized this rural area, and
11 there's been no -- shown no real need to urbanize this
12 rural area, what I bought into, what I've invested in,
13 I could have bought cheaper in Hemet if I wanted
14 urban, it would be gone, lost forever, not able to
15 mitigate this loss. Thank you.

16 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony, sir.
17 George Hai g, followed by Sam Powell followed by Ann
18 McCi ven. George Hai g. Mr. Hai g, are you here? No
19 problem. Take your time, sir. I'm sorry, sir. I'll
20 call another speaker to make sure we get our paperwork
21 first; is that okay?

22 MR. Hague: Good afternoon. My name is George
23 Hague. It's the Sierra Club's understanding that
24 within the last few days you may have received a
25 couple of substantial letters concerning the Villages

15

1 of Lakeview. I have no doubt that you'll want staff
2 to provide you with written responses to these letters
3 prior to voting on the Villages but please do not
4 forgo reading the letters yourself.

5 On November 13th the City of Riverside sent a
6 very strong letter addressing concerns with The
7 Village. Its staff response was to simply dismiss it,
8 so please read the letters themselves. It would only
9 be appropriate for the public to also have the
10 opportunity to read staff responses and give you
11 additional input prior to your vote and what could be
12 Riverside's largest housing project ever. The Sierra

13 Club therefore requests that you continue the public
14 hearing to a date which will allow everyone, you and
15 the public, to review staff's response to these
16 letters.

17 Let me point out, also, Fish and Game opinion
18 right now is the same that they had in the draft EIR,
19 no project north of the Ramona Expressway, and unless
20 somebody can tell me otherwise, you need to have that
21 in your mind as you're considering this project. They
22 are in charge of protecting the wildlife area as I
23 wish everybody here would be in -- would be in charge
24 of. The 18 pages that follow this cover page are
25 unavoidable adverse impacts. Really consider this

16

1 project. All of these impacts are substantial, so bad
2 that they are unavoidable and you're asking people to
3 live with them if you vote for this project, please
4 read those pages.

5 Then there's an article, newspaper article that
6 includes a quote from Randall Lewis talking about the
7 traffic for the commuting from this project to,
8 believe it or not, San Diego, thinking of this as a
9 project that will allow such commuting. If that is
10 the case, then their average of 20-some miles to a job
11 is bogus. They totally need to redo their traffic
12 impact and the Greenhouse Gas Analysis.

13 The last attachment has to do with a lawyer's
14 opinion on having an agricultural land mitigation
15 (inaudible) which this County will forego at the last

16 minute, at the last general plan. It appears that it
17 is still possible to do so, this project would be wise
18 to do so. You should be also requiring them to have
19 such a mitigation, and hopefully you will, and north
20 of the freeway, Ramona would be nice.

21 One point very quickly on -- the Planning
22 Commission did talk on five meetings but they didn't
23 settle everything. I brought up as has several others
24 the ideal that in 2007, Title 24 -- now Title 24 is
25 updated, every three years, it improves. In 2010 it's

17

1 going to be 35 percent better than it is now. By the
2 time this project is built that 35 percent better than
3 2007 will be behind the times. If you're going to do
4 this correctly and they are going to build the best
5 project possible, that 35 percent should be above the
6 existing Title 24, whatever it is. If it's 2007 when
7 they start building or if it's 2010 or 2013/14 version
8 that's what the 35 percent should apply to, not the
9 2007. And I thank you very much.

10 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony, sir.
11 I'm going to call up Ann McKibben next followed by
12 Corrina Garbonni followed by Michelle Haden.

13 MS. McKibben: Good afternoon. My name is Ann
14 McKibben, I'm president of the Friends of the
15 (inaudible) Club in San Jacinto Valley. We are a
16 non-profit organization. We have been giving nature
17 walks at the wildlife area since 1991. I spent the
18 last 18 years organizing nature walks, restoration

19 projects and attending public events to let people
20 know about the wildlife area. I didn't do this alone
21 but I've been -- I helped. One of the important
22 things to consider about this project is the State of
23 California is the largest land owner in the Valley.
24 It owns 10,000 acres at the San Jacinto wildlife area,
25 the Davis Road Unit is also 9,000 acres Ventura Canyon

18

1 and there's Lake (inaudible) recreation area.

2 The wildlife area has been there since the early
3 1980s, it has a long, long, long history. Its
4 mitigation for the State water project that allows us
5 to live and work here. Partial mitigation, it is also
6 an SKR reserve and it is a multi-species habitat,
7 MSHCP reserve. Perhaps that is one of the most
8 important things to consider when you consider
9 approving this plan. I think personally the whole
10 idea of the wildlife area as being MSHCP reserve has
11 been ignored. Mitigation lands across the valley on
12 hillsides, and you have to ask yourself if it's
13 appropriate to dump 1785 dwelling units next to an
14 MSHCP reserve which will amount to about 5,355 people.
15 Is that an appropriate land use next to a reserve?

16 The County has set up a reserve system that is
17 supposed to protect its endangered plants and animals
18 in perpetuity. You have to ask yourself if this
19 development is sensitive to those needs. Putting
20 5,000 people right between the border of the wildlife
21 area and the Ramona Expressway, that's 300-some acres,

22 think about the density of that. Think about the
23 feral dogs, the noise, the lights, the traffic, the
24 water, the air quality degradation. That's probably
25 one of the most important things you need to look at

19

1 and I urge you to think about this seriously. If
2 we're going to have a reserve system you need to have
3 land -- compatible land uses in places that protect it
4 and this project does not do that. Thank you.

5 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony. Is
6 Ms. Garbonni here? I have a message she might be
7 late. If she's not here I'll put her at the end.
8 I'll call Michelle Daily followed by Mike Foley
9 followed by Mary Hansen. Ms. Daily, good afternoon.

10 MS. DAILY: Just a quick note. Ms. Garbonni is
11 unable to make it but we do have Paul Macarro who will
12 use her time instead today. Good afternoon and thank
13 you for time today. My name is Michelle Daily, I'm an
14 in-house attorney for the Pechanga Band of Luiseno
15 Mission Indians. The tribe has worked very closely
16 with the applicant and the consultant to the
17 applicant, the County planner and the County
18 archaeologist on developing appropriate mitigation
19 measures and conditions of approval for this project.
20 At the November 4th Planning Commission Hearing the
21 applicant agreed to the mitigation measures and the
22 conditions of approval as drafted by the County
23 archaeologist.

24 It is our understanding that there have been no

25 changes made to those mitigation measures and

20

1 conditions of approval and we continue to support
2 those requirements by this project. The tribe does
3 believe that this is a very culturally sensitive area
4 and while not opposing the project, we do strongly
5 believe that these appropriate mitigation measures are
6 needed. Thank you.

7 SUPERVISOR: Ms. Daily, on behalf of your client
8 do you believe that the conditions of approval
9 adequately give you a comfort level that if artifacts
10 are found will get the appropriate procedures in place
11 to alert you and to do the appropriate --

12 MS. DAILY: Yes, correct. Our main concern was
13 the applicant's archaeologist has identified a highly
14 sensitive area. Our main concern was outside of that
15 area what happens? We do believe there could still be
16 subsurface materials there and we did work out
17 mitigation measures to deal with those issues, so
18 we're comfortable with that.

19 SUPERVISOR: Thank you very much for your
20 testimony.

21 MS. DAILY: Thank you.

22 SUPERVISOR: Mike Foley will be followed by Mary
23 Hansen followed by Allen Manee. Good afternoon,
24 Mr. Foley.

25 MR. FOLEY: Good afternoon. I am Mike Foley, a

21

1 resident of Nuevo for almost 20 years and I am one the
2 founders and past president of Friends of Nuevo
3 Community Council, founder and president of New View
4 Used Sports and current chairman of the Lakeview
5 Nuevo Municipal Advisory Council. As a participant of
6 the organizations I've mentioned, I've been informed
7 and involved in The Villages of Lakeview project
8 since it was introduced to the community several years
9 ago. I believe it is a testament to the outstanding
10 community outreach efforts of those group of
11 companies. Their continued involvement in the
12 community has demonstrated a real desire to not only
13 include our thoughts, needs and desires into their
14 concepts and final plans but also a commitment to
15 building the finest master planned community in
16 Riverside County.

17 Through this long process, adjustments have been
18 suggested and made. Community needs have been
19 addressed and although not everyone's concerns have
20 been or ever will be satisfied, it is my opinion that
21 the belief that this project is the best collaboration
22 of community private sector and government possible in
23 today's environment. The Lewis Group has proven
24 itself to be the developer to trust with such change
25 to our community. Development is needed, it will come

22

1 and it should be undertaken in the most responsible

2 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
and thoughtful way. I certainly feel confident that
3 Riverside County, the community and the developer have
4 done all possible due diligence. Now is the time to
5 approve this project in order to be ready when the
6 economy is ready and the need for responsible growth
7 presents itself. I urge the Board to approve this
8 project. Thank you.

9 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony,
10 Mr. Foley. The next speaker will be Mary Hansen
11 followed by Allen Manee followed by George Hai g.

12 MS. HANSEN: Good afternoon. My name is Mary
13 Hansen and I live in Nuevo. This proposal you have
14 put forth to add 11,150 homes or more called Villages
15 of Lakeview proposed by Lewis Group of Companies from
16 Upland, California proves to me your value of the
17 rights and privileges of local citizens of the
18 Lakeview area is of no real concern or importance to
19 you. Do not destroy the rural, country lifestyle that
20 Lakeview and Nuevo community has worked so hard to
21 keep.

22 When my family moved to Riverside County in La
23 Sierra nearly 50 years ago, Riverside had a population
24 of 144,000 people. Every spring orange blossoms
25 perfumed the air from acres of orange trees which are

23

1 now gone, the developers destroyed them. La Sierra
2 and North Corona were the homes of turkey and chicken
3 farms. It was where raising animals and agriculture
4 was affordable, it was a wonderful place to live. But

5 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
when Armington joined hands with Riverside, the small
6 town feel of that time began to disappear, the
7 developers destroyed it.

8 Seven years ago my husband and I moved from Norco
9 to the Lakeview area so we could again have the peace
10 and quiet of country living, and now we are too old to
11 move again. If you jam, cram our area, it will only
12 bring strife, bloodshed, bad air and disease into our
13 community. Also, our wildlife, our most lovely and
14 beautiful habitat will be destroyed.

15 The very first morning after moving to Nuevo at
16 the break of day I had the privilege of seeing a huge
17 flock of Canadian geese fly out of the empty field
18 next to our acre, and it was absolutely breathtaking.
19 The birds positioned themselves while still on the
20 ground and they lifted off in their V-flying
21 formation. It was awe-inspiring and I'll never forget
22 it. Don't fool or deceive yourselves any longer. All
23 the money in Riverside County earned from developers
24 will never do for Riverside County what Riverside
25 County needs.

24

1 Remember, gold does not rule but the golden rule
2 does. Do unto others as you would have them do unto
3 you, then and only then will Riverside County receive
4 what it really needs for now and future generations.
5 Thank you for your time.

6 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony,
7 Ms. Hansen. Allen Manee, I hope I'm saying your name

8 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
right, followed by George Hai g followed by Joseph
9 Ontiveros.

10 MR. MANEE: Thank you, I appreciate it. This is
11 Allen Manee. I have a B. A. in biology and a Master's
12 in environmental planning, UC Berkeley graduate in
13 School of Architecture, two year program for
14 environmental design, currently a state biologist for
15 the State of California, former environmental and
16 transportation planner with the County of Riverside,
17 also a specialist at the state level as an MSHCP
18 specialist. Basically, I apologize, I gave you a very
19 brief one-page summary of my comments.

20 The concepts that I'm concerned with are the
21 following: I use the term dynasty project. This
22 project or any project like this that has a clear
23 effort to create a style and ambiance and a type of
24 setting in its own development is critical and when it
25 takes ten years or more or five years or more to

25

1 develop, but especially when it takes ten or more
2 years, there's a plus and a negative side. The
3 negative side is that these projects over time
4 sometimes have to come in for amendments and changes
5 in the project development. Sometimes that's good and
6 sometimes it's bad, but it's really, in my opinion, an
7 archaic method and shouldn't be pursued by this county
8 or any other county because dynasty projects do change
9 sometimes theoretically into a different project and
10 they morph into something that is not really a good

11 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09. txt
12 idea.

13 What I would recommend as a way of enhancing this
14 project is the following design changes: I would take
15 and move and rearrange and concentrate some of the
16 user facilities of this noble project, it's a good
17 project, so that you could reduce on that 383 acres
18 that is nearest the wildlife preserve. You could go
19 down to 900 homes, then concentrate uses that would be
20 passibly gotten to either by -- since the Mid-County
21 Parkway is not built, by some method of overpass or
22 underpass so that the uses could still be used by all
23 people in the development.

24 My last statement or my second to last statement
25 is this: When you anchor a project like this, which
is in my opinion, a dynasty project, and there are

26

1 many. I'm sure you know them. I could name them,
2 Rancho Santa Fe, Beverly Hills, Century City areas,
3 they've become a dynasty. What happens here is this
4 one is anchored by the Mid-County Parkway at the Park
5 Center and City Center Drive near Bridge Road. So
6 this is already locked into another huge area-wide
7 development, then, therefore, in my opinion, act
8 together to be even a greater force that leads in
9 development from that point forward.

10 Does it become a good development? Does it
11 become a Beverly Hills? Does it become a new project
12 with new thinking and new development and maybe new
13 uses? My last concern is my concern for the MSHCP --

14 SUPERVISOR: Mr. Manee, your time is pretty much
15 up. I'll give you another ten seconds.

16 MR. MANEE: Okay. Yeah. I want you to consider
17 extra protection for the constrained linkage, number
18 20 and for habitat -- discontinuing habitat, number 5.
19 Thank you so much.

20 SUPERVISOR: Thank you. We have your sheet.
21 Thank you for your testimony. Joseph Ontiveros
22 followed by Sam Powell followed by Paul McCarro
23 followed by John Lauda.

24 MR. ONTIVEROS: Good afternoon. My name is Joe
25 Ontiveros. I'm the Cultural Resource Director for the

27

1 Soboba Band of San Jacinto Indians, Soboba being
2 the closest Reservation to the project area. Due to
3 the high concentration and spiritual significance of
4 cultural sights on the project area the Soboba Band
5 does have a direct concern regarding the development
6 of Lakeview. In the event the project is approved,
7 Soboba requests that the Board of Supervisors uphold
8 the conditions of approval in the mitigation measures
9 that were approved by the Planning Commission. We
10 feel that these conditions will assist in the
11 preservation of known resources and provide an
12 opportunity to preserve resources that may not be
13 uncovered -- or that may be uncovered during the
14 development stages. Because the addendums will be
15 done for each phase of this project, no details for
16 the treatment and dispositions of any burials or

17 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
artifacts have been established yet. What we are
18 requesting is that these -- or that these treatments
19 of dispositions agreement be detailed into an
20 agreement of its own and have it mandated that they be
21 approved prior to the approval of any kind of a
22 grading permit that may be issued on this project.
23 Basically that's our request at this time. Thank you.
24 SUPERVISOR: Thank you, Mr. Ontiveros. Sam
25 Howell followed by Paul McCarro.

28

1 MR. HUFF: Good afternoon. My name is Sam Huff.
2 I'm the attorney for the Soboba Band of San Jacinto
3 Indians and we want to impress upon this Board that if
4 you were inclined to approve of this specific plan
5 today, that the conditions of approval that are
6 incorporated in it for the treatment of cultural
7 resources be included in that approval. We believe
8 that they are well designed to insure that the project
9 as it proceeds in over the next 15 to 30 years is done
10 in compliance with CEQA and other state laws, and
11 that is the conclusion.

12 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony. Paul
13 Macarro followed by Don Lauda followed by Alexandra
14 Castro. Mr. Macarro has nine minutes.

15 MR. Macarro: Good afternoon supervisors. My
16 name is Paul Macarro, (inaudible), I'm also a tribal
17 member and I serve as the Cultural Coordinator for the
18 reservation. I'm speaking today to ensure that the
19 cultural resources within the boundaries of the

20 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
project are protected to the greatest extent possible.
21 Although it's called Mystic Lake today, our ancestors'
22 village was called Pah vo (phonetic). The first words
23 mean water, pond, aho, place of water, it's an older
24 word. As it is today, the water in abundant resources
25 that existed there were central to sustaining the

29

1 village.

2 Because we know that it was a major village
3 complex, all components of a large village are
4 identified on this project site. For instance,
5 (inaudible), which are rock art, pictographs outline
6 the area where this project is. There are also large
7 concentrations of artifacts that were located during
8 excavations for archaeological testing during early
9 stages of project. Where my ancestors lived, they
10 died. Because of our knowledge of how our ancestors
11 lived and died, we believe there is a high potential
12 for subsurface burials, burials of our ancestors that
13 are likely to be discovered during the project's
14 extensive grading plan, a plan which lasts over 25
15 years.

16 The Pechanga Tribe is participating in the
17 assessment of the evaluation of the project impacts,
18 the cultural resources for nearly six years. In that
19 time, the tribe has provided extensive comments on the
20 archaeological report, DEIR, including testimony
21 before the Riverside Planning Commission. We have
22 never opposed this project, rather Pechanga consulted

23 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
with Lewis, their project archaeologists and the
24 County Planning Department concerning the impacts to
25 resources encountered during this process.

30

1 For our people, beginning the holiday season is
2 marked with the day after Halloween. It's known as
3 (inaudible), All Souls Day. It's a candle lighting
4 ceremony that we take part in. We light candles for
5 our ancestors, rain or shine, in heavy wind. We
6 are -- it's our responsibility to keep those candles
7 lit down to the wick, and that's really -- it's --
8 it's our charge. You can liken that to what we are
9 getting out of this process and that is at the very
10 least amount of protection, it's called mitigation
11 monitoring in the CEQA process.

12 When we do not outright oppose a project, all we
13 can do is sustain in our proverbial candles. We
14 accomplish this mission by actively participating in
15 all levels of the project, tracking this county CEQA
16 process and consulting with lead agencies on a
17 respectful government to government process. If we've
18 been successful in proving ourselves as the tribal
19 experts and stress the importance of these places from
20 our people's perspective --

21 SUPERVISOR: Mr. Macarro, just one quick
22 interruption, I'm sorry. I have one speaker that gave
23 time to you, Anna Hoover, so you have a total of six
24 minutes.

25 MR. MACARRO: Okay. Thank you. If we've been

1 lucky enough, if we stress the importance, then we're
2 allowed to monitor and it's the very least we can do.
3 For us, it's like having to watch someone dig up your
4 great grandparents' graves, throwing away your
5 grandmother's possessions and it, you know, we're --
6 of course we are not opposed to construction. You
7 know, we're developers, too, but there's a way to do
8 it, there's a way to be responsible. We're being
9 responsible to our ancestors when we enter this
10 project this way and do not oppose the project. As
11 faithful stewards of our ancestors' place of
12 (inaudible) it is our responsibility to look out after
13 these places. Today we ask this Board of Supervisors
14 to follow the determinations made by Riverside County
15 Planning Commission for the Village of Lakeview's
16 specific plan by adopting the Cultural Resources
17 Management Plan as is modified during the Planning
18 Commission process, including Native American
19 monitoring in the entirety of the project. Thank you
20 so much. (Inaudible.)

21 SUPERVISOR: Thank you for your testimony, sir.
22 Don Lauda followed by Alexandra Castro.

23 MR. LAUDA: Thank you. I need to use notes. I'm
24 not real good at this and I'm not afforded a
25 teleprompter so.

1 SUPERVISOR: Take your time.

2 MR. LAUDA: I will be referencing my notes.

3 Number one, I have three issues that I find beneficial
4 to have the Lewis companies in our community. And the
5 first one is their reputation for doing good projects.
6 My wife and I just shopped at Victoria Gardens, we've
7 seen their projects. They are a company that is
8 coherent of the needs of the environment as well as
9 the needs of the community.

10 The second issue I'd like to bring up is the
11 Lewis' investment in the community, their wellness
12 programs and the way that they have committed to our
13 community, helped with community parks and their
14 communication with community. They have been in touch
15 with the community, they have been talking to us for a
16 long time and they have not closed their doors or
17 closed their ears. They have been listening to the
18 community of Nuevo for a very long time.

19 Now I want to address thirdly the environmental
20 issues. It is my position on the environmental issues
21 that a master planned community with roughly half the
22 land set aside for open space is the ideal model for
23 everyone to follow, and if this model fails the M --
24 the environmental program fails as a whole because
25 this is an ideal program.

33

1 Secondly, I'd like to say if this project isn't
2 approved, development will happen anyway. Random
3 urban sprawl will not meet the environmental

4 protections that this master plan will provide. The
5 money generated from a master plan brings in the funds
6 to adequately protect, to mitigate water, to mitigate
7 the public, to control the public, so that we do not
8 violate this space. If you just leave it to urban
9 sprawl, this space will be violated. In a community
10 that open space means the dump, believe me, this was
11 the best choice we have. And a master plan of this
12 size is needed to generate the revenue and to provide
13 the public controls and environmental controls on the
14 boundaries near the sensitive areas.

15 In conclusion, my family was a pioneer family in
16 Perri s. My family has been over here -- been in this
17 Riverside County for over a hundred years. I have got
18 to watch the City of Perri s grow parcel by parcel. I
19 do not think that's a good plan. Anybody would say
20 it's not functional.

21 I'll wrap it up. I am appealing to you, please
22 don't let our community be subject to random urban
23 sprawl. Let us have a master plan and build it right.
24 Thank you.

25 SUPERVISOR: Thank you, Mr. Lauda. The next

34

1 speaker and last so far is Alexandra Castor. I
2 believe that Mr. Pink is coming up. Mrs. Castor, are
3 you in the audience? Will you please stand so I can
4 see you. You're giving three minutes to Mr. Pink; is
5 that correct? Anybody else that wishes to comment on
6 16.4 before I close the public hearing? Okay. Then

7 I'll close the public hearing and call upon Supervisor
8 Ashley.

9 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: What I would like to do, I'd
10 like to have -- would -- let's keep the hearing open
11 and I would like to have the applicant come back and
12 address some of these issues, respond to these and I
13 think that should be part of the public hearing, so
14 let's keep that public record, it all should be on the
15 record. So I'd like the applicant or the consultants
16 to come up, or they can all come up, I don't care,
17 just I'd like to -- you've heard a lot of these
18 issues, some were resolved by the testimony, some may
19 not have been. I'd like to hear you respond to all
20 these.

21 MR. WELLS: I'm Lance Wells of the Lewis
22 Companies. Supervisors, thank you for giving us the
23 time and we're happy to answer whatever questions. We
24 also have in the audience with us a number of our
25 consultants so we'll tag team in between probably so

35

1 it won't be long.

2 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: Okay. There was the one on
3 the Indian artifacts. I think that's clearly been
4 resolved about the testimony of the Pechanga and
5 Sabobada San Jacinto Bands of Indians. I think that's
6 been taken care of quite adequately now. You've also
7 had the issues raised about the impact on the reserve
8 and the 500 foot buffer and all that, and particularly
9 that one -- you have that one village that's north of

10 the Expressway that's over (inaudible) and that's the
11 best part of your project and that's probably the one
12 that everybody seems to be taking issue with. Would
13 you please tell us what you've done? And you've heard
14 all this before. This isn't the first time. There's
15 nothing new that you haven't heard, it's all --
16 everything we heard today basically came up at the --
17 or most of it, the essence of it came of at the
18 Planning Commission meeting. So, explain how you're
19 addressing that.

20 MR. WELLS: Supervisor, you're correct that we
21 did not hear anything different than we've heard in
22 the five previous Planning Commission meetings as well
23 as meetings with the public. Over the course of
24 planning this project, we've had many, many, many
25 meetings with community outreach, with people in the

36

1 community and we've heard a number of times -- but
2 we've also heard from some of the Planning
3 Commission's concerns about density north of Ramona,
4 and you have a school of thought this is what we want,
5 no density in Ramona. We believe that there is a
6 proper amount of density. We began this community
7 with the idea of having a village club resort village,
8 very, very nice, high-end village. It was going to be
9 north of Ramona and we started with 3,000 units,
10 subsequently we dropped that to 2,000 units, and
11 during the Planning Commission hearings as we heard
12 concerns about density, we dropped it down to 1718

13 units.

14 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: Well, I heard a lot of
15 complaints like the animals -- the people are going to
16 go out into the wildlife area and hurt it, the
17 lighting, our animals and turn them loose. What are
18 your --

19 MR. WELLS: Well, we've done a couple things.
20 First of all, right here and right now we are prepared
21 and have heard concerns about density. We have
22 determined internally that we would be willing to drop
23 the density again to 1500, which would make exactly
24 half the number of units. We've also, in meetings
25 that we've had with Fish and Game Department, we've

37

1 had agreements that we've offered them and we would
2 prefer a condition, we would provide fencing and burms
3 between the two areas --

4 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: In addition to the 500 feet?

5 MR. WELLS: Yes, yes, in addition to 500 feet.

6 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: And you say you're
7 restricting, what, two animals, two pets per house,
8 did I see something like that? Dogs got to be on
9 leash and cats have to be kept inside?

10 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sir, that's correct. That's a
11 mitigation measure from the EIR.

12 MR. WELLS: In addition to that we've agreed that
13 we will not --

14 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: How about that stewardship --
15 we talked about a stewardship program. I wonder

16 how -- because I got a feeling that the people in this
17 village, if this is approved, will become the greatest
18 supporters and defenders of the wildlife preserve and
19 I don't think you'd be able to blink out there without
20 somebody, you know, watching you. But I wonder how --
21 you know, something about a stewardship program, I
22 wonder if you can tell me about that.

23 MR. WELLS: We have a community services
24 organization, it's funded through the transfer of a
25 tax, basically it's based on the transfer of housing.

38

1 We've agreed to take some portion of that money and
2 use it for environmental stewardship to provide,
3 perhaps, training for the wildlife area to provide
4 manpower for leasing of the area, that type of thing.
5 (Inaudible) significant amount of money. We've also
6 agreed as part of our -- well, we've agreed that we
7 will not build any attached buildings in the villages
8 that abut the wildlife area, so it will all be single
9 family detached.

10 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: Now, there was one thing that
11 there was concern about facilities being built and I
12 read the conditions, but you can put out for the
13 benefit of everyone here that the phasing, like you
14 get to a certain phase and like you have a certain
15 number of units, you have to build this 40,000
16 community center and the parks are all -- seem like
17 you get so many units and you have to build a park and
18 facilities are being phased and staged as you

19 construct it. Expressway and some of those
20 improvements have to be built as you reach a certain
21 population, obviously. How did that all come in?
22 Tell the folks, you know, what you did to work that
23 out. How did you get into the process you went
24 through to come up with this?

25 MR. WELLS: Well, we work very carefully with the

39

1 staff as well as the community world, we're big
2 believers in the Lewis Companies in providing things
3 when they are needed as opposed to after we're done.
4 We build schools early, we build community centers
5 early, we build infrastructures early. Ramona
6 Expressway we have an agreement that we have
7 benchmarks at every time -- when we get to our first
8 1200 units we have to have so much of Ramona
9 Expressway done. We have to have affordable housing.
10 After so many units, we have to have affordable
11 housing.

12 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: Okay. I saw that and that's
13 phased in. And I think --

14 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Supervisor?

15 SUPERVISOR: Yes.

16 MR. LEWIS: If I could add one more comment on
17 this. The question was when will the shopping come?
18 I didn't explain at the beginning on model for how we
19 will work on this development. We will act as the
20 master developer. We do not intend to build any
21 homes, we hope to bring in guest home builders. But a

22 big part of our business is doing shopping centers and
23 offices and business parks, so -- and we have a strong
24 economic incentive to do a shopping center as quickly
25 as possible because that's what we do, that's one of

40

1 the ways that we make money. But we also know that
2 will be a good amenity for the customers that want to
3 buy homes here. So the retail, we will be pushing
4 harder than anybody to bring shopping centers early
5 because it's a big part of our business.

6 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: I noticed the conditions, so
7 you will join -- the road is going to be formed for
8 the area sometime next year, which basically it will
9 encompass the whole areas, all the existing plans, all
10 the underdeveloped plan, in that whole area. We're
11 talking about above and beyond the developer impact
12 fees and you will not get the reduced rate way out
13 there. And also, the (inaudible) fees and you've
14 agreed it now indicates you're going to have to put up
15 an additional \$5,000 because there's a mobility study
16 done that required that they studied all the
17 circulation all the way through the 215 and places
18 beyond, and they're trying to point out that you have
19 to do improvements -- it's fine to have your project,
20 but we don't want you to drive down the Ramona
21 Expressway and you can't get on the 215, what good
22 would that do? We don't need that. I noticed that
23 was in the conditions and that wasn't brought up in
24 the presentation.

25 There's another one, there was an infrastructure

41

1 study that where all the schools and parks and
2 everything should be, that was done prior to this
3 development, prior to the start of this development,
4 and that was going to come into play as well, your
5 planning of this development, that was going to come
6 into play so that's why we get into the phasing of
7 these parks and roads. And then the new school
8 district, the parks, the water district, all that are
9 involved, and I understand that's why you're
10 pressurizing that water line, you know, the treated
11 sewer, you know, the pressure treated sewer from the
12 eastern district, the water is being treated. That's
13 been moved around and it's used by farmers, but they
14 can't use it up, plus a lot of this project and that's
15 going to be pressurized, and from my understanding you
16 might have to put a water tank up there to do that, so
17 that would be good. And I understand, from what I'm
18 told, and normally the eastern would have to come in
19 and buy these sites for some of these tanks and you're
20 going to donate those. I heard that.

21 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

22 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: That's good. What I think
23 I'd like to do is go ahead and close the hearing but
24 I'd like the staff to bring back next time to
25 reconcile all these issues brought up, here's the

42

1 answer, so we can see where these have been through
2 the conditions, that they've been mitigated, if there
3 is an opportunity to do so. Then we can close and
4 continue a decision on this until January, the third
5 week in January, that would give adequate time to
6 really look at this.

7 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: January 26th it would be, sir.

8 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: January 12th -- let's go
9 January 26th. We can bring -- reconcile all this. We
10 can all have a nice discussion and discuss those
11 issues and make sure we understand it and make sure we
12 resolve everything and we can make a decision
13 whether -- you know, the decision can be, one, we can
14 send it back to the Planning Commission; number two,
15 approve it as submitted it or approve it with
16 modifications and conditions. All those are things
17 that we can consider, so that would be my motion.

18 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you, Supervisor
19 Ashley. I'm going to close the public hearing.

20 MR. LEWIS: Thank you very much.

21 SUPERVISOR: Supervisor Buster made a motion.
22 I'll second your motion so that you can discuss it.
23 Supervisor Buster?

24 SUPERVISOR BUSTER: Yeah, just a couple of
25 questions that maybe they could figure out the answer

1 when they come back to us on the 19th.

2 First, roughly, how many approved but unbuilt
3 residential units are there in the western county
4 both in the unincorporated areas and then in our major
5 cities? One of the issues here is whether this
6 project is right, whether it's premature, that's one
7 issue maybe that we can get at more closer because
8 obviously it's highly conditioned. I mean they are
9 making an effective point that they are stretching
10 themselves to accomplish a lot more with the amenities
11 in this project, with energy saving, so forth than
12 other existing projects. They've gone to the next
13 level. Well, that implies to me there's going to be
14 an extra cost out there on that home, so when new home
15 buyers start emerging here and we get through this
16 foreclosure crisis, it's going to be even more
17 competitive than it was before. So the existing
18 housing stock which doesn't have all those conditions,
19 I mean, you've got everything plus out there, is going
20 to be bid on first. So I'd like to have some idea of
21 how ripe is this project from actual, you know, supply
22 and demand standpoint, then maybe more of a cost
23 standpoint.

24 I'm glad we have Native Americans here because
25 they really remind us of the depth, you know, the time

44

1 depth of what goes on in this county, and this is one
2 of the most beautiful valleys, this or I think
3 Southern California really has. And it is formed by,
4 you know, it's an earthquake valley, it's a rift

The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
5 valley as it were. Indians came through and saw this
6 beautiful rustic lake out there with all the geese out
7 there, the lady still marvels at it today. So there's
8 values, intrinsic values there that are hard to
9 measure, hard to mitigate for. In fact, this project
10 might probably challenge the limit of our ability to
11 mitigate things, to take care of what we would think
12 is fundamental basic incompatibilities. Whether it's,
13 you know, trying to integrate new development for the
14 rural community. I'm glad to see the virgin opinions
15 that the rural community that's surrounding it, Nuevo
16 has a strong -- people are strongly concerned about
17 their community. They approve this project, they
18 dissent from it, they maybe want more conditions, but
19 they are strongly interested in keeping the values of
20 these communities. I think that's one of the things
21 that the County has to guard, jealously guard here.
22 There's that but there's that incompatibility which I
23 know they worked long and hard on.

24 The second obvious one is Ramona Expressway to
25 become Mid-County Parkway and all that lies with the

45

1 huge reserve lands over there, that's a huge
2 incompatibility. And then, you know, if the new
3 residents on both sides of Mid-County Parkway are to
4 become really invested in the area such that they,
5 too, such as Supervisor Ashley pointed out, want to
6 become the most important guardians of it, how does
7 that interconnect across the Mid-County Parkway? What

8 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
are the ongoing measures to assure this takes place?
9 And then you can see on the north side that being also
10 cheek to jowl with dairies, you've got an ongoing
11 motor issue there. I'll speak to -- we haven't
12 resolved that issue. We have people in Victoria
13 Grove -- it's a very different place than Victoria
14 Gardens -- Victoria Grove in La Sierra and (inaudible)
15 all the new residents signed off that they knew there
16 was a large agricultural ongoing activity there which
17 happened to be a chicken farm. Well, that did not --
18 that did not solve the problem. So I want some
19 discussion of that too when you come back.

20 But over and above all of that -- over and above
21 all that, it's kind of interesting, it's an earthquake
22 valley because we've had an earthquake. We've had a
23 tectonic shift here in Riverside County as to what our
24 expectations are, basic expectations about growth
25 should really be.

46

1 You heard the historic line from the 1950s or
2 more that growth was inevitable and we were in -- we
3 needed it no matter what, and it was the leader, it
4 brought everything else behind it. It would come.
5 The rest of it would come, commercial would come, jobs
6 would come, the revenues would come, the property
7 taxes, the sales taxes, all of that was dependent on
8 growth and developmental land, and in fact,
9 developmental land at the farthest reaches, at great
10 distances, physical distances from infrastructure and

11 The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
12 that we could overcome all those. We have the ability
13 to overcome all these obstacles out here. I think all
14 this assumption should be thrown into a clapped hat.
15 I mean, when I just see next year's county budget, you
16 know, come back, come back and hear us in our budget
17 reading.

18 This county in its ability to pay for things,
19 just from a property tax standpoint has been shaken to
20 the roots, has been shaken to our roots. And it's
21 partially -- largely dependent because we put all of
22 our eggs into the growth basket, and boy, did we buy
23 on to it. So, you know, I saw the land rush as a
24 resident and so forth in the late 1980s when 110,000
25 units were approved, mainly around the southwest
county, some of which hadn't even been built yet

47

1 without much planning, without the adequate fees,
2 (inaudible), so they had some developer fees but
3 without the coherent planning.

4 This developer comes forward to us with coherent
5 planning as far as -- and in fact beyond what they're
6 required to do under a specific ordinance, but yet the
7 changes here that happen in Riverside County are so
8 great that it is incumbent on this Board to assure
9 ourselves that this project is right, you know, that
10 it can adequately mitigate and that these residents
11 aren't consigned for ten to 15 years after they buy in
12 to commute to far distant jobs out there. And that's
13 what I don't have the assurance of at this point.

The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09.txt
14 That's where I think the extra amount of scrutiny,
15 extra amount of depth has to take place here on this
16 particular ground -- you know, this is the one big
17 area that really hasn't been developed in the western
18 county so it ought to be done right.

19 SUPERVISOR: Thank you Supervisor Buster. We
20 have a motion for a continuance, and a second for
21 continuance. Is there any other further comments
22 before we vote? None.

23 SUPERVISOR ASHLEY: We're going to close here.
24 We are going to continue the decision and we're going
25 to hear all of this and have all of this analyzed back

48

1 so we can make a decision.

2 SUPERVISOR: Yeah. (Inaudible) is going to come
3 back with a -- answers to issues that have been raised
4 by the audience with the Board and have full
5 discussion and ultimate approval consideration at the
6 January 27th meeting. The pass is unanimous. Our
7 screens are dead up here. That takes us to
8 adjournment. Do we have any special adjournments for
9 today? If not, this meeting is adjourned.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16

The Villages Of Lakeview Proceedings 12-15-09. txt

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

49

CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon Mr. Pink.

MR. PINK: Couple of people gave me their time, as well, if so needed.

CHAIRMAN: OK go hand that to the Clerk.

CHAIRMAN: I assume Mr. Pink has nine minutes. Three, three and three.

MR. PINK: OK. My name is William Pink. I'm a member of the Pala Indian Reservation. I currently reside on Pechanga. I grew-up in the San Jacinto area, lived on Soboba the first year of my life and I don't know whether to be opposed to this project except maybe with conditions that I could maybe support the project.

When we were first consulted with this, we got to hear a lot of the usual promises. We will work with you if you don't oppose us and then we began to see the promises sliding backward just as we did with Audie Murphy. You know, Audie Murphy sustained significant damage out there and I guess what I want here is greater assurance that some of these sites will be protected, that more effort is going to be put into protecting these sites. They are significant. They have religious significance, cultural significance and I don't think those issues have been addressed properly and one of those issues being in the event of discovery of human remains out there, what happens, who is the most likely descendant?

I think the matter's been confused by the archeologists and doing cultural resource assessment raises the question, are archeologists really qualified to do cultural resource assessment and my answer to that is no they are not. They can assess the scientific value of an archeological site but they cannot assess my religious beliefs and for that reason, this particular document is deficient and so I, if anything else, would ask for a continuance until these matters are addressed.

And I want to address it specifically as I believe this to be Luiseno territory and this is from my upbringing. As a child nine years old, my aunt's great aunt, who was Thorentina Alubo from Cahuilla, used to come down to the San Jacinto area and stay with her and she would tell us stories as to how they came into certain areas of the land and one was of how they traveled to the mountains and saw the ocean for the first time and thought that the flood was coming back so he encouraged the people to move to the mountains and that is how they became mountain Cahuilla. The issue here that the

archeologists bring is that they claim this area to be a joint area of Serrano, Cahuilla, Luiseno, and you know, it just, it confuses the matter. And I think it's a very simple clear cut and dry it is Luiseno territory and that needs to be spelled out. The other is in the bird songs of the Cahuilla people themselves say they are not from here. They traveled during their migration visiting different places looking for home and when they came to the village of Ioba, which is at Gilman Springs, the one song, *Ioba Ioba Cotamelay*, which means I am at the village at the end of the valley, they came to realize that home is where they came from which was the desert region: Palm Springs, Banning Pass, and out into the Coachella Valley. So even their own songs say they are not from here and I think this needs to be changed in this particular document and the confusion with possibly the Serranos that what a lot of people do not realize that there at one time was the San Jacinto Indian Reservation in conjunction with the Soboba Indian Reservation and those people for some reason disappeared and these may have been Serrano people that were moved at one time to that region and placed on that particular reservation. That reservation was sold and dissolved. So it no longer exists and nobody actually knows what happened to those people, where they went to. You know we do have those buffer zones Nichia Canyon, Massacre Canyon, Portrero, which are absolutely Cahuilla territory and possibly border with Serrano people. But as for this particular area and with respect to my religious beliefs and cultural values, this is absolutely Luiseno.

The other thing I would ask for too and what happened in Audie Murphy and that is the use, because I worked on projects from 1975 through '80. I was also served as former Executive Secretary of the California Native American Heritage Commission instrumental in the passage of 5097.98 of Public Resources Code having to do with the discovery of human remains and the appointing or designation of a most likely descendant. So if these matters can move clearly and that there is not confusion when human remains, and they will be discovered out there, I can guarantee you that. Even the archeologists have said in some particular areas and I asked them specifically based on the information you have, can you predict that there will be burials in this location and the answer was yes. You know, we know this from as many sites have been dug up in Riverside County that there will be encounters with either cremations or burials. And so, there needs to be something resolved with respect to monitors, I think,

I believe there should be monitors on the project. I think, but I think there has to be a revisit to this thing because it's getting down to, and I don't know why but I think the archeologists are the driving factor in this, where Indians become more excluded in these projects as we go along. You are now setting aside more land for rats than you are for Indian burial sites and that's wrong. Why can't we look at these open spaces, why can't we look at the SB 18 process with respect to the General Plan Amendments, you know, identify these areas and make them inclusive that they be rat areas as well as protecting our cultural values. What is so difficult about that?

The other part is the mining, and this is what happened at Audie Murphy, some very significant sites that were destroyed because of the mining activities that were allowed there. Under these projects, subdivisions are exempt from SMRA, Surface Mining Recommendation Act, but I think you can condition this to where we do not allow mining up in these foothill regions where a lot of these significant sites are. I know it requires that maybe they'll have to import road base, that type of thing, but if it adds to the protection of our sites and preserves our religious sites, then so be it. That's what needs to be done. You know, what happened at Audie Murphy was they ended up exporting most of the materials they were producing which is allowed under SMRA on these things and we don't need to do this here. We don't need to go in these foothills and because it comes afterwards it's probably not even mentioned but when somebody wants road base they because of the exemptions can go in there and start grinding these rocks up that were bedrock mortars, cupule boulders, which are truly religiously significant to us and other features, pictographs. You know four pictograph sites at Audie Murphy were destroyed for that very purpose of creating road base and that was not necessary and a lot of these things here are not necessary as well so I could either ask for those conditions or that this be, that there not be approval at this time, that it be continued until we can really sit down and have some serious discussions on this as to who the MLDs will be in the event of discovery, whose territory it is, and that some of these sites be preserved in much better condition than what they are and they are not a science. This is our ancestry. You know, we are from here. We've been here for more than 6000 years and should not be passed over lightly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Pink for your testimony.