

Torres, Eddie

From: Ron Santos <rsantos@lakeforestca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2012 11:01 AM
To: 'smolloy@baldwinsons.com'; Torres, Eddie
Cc: Alisha Winterswyk; Cheryl Kuta
Subject: FW: Portola Center development comments/concerns
Attachments: E-Mails - Public Comments 07-02-12 to 07-24-12.pdf

Hi Eddie and Scott,

Please see the attached updated pdf of the comments received by the City via e-mail regarding the Portola Center project between 07-02-12 and 07-24-12.

RON SANTOS

City of Lake Forest

(949) 461-3449

From: The Schreibers [<mailto:schreibers@cox.net>]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 4:34 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Center development comments/concerns

To Mr. Santos and any others at City Hall involved in the planning/reviewing of Portola Center,

We are residents of Portola Hills and have enjoyed all that it has to offer since 1998. We value the natural, untouched beauty of the surrounding areas of Whiting Ranch, O'Neill Park and the Santa Ana mountain range; the peacefulness of living in a neighborhood that is not overcrowded or aesthetically marred by commercial development or excessively dense residential development; low crime rates and a safe environment to raise families; etc.

We have some very serious concerns about the Portola Center development that we'd like to express and would hope that the city of Lake Forest will take into account during the next phases of the review process. Those concerns are:

- As we understand it, the density of the new development should be on par with the current density of Portola Hills. It does not seem like 904-930 new homes is consistent with the current density. Even if the number of new homes were closer to 904, the density is not consistent with the current density and would negatively change the aesthetics of Portola Hills.

- As we understand it, there are very large retaining walls, similar to the retaining walls in the new development in Lake Forest called Whisler Ridge. Again, this is not consistent with the current development in Portola Hills. These large retaining walls are an eyesore, not an appealing visual for our neighborhood.
- The traffic produced by such a large number of new homes will place an undue burden on the existing roadways. Portola Parkway, Bake Parkway, Glenn Ranch and Saddleback Ranch roads are already congested at peak hours. The proposal of adding a traffic light on Saddleback Ranch, so close to where it meets Glenn Ranch is illogical and unreasonable. What is the city code regarding stopping and sight distance relative to traffic lights? Will there be a traffic study prepared while school is in session, so as to provide a realistic view of traffic patterns? Safety of everyone and especially young children is of huge concern.
- There should be more entrance/exit points into the proposed new neighborhoods off of Glenn Ranch and El Toro to mitigate traffic on Saddleback Ranch Road. Additionally, what is the city code and or Emergency Safety code relative to evacuation routes? We were here during the fires of 2007 and with the addition of so many new homes, there needs to be a better evacuation plan with more roads to evacuate on.
- Will the city of Lake Forest take into consideration the new proposed development at Glenn Ranch and El Toro during the EIR period?
- As we understand it, \$2.9 million is supposed to go directly to Portola Hills Elementary, not SVUSD, as soon as the first permit is approved. Who at the city is actively involved in ensuring the money does in fact go to the school, not to the district?
- Why are tract plans displayed at these community meetings, but not posted on the city's web site?
- As we understand it, there have been numerous issues with the quality of the past development performed by Baldwin (i.e. excessive settling, slope failure, etc). What can the city do to ensure a higher quality of engineering to avoid these issues with the new development?

We look forward to hearing back from you and to your support in ensuring the developers are kept to responsible development of our beautiful neighborhood. Thank you.

Sandy & Brad Schreiber

28602 Chimney Rock Circle, Portola Hills

Torres, Eddie

From: Ian and Amanda Morrell <morrella@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 2:28 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Cc: Ackerman, Gayle
Subject: Comments to Modified Initial Study/Environmental Check List for Portola Center
Attachments: Morrell Portola Center IS NOP Comments.pdf

Mr. Santos,

Please find attached our comments to the Modified Initial Study/Environmental Check List for Portola Center.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on this project.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

R,

Ian and Amanda Morrell

Ian and Amanda Morrell
28561 Chimney Rock Circle
Portola Hills (Lake Forest), CA 92679

16 JULY 2012

VIA EMAIL, Facsimile (949) 461-3512, and HAND DELIVERY

Ron Santos
Senior Planner
City of Lake Forest
25550 Commercentre Drive
Lake Forest, CA 92630
rsantos@lakeforestca.gov

Reference: Comments to Modified Initial Study/Environmental Check List for Portola Center

Dear Mr. Santos:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on what scope or level of analysis will included in the Environmental Impact Report for the Portola Center Project. We have waited a long time for this project to move forward, and we understand that this stage of the process is all about gathering data and feedback.

We agree with most of the areas already identified to be studied in the EIR. However, we do not feel that some of the conclusions presented in the *Modified Initial Study/Environmental Checklist*, or in the *Opportunities Study EIR* are fully supported at a project-level, and therefore should be included in the project-level EIR so that substantial evidence can be presented to support such conclusions.

We respectfully request that you also include Biological Resources, Land Use and Planning, Public Services, and Utilities and Service Systems in the document. Our priorities are traffic, construction impacts, visual continuity, impacts to wildlife, and air quality as well as cumulative impacts. However, our hope in offering a detailed list of concerns is that City staff and decision makers will thoroughly evaluate the details of this project and work with the proponent to significantly improve what is being proposed.

Our specific concerns are the following:

2.1 Project Location

The NOP references the Portola Center Area Plan 2008-01, and Tentative Tract Map Nos. 15353 and 17300 (the project). However, beyond that reference there no plans or maps currently offered for public review.

2.4 Project Characteristics

This section states: “The project consists of an Area Plan (Area Plan 2008-017) and Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No.s 15353 and 17300 for the 195-acre Portola Center project site. The project will include a variety of housing types, including a mixed-use area with a small neighborhood commercial component, as well as parks, and open space.”

There is an apparent lack of detail to adequately and consistently describe the technical aspects of the project. Per CEQA, the language of the project description should be clear.

- Even after reading the *Modified Initial Study/Checklist* we still feel like we are in the dark relative to understanding the details of what is proposed. The big picture concept is easily understood and remains somewhat consistent but the project level details are vague and make it difficult to get a handle on all the possible ramifications for which one might be concerned.

For example, one speaker was under the impression from information provided at the City Council meeting on July 10th that most of the new homes in Portola Center would be restricted from building their own backyard swimming pools. It is not apparent from the applicant information if new community clubhouses and swimming pools are to be provided. The speaker was concerned that the new residents would be trying to come to the existing HOAs to try to use our pools. Following the Planning Commission Workshop, Mr. Robert Day told the above mentioned speaker that what she had said was not true at all, inquired where she had gotten that information and showed her an “outdated” Area Development Plan where swimming pools would be proposed. Are HOA pools part of the proposed project or not? Will new homeowners have restrictions on their lots or not? If so, what are they?

- We understand that new information or changes in the project design will happen during project development. Yet it seems to us that there are still significant issues to be resolved by the proponent and the City prior to moving forward with an EIR that may or may not be of critical significant importance to public feedback and local approval. As such these changes may render further scrutiny under CEQA and we (the public) may not even be informed of such changes when in fact these changes might affect our comments and create new concerns.
- Most of the Planning Commission Workshop presentation by the applicant focused on describing the intent of the use of retaining walls on the project site verses details about the entire project when the public has not had access to the Tentative Tract Maps. Additional information is needed to adequately offer input.

3.1 Background

- The list of public agencies on page 3-1 of the *Modified Initial Study* is incomplete. Appropriate approving agencies should have been listed instead of saying “among others” so that we could develop a better understanding of where additional input will be coming from.

4.3 Air Quality

- Moving 500,000 CY of dirt from the South parcel to the North and vice versa for a total of 1,000,000 CY of earth moved offers much room for concern related to truck trips, noise, exhaust, air quality, ground vibration, impacts to existing adjacent homeowners, HOA swimming pools, accidental windshield damage by rocks to privately owned vehicles and respiratory health concerns for those who live here with asthma or allergies to dust. All of which could have economic impacts to existing residents.
- If one truck has the holding capacity of approximately 11 CY of soil then is the proponent anticipating the equivalent of 90,909 loads? How much time will be required for Grading and Drainage and for transporting that much earth from site to site? There is no mention of how Santa Ana Wind conditions, which are severe in Portola Hills, will impact construction activities, wildlife habitat and air quality during construction. This needs to be a consideration. Not only will the winds have a huge impact on air quality but they could contribute to flying debris and pollution in reserve areas.

4.4 Biological Resources

The *Opportunities Study EIR* stated that Wildlife movement corridors would be addressed at the project level. According to the *Modified Initial Study/Environmental Checklist and the Technical Study* Biological Resources are not included in the project level EIR. Please include this Section as part of the DEIR.

- We are concerned that the addition of massive retaining walls will impede the movement of wildlife in and around the project.
- The consolidation of MM3.1-1, MM3.1-2, MM3.1-3 have diluted the requirements that were once in MM3.1-3.
- The last biological studies were conducted in October 2010. We are only a few months shy of two years and this is the beginning of a lengthy process before dirt starts to move. At what point will biological site investigations be conducted again to ensure analysis of sensitive species conditions/findings remain consistent with earlier studies? Surveys conducted during breeding seasons for the species listed on page 4.4-26 is prudent.
- Page 4.4-29, the use of 1997 mapping to determine acreage for mitigation calculations for Coastal Sage Scrub is inadequate to determine conditions fifteen years later. These are permanent significant direct impacts and the full amount that exists today is what should be mitigated, and not those mapped in 1997, regardless of whether this results in more or less fees being paid.
- Comment response RTC CDFG-2 stated that wildlife crossing measures will be identified, discussed and analyzed within the project level EIR for any project proposed for this site. If this is the case why has Biology been already dismissed in the Initial Study? Comment response RTC DASII-1, Vegetation maps will be included as part of the project level review on each of the development sites. During project-level review the specific impacts of the proposed site designs

will be analyzed as to avoid or minimize impacts to habitat. We see no effort to minimize impacts in the Technical Study.

- The statement that coyotes “may be” directly impacted is false. Coyotes will be directly impacted as will other species not identified. This needs to be revisited. Reduction of wildlife habitat, foraging areas, corridors and movement are concerns that needs to be adequately analyzed with the details of the proponents plan. The impacts and “edge effects” especially given the projects proximity to Reserve areas needs to be mitigated to less than significant. We have seen a Bobcat in the very narrow common area behind our house as well as many other mammals and raptors. We know they are using this for movement. We live on the interior of the development. Below are three photos taken in our backyard. Foraging on the Portola Center Site is certainly needed to support these birds even though they are not species of concern.



- Page 4.4-43, MM3.4-2 states that “if coastal sage scrub habitat is found...”. Coastal Sage simply exists.
- Page 4.4-44, Number 3, “If birds....to areas of the site (insert “to”) be protected...” Number 4. Why not fence before?
- What is the dust drift radius of the construction area in Santa Ana Wind conditions and how will that impact Coastal Sage Scrub and the other species mentioned for protection?
- We have a neighbor behind us who is on an elevated pad with a spot light that shines directly into our second story bedroom window. We know that light mitigation will occur but how will it be enforced? In addition, having clear line of sight into windows and backyards is problematic. Can this be studied?
- Approximately 13 years ago we had purchased a new home in Santiago Canyon Estates, not far from the Portola Center Site. As the development was new, there was much dirt/mud to be found. Our first weekend there we noticed all these birds flying around and we thought how wonderful it was to see. To our surprise (and the rest of the residents), they were Swallows and they started attaching mud to our homes in order to build their nests. We were told by the authorities that we were not allowed to harass the birds as a means of preventing them from getting to our homes (say by washing the mud off with a water hose) and we were not allowed to remove their nests once attached until after nesting season. We ended up with 3 nests on our house while other neighbors had many more. Some residents had real problems and issues with the birds. It seems logical to us that it is possible for the same activity to occur in Portola Hills as a result of so much grading, wetting and the lag of build out. It would be prudent to disclose this

information to residents as a part of the EIR and identify mitigation such that homeowners are educated about what is happening and what is and is not allowed by law.

4.6 Geology and Soils

- The *Modified Initial Study* states that retaining walls are a “key” component of the grading plan. The proponent’s presentation to the Planning Commission stated that retaining walls will vary in height from 3 to 30 feet and are used in such a manner to be consistent with (their somewhat paraphrased interpretation) the City’s Retaining Wall Guidelines. Given the local geology, soils conditions, landslide potential, wetting induced settlement issues on the project site, and in Portola Hills, the use of large conventional concrete block or mechanically stabilized earth walls are a big concern for many reasons. What about long term viability (test of time), homeowner restrictions, visual aesthetics, ability to blend with existing neighborhood and natural character of the area, maintenance responsibility and costs, child safety, and wildlife movement?
- What about the compaction needed to install such walls? Certainly the ground vibration alone may affect the existing slopes and homes on the perimeter of Portola Hills. Portola Hills II HOA has had to expend over one million dollars repairing slope failure near Whiting Ranch. Slope failure as a result of the construction of Portola Center should not fall to the responsibility of the HOA, City or residents even if beyond the statute of limitations. Mr. Stephen Haase said in his presentation that Baldwin wants to “responsibly” develop and maintain “in perpetuity,” yet they have not previously demonstrated a concern or financial support to either Portola Hills II HOA or Portola Hills Elementary when slope failure previously occurred. We are concerned that there will be additional cumulative impacts relative to slope failure as a result of this project, and suggest that the City investigate obtaining various guarantees (such as long term performance bonds) to offset this risk.

4.10 Land Use and Planning

- Based on the information we have thus far, we believe that the project proponent is not putting forth a plan that achieves a balance between the desire of the proponent to create developable land and the surrounding community's desire for a high quality, visually harmonious development. Their use of retaining walls is very subjective relative to meeting the Goals and Objectives in the *City of Lake Forest Retaining Walls Guidelines*.

4.14 Public Services

- We are concerned about the additional demands/load for utilities like electricity and water. As the project does not appear to include additional potable water storage, we are particularly interested in learning how the proposed project will affect our water pressure. Portola Hills has historically had issues regarding low and fluctuating water pressure (<25 psi).

4.16 Transportation and Traffic

- Traffic has been consistently the number one issue in the City of Lake Forest. The cumulative traffic on Portola Parkway needs to be evaluated again to include all of the new developments to

ensure proper measures can be taken to maintain acceptable level of service on Portola Parkway between El Toro Road and Lake Forest Dr.

- The capacity of the intersection at Glen Ranch and Saddleback Ranch is of utmost concern. During the fires it was our only ingress and egress from this area. It took 45 minutes at 4:30 in the afternoon to get from the Whiting Ranch Parking lot/Oakley area to Chimney Rock. Our concern is that with an increased residential load and no ingress or egress other than off Santiago Canyon or Ridgeline which were closed in the last fire, the additional homes in this area are a serious issue. Portola Center ingress and egress on the north side needs to be off of Glen Ranch to provide adequate options and dispersion techniques.

We suggest improving the entrance to Whiting Ranch and have it serve the residences and the park. Signalize it. Make one the entrance to the northeast side off of Saddleback but have it be right hand turns only. If residents want to exit onto Saddleback to go towards the school, but restrict left turns without an additional signal on Saddleback so close to Glen Ranch.

- Recent traffic counts were taken at Saddleback near Cedar Ridge right around July 4th and should be considered invalid. Counts in late Sept. or early Oct. would represent a typical condition for this area.
- Section 7-12, City of Lake Forest Opportunities Study Program EIR, Chapter 7 Recirculated Portions of the Draft PEIR stated the following: “In addition, while the analysis of project level intersections is not part of the program-level analysis, the Lake Forest Traffic Mitigation Program (LFTM) requires analysis of intersections within each of the sites as part of project-level review, as well as analysis of a specific list of twenty intersections (called “secondary intersections”) at the project level, as part of the project level traffic studies required at the next level of analysis. Seven intersections are specified for the Portola Center applicant to study as part of the project level traffic study. The seven required intersections for Portola Center are: El Toro Road at Glenn Ranch Road, Saddleback Ranch Road at Malabar Road, Saddleback Ranch Road at Millwood Road, Marguerite Parkway at El Toro Road, Marguerite Parkway at Los Alisos Boulevard, Marguerite Parkway at Santa Margarita Parkway, and Los Alisos Boulevard at Santa Margarita Parkway. We look forward to reviewing these traffic studies.
- During the construction of this project, we are concerned about impact from construction traffic and the affect on long term traffic flow and impact to Glen Ranch and Saddleback Ranch, Glen Ranch and Portola Parkway, Portola Parkway and Lake Forest Drive, Glen Ranch and El Toro Road, Saddleback Ranch and Millwood, Saddleback Ranch and Malabar, Saddleback Ranch and the entrance to Portola Hills Elementary School, Saddleback Ranch and Pendleton, Saddleback and Fawn Ridge, and Saddleback and Shady Ridge. These intersections will be directly or indirectly impacted to varying degrees, some to unacceptable levels of service and safety.
- Given the lack of public transportation in this area and the distance to goods and services we question the viability of senior housing in the neighborhood commercial area. Ten thousand square feet of commercial is not much and would not likely provide adequate support for seniors.

4.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance

- This is a project with cumulative considerable impacts and the EIR needs to adequately identify and analyze onsite and off-site construction related impacts with the new Lake Forest Sports Park on Portola Parkway, the extension of Rancho Parkway, and the Standard Pacific Sky Ridge Project and Annexation Proposal to the City of Mission Viejo for 85 new homes near the intersection of Glen Ranch and El Toro Roads between the Hidden Ridge and Painted Trails developments.
- While not part of the project site, there will be impacts to the traffic on Saddleback Ranch with the generation of 614 additional trips to and from Portola Hills Elementary School. While mitigation of impacts to the school site have been satisfied through the payment of School Mitigation Fees, the cumulative impact to traffic between the project site and school site has not been addressed. Please include this topic in the analysis.

While all separate projects considered together have the potential for significant short term and long term traffic and short term mobile source emission impacts from construction and operational activities. We look forward to reviewing the DEIR and hope that you give consideration to our input.

Sincerely,



Ian and Amanda Morrell

Cc: Gayle Ackerman, City of Lake Forest
Planning Commission Chairperson Jerry Verplancke
Planning Commission Vice Chairperson Terry Anderson
Planning Commissioner David Carter
Planning Commissioner Tim Hughes
Planning Commissioner Jerry Zechmeister

Portola Center Letter

Dear Ron Santos and other concerned Lake Forest representatives,

I am writing this letter about the issues I have with the Portola Center development by Baldwin and Sons.

My first issue is with the biological technical study prepared for Portola Center by Dudek in May of 2012. I am a reptile expert who has been working with native California reptiles for over 20 years. When I read through the report I found some errors that I feel are significant.

On page 40 in Table 6B it states the Special Status Wildlife species Potentially Occurring on the Portola Center Project Site.

They listed that the Orange-throated Whiptail has moderate potential to occur, the fact is that I have seen this lizard on the site and have made observations from the sidewalk and trail near the site, they do occur on site and I would be glad to give the GPS and photographs to validate my claim. The San Diego ringneck snake was also listed as moderate potential to occur, the reality is that they do occur on site and I have found them on the site and would be glad to give GPS coordinates and pictures to validate my claim.

My next issue is the fact that two species of special concern are not even listed as having potential to occur and they do occur on site. I also have witnessed the Red Diamond Rattlesnake on site and another species of special concern the Coastal Patchnose snake was found dead on a road a few feet from the site. In the section where Dudek listed the Red Diamond Rattlesnake they stated that the status of the snake to occur on site had a "low potential to occur". The fact is, that they do occur on site and that Dudek missed many of these issue makes me question the validity of this EIR. Also they mention that the Golden Eagle was very unlikely to occur on site and I have seen a Golden Eagle sitting on a light pole above the site.

One of my issues is that during their survey they only observed four common reptiles; my question would be what methods did they use to survey animals that do spend a lot of time underground? I am very happy to hear that the city of Lake Forest is going to do an independent EIR. I hope that this study will be more complete and accurate. We will see. The Dudek study listed two other possible common species I am very curious to see the number of species of special concern and also common reptiles that do occur on site. I really hope that Eddie and his company do a complete survey and are able to find more of the reptiles that I know occur on site. At this time I do not want to release a list of the snakes that do occur so that we can see what they find. I would be willing to help them with their study any way I can. I would be willing to give them GPS coordinates and photo vouchers of the species of special concern or any other information they feel will help with their survey. They just need to contact me and let me know what information they want.

Another concern is the time of year when the reptile portion of the study is completed. Spring is the best time to look for reptiles followed by summer before the majority of them go underground for several months for hibernation. This study needs to be started ASAP. Or wait until next spring to get a complete survey of the species of special concern that are on the site. I spoke with Eddie at the July 10th meeting and shook his hand and said to him that I am willing to help so here is my invitation in written form. My email is dgreptiles@yahoo.com and the rest of my information can be found on my website at dgreptiles.com.

Reptiles are my passion and I will not just sit quiet while they are bulldozed over and become trapped to be buried alive. Snakes can't dig their way out, they use rodent burrows for shelter or below rocks and will be trapped and crushed as earth is moved around. From the sounds of this project lots of dirt is going to be moved around and many reptiles will be killed in the process. I know that this happens every day where construction is happening but this is a chance to be sure that the proper steps are taken to be sure all species are represented and accounted for.

My second issue is with traffic, I have two daughters who are 3 and 5. They will be going to Portola Hills Elementary and it is very clear that we have an existing problem with the traffic around the school. I know this is outside of the scope of this project but this project will only add to the current issues and make the traffic worse. I feel that we as Portola Hills residents, the city of Lake Forest and Saddleback Unified School District need to work together to repair these current issues before Baldwin begins to build. I need the city to let us know what we can do to help the project. I know many private residents who would be willing to fund raise for residential stop signs in an effort to slow down the traffic on our hill. I feel that the four way traffic signal at the bottom of Saddleback Ranch will add to the traffic problem, the best solution would be to keep the entrances to the new communities only on Glenn Ranch. This street is very wide and could easily accommodate the new residents. I understand that they would also be using Saddleback Ranch to drop their children off at school and that is another issue we will have to deal with. I feel that the main motivation for Baldwin wanting the four way signal is because it is the easiest place for the entrance and also because it is the least expensive to build.

On the walk through on July 12th we used the entrance to the painted trails community and this is a perfect example of the type of entrance that could be constructed off Glenn Ranch for the smallest 80 home northwest portion of the project. There is plenty of room off Glenn Ranch to construct all of the entrances and exits for this project. In some of the early plans two of the three lots had their entrance and exits off Glenn Ranch. We currently have a bottle neck situation as all the traffic collides below Millwood. It seems like a stop sign at Pendelton and a lighted signal at Malibar would be a possible solution. I was very happy that the commissioners and the Baldwin reps got a taste of what the traffic is like. After the first stop on the tour at Malibar and La Quinta on July 12, on our way to the second stop all of us had to wait for an extended period of time as each member of the group had to wait for traffic in both directions and could see how difficult that intersection is for anyone who uses Malibar in the morning in an attempt to avoid the traffic at the school. The residents of Malibar would probably be willing to fund a portion of the project in order to save the city money if the cost was the only factor stopping the light. I have high hopes that our city traffic engineer will be able to help us in the process of doing the right thing and working on our existing traffic problem of slowing people

down as they come down the hill and the issues during drop off and pick up at the school. During the walk through on July 12 she seemed willing to help us. I wanted to close by saying thank you to all the city representatives who took the time in the rain to become familiar with the project and actually get a little taste of our current traffic issues and see our concerns with their own eyes. This is the best way to look at this project through our perspective.

Sincerely,

Dan, Kristina, Payton and Aubrey Grubb

Torres, Eddie

From: Nazishdc <nazishdc@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 2:41 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Re: Portola Hills Development

Hi Ron:

It appears a new intersection is planned on Saddleback Road, which seriously concerns me. The location is much too close to existing Millwood Road, which I live on. What traffic reviews has the City performed regarding an intersection on Saddleback? I am strongly opposed to a new entrance on Saddleback Rd for the new development.

Thank you.

Regards,
Nazish Mir
28252 Millwood Rd, Portola Hills
949-636-5919

-----Original Message-----

From: Santos, Ron <rsantos@lakeforestca.gov>
To: Nazishdc <nazishdc@aol.com>
Sent: Mon, Jul 11, 2011 11:29 am
Subject: RE: Portola Hills Development

Ms. Mir:

Thank you for comments. The City will keep your recommendations in mind when formulating conditions of approval for the project.

RON SANTOS
City of Lake Forest
(949) 461-3449

From: Nazishdc [<mailto:nazishdc@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 04, 2011 10:56 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Cc: Herzog, Peter
Subject: Re: Portola Hills Development

Dear Mr. Santos:

Thank you for your email. I will thoroughly review the City's response to Joe Richter's letter and reply in regard to the overlap with my concerns in a separate letter. In this letter I would like to focus on my primary concern: construction operations.

I appreciate your comment that the City has had success with noise compliance beyond initial warnings, however, *any* violation will cause major disruption in my family's life. Accordingly, I would like to request a gate and responsible guard for the construction site who clearly understands no workers will be permitted on-site during non-work hours. My understanding is that having a guarded gate and only allowing workers through the gate at designated construction start time is common practice in other Orange County communities like Coto de Caza, Dove Canyon, and Shady Canyon to name a few.

I believe the guarded gate is necessary because workers will congregate before work and create early morning noise, they will warm-up and move vehicles and machinery prior to start time, complete maintenance of heavy equipment outside of work time, etc.

Speaking of which, maintenance of heavy equipment ought to be clearly defined as work allowed only during work hours, and should be done as far away from our homes as possible. Concrete trucks ought to also be staged away from our homes.

Finally, to ensure compliance, rather than a simple warning, the first offense ought to include a work-stoppage penalty.

Thank you for your time. I look forward to your response.

Best regards,

Nazish Mir

-----Original Message-----

From: Santos, Ron <rsantos@lakeforestca.gov>

To: nazishdc@aol.com <nazishdc@aol.com>

Sent: Fri, Jun 3, 2011 1:52 pm

Subject: RE: Portola Hills Development

Dear Ms. Mir:

Thank you for your e-mail regarding the proposed Portola Center project. Given the project's protracted timeline and our recognition of the importance of these issues to you, as well as many other members of the community, the City opted for thoroughness in preparing a response to your inquiries at the expense of promptness. Nevertheless, the City apologizes for the delay.

As it turns out, several of your inquiries were also posed by Mr. Joe Richter in a letter received a few days in advance of your e-mail; a letter to which the City recently responded. Rather than refashion the City's responses in a separate letter to you, we have attached a copy of that letter to this e-mail in hopes that you will find the full breadth of the response to Mr. Richter's letter beneficial. In addition, responses to inquiries which were included in your e-mail but not addressed in the letter to Mr. Richter are provided below, inserted into the context of your original e-mail.

Should this e-mail and the attached letter fail to satisfactorily address any of your questions, or in the event that you have additional questions, please feel free to contact me at any time. I may be reached directly at (949) 461-3449 or via e-mail at rsantos@lakeforestca.gov.

RON SANTOS
Senior Planner
City of Lake Forest
Development Services Dept.
(949) 461-3449

From: Nazishdc [<mailto:nazishdc@aol.com>]

Sent: Thursday, April 07, 2011 10:24 AM

To: Kuta, Cheryl

Subject: Portola Hills Development

Cheryl Kuta
Planner
City of Lake Forest

Dear Cheryl Kuta:

As a resident of Millwood Road in Portola Hills, I am writing to you in regard to Baldwin's Portola Center, also known as Portola Hills South.

I have many concerns about the development, as summarized below, and would appreciate your response:

1. What are construction hours of operation?

[RS] The Lake Forest Municipal Code prohibits noise associated with construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property between the hours of eight p.m. and seven a.m. on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a Federal holiday.

Who can I contact if the hours are violated?

[RS] Between normal City Hall business hours (8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday) residents should contact the Building Department at (949)461-3471 or Code Enforcement at (949) 461-3474. Outside of normal business hours, or on the City's closed Fridays (City Hall is closed every other Friday), the Sheriff's Department (949) 770-6611 handles noise complaints. The project developer will also be required to identify a person(s) on the construction team who will be responsible for overseeing the various phases of construction and to whom complaints and inquires may be addressed. The City will make this contact information available to any interested party.

What is the process to penalize the construction company for violating the defined hours? I am quite worried about my family, including young children, being woken-up too early in the morning with construction noise, which would surely impact our quality of life. When I lived in Fairfax County, Virginia, the local police were to be called if construction began prior to 8am. After issuing a warning for the first incident, the police issue citations to the construction company for any subsequent violations. I am not sure if the process is the same here.

[RS] The City/Sheriff's Department have several options available for addressing construction projects in violation of the City's noise ordinance. These include issuance of a citation(s) and/or a stop work order. Repeated offences may also be subject to the filing of a criminal complaint/notice to appear in court. Notwithstanding, the City takes extra care to ensure that builders are knowledgeable with respect to the applicable regulations and penalties, including the imposition of a requirement for a pre-construction meeting to be attended by construction supervisors wherein the City's regulations are affirmed. Generally, the City experiences full compliance with its noise regulations and enforcement actions beyond an initial warning are rarely necessary.

2. How will the proposed development impact my view? When I bought my house on Millwood Road, I paid a premium for the view. I do not want to be robbed of my view.

a. A view impact study ought to be completed using virtual imaging technology to demonstrate the interface between each of the existing homes and the new development, and results provided to owners of existing homes in a timely manner.

b. Please require Baldwin to put in survey stakes with horizontal and vertical control descriptions at a minimum of every 180 linear feet where, about every third lot line wherever a proposed pad will intersect with an existing slope or meet an external perimeter in a timely manner.

c. I would like to reiterate my neighbor, Joe Richter's suggestion for the City Council and Planning Commission to walk the staked area with Portola Hills residents.

3. How will traffic be impacted by the new development? The intersections of Portola and Glenn Ranch, as well as, Glenn Ranch and Saddleback are already congested.

a. If the County believed 618 single family lots should be the maximum density and Baldwin felt they had a profitable project, why would the City approve an increase of 50% or more in density?

b. Baldwin had promised 60% less traffic to the County.

c. Why does the plan now include apartments and condominiums?

4. The County negotiated the payoff of the Mello Roos, which represents a savings of approximately \$15,000 each to me and my neighbors. Has the City included and confirmed this Mello Roos payoff?

5. Will we get the value-enhancing entrance the County was able to negotiate for us?

6. Will you work with the school district and require Baldwin to live up to their prior commitment to the County to fund new classrooms?

7. Is the proposed park at the intersection of Glenn Ranch and Saddleback Ranch still 6 acres?

Thank you for your time. I look forward to your response.

Best regards,

Ms. Nazish Mir
28252 Millwood Road
Portola Hills, CA 92679

Torres, Eddie

From: Chris <christopher1213@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 9:14 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Cc: 'Patty Durazo'
Subject: FW: Portola Hills Elementry Meeting

Ron,

We here in Portola Hills are deeply concerned with the scope and impact of the project being proposed. I spoke with Cheryl in your office regarding the traffic implications and other issues of this at some length. She informed me that the traffic studies were not available and not finished and that it was the intent of the developer to submit the EIR without any traffic data and later submit this. This is part of the EIR and the EIR should have some information in it to submit it correctly.

Since there seems to be some difficulty in Baldwin getting the traffic study done I would propose that we here in Portola Hills commission the study for them. I do have DOT Traffic counters of my own and would love to pull data and submit to you the traffic information done at the time necessary to give you the right information for the EIR.

Since the studies are not done we also would like to parallel our data gathering efforts with those of Baldwin so we both accurately track data. If called upon we would also love to coordinate with Baldwin to make sure that there is effective coverage of the concerns of the existing residents of Portola.

This especially is relevant in the proposal to place the entry of a private gated community less than 500 feet from a very busy and steep primary artery for both Portola Hills and the school. Given the needs for setbacks for crosswalks on both corners, setbacks for traffic intersections and the limited space the current design of the entry and egress is certainly ill designed. Further the setback proposals for the gating entry is certain to cause an uncontrollable traffic problem at peak times and should require the builder to put entry to the parcel on Saddleback Ranch where both the incline angle and traffic handling capabilities are much more conducive to such a plan. I understand that this will be much more costly to the builder but they have stated in meetings that they do not want to disrupt the pastoral lifestyles of those residents whom already reside in the community, but improve it. Yes such an entry would require that Baldwin rethink their street and lot plans but this is a significant issue and warrants further public and city review.

I would also implore you to return the EIR Initial study and checklist as there are significant errors there as well. I know these studies are costly to continue doing but even in a cursory review I found significant errors probably stemming from the "cookie cutter / boilerplate" approach most of these firms use. We and you of course would like the report to reflect accurate information. Statements within the report include:

"The proposed project does not contain a housing component. No impacts would occur and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR"

Further the new proposed site plans viewed at the meetings expanded the building areas and again may warrant a complete and full re-commission of the studies already completed for the EIR as the borders of building are significantly different and now may be into flood plains and impacting other unknown factors

In viewing the forms being submitted I noticed that it was checked off that "The proposed project WILL NOT affect highways or other facilities under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Transportation." Have the studies of impact been done and are they available (including data gathering times dates and locations) for public review?

In closing as you can see this proposed development seems to be far from ready to turn a shovel on and has many significant issues to be dealt with before such an event could occur.

We would like to be able to make a complete review of all of the aspects of this project seeing that there are many issues and certainly significant mistakes or misrepresentation even in the most brief review of the CHECKLIST for the EIR, and I have not even had a chance to review the report itself. Judging from the Checklist your office should certainly allow time for significant further time for a reevaluation of the EIR if not a request for a restudy of the impact based on the new building proposal displayed at the meetings.

I would be happy to spend some time with your office in review of these many aspects of the project and EIR that though they may seem to be well thought out and correct, might prove to either be substantially in error or only make sense on paper but in practical practice have no foundation in reality.

I am looking forward to the meetings where we can discuss more in detail these issues, but in the mean time I would like to get started with the traffic engineering department working with them to commission our own study of various key points of traffic and submit the vital traffic numbers that Baldwin has indicated on several occasions that they have and would make available but that your office has indicated has not been made available to you. (we would like this to including the times, dates, durations, modeling, and raw data in a usable electronic form, so we might run our own modeling and stat analysis)

It was further indicated to me that these studies are as yet not completed and must be redone and I would ask that until these can be properly executed, the EIR reviewed or re-commissioned, and that the new plot of the building area completely researched (possibly warranting the re-commission of the EIR as a "new study") that maybe it is time to take a breath until such time as all of these items are properly addressed.

Chris Botosan
Portola Hills

From: Chris [mailto:christopher1213@cox.net]
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2012 9:41 AM
To: 'ckuta@lakeforestca.gov'
Subject: Portola Hills Elementry Meeting

I could not stay for the meeting at PHE but when I arrived I saw MANY pictures, elevations, renderings, and plot illustrations that have not been made available before.

- **Are there on display at you office, or are these secret and under close guard by the city and Baldwin?**

They most certainly are not on your site that is supposed to be the source for information for the citizens and I think if we would have seen them before we would have been in shock and horror.

- **Where can we see these again (TODAY)?**

It seems that the city has already cut their deal with Baldwin and that these meeting are really only an exercise that is required by law.

- **Do we have any input (MEANINGFULL) or way to scale this massive and radical change to our community?**
- **Even if by email I would like to see all of the materials that were on display and make sure we all have seen it here.**

Torres, Eddie

From: Stephani <skvalencia@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 7:38 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Center Area Plan

Mr. Santos,

I am an original owner (16 years) in Portola Hills. I can not believe the city of Lake Forest is allowing Baldwin Brothers to build homes in this area again. We cannot afford to have more traffic on this hill. I live off the corner of Malabar and Saddleback Ranch Road. If you have ever been on this corner at 2 PM on a school day you will see a vehicle can not access Saddleback Ranch because of the double parked cars attempting to pick up their children from Portola Hills School. I have almost been hit twice attempting to access this road. This is only the beginning of traffic problems.

We also get commuters driving from north county (not wanting to pay the toll) using Santiago Canyon cutting threw Portola Hills to get to south county areas. To add approximately 560 more vehicle on this hill is transitivity. Why is a signal being installed for these 280 homes, when their is not one at Malabar and Saddleback Ranch? Because it is not needed?

Lastly, why is Baldwin being able to bid and win contracts? This is an inferior company. They build, then file bankruptcy. They build inferior homes requiring numerous repairs, homeowner unable to sue because they file bankruptcy. Also, Baldwin does not include enough parking areas in their communities they build. We have a enormous parking problem on this hill no public parking. If a resident had more cars then parking allotments then they are out of luck. Should future homeowners be made aware of this problem, yes, then they can chose to live in another city.

As citizen and taxpayer of this city, why have we not been informed of these traffic studies? Why haven't adequate studies been done. Baldwin and Sons is destroying Lake Forest, this land need to be left undeveloped. We have encroached enough in the wilderness ranch, why more. We do not need the additional traffic. Wait in line to turn left on to Glenn Ranch at 6 PM on a week day, then left on to Saddleback Ranch.

Thank you for listening,

Stephani K Valencia
19666 Orviento Drive
Portola Hills, CA 92679

Torres, Eddie

From: Kristina Grubb <kpimbriale@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 2:44 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Letter of concern regarding Portola Center
Attachments: Letter of Concern Portola Center.docx

Dear Ron Santos,

I understand that you are the one to direct this letter to and if I'm wrong, may you please pass on to the appropriate person.

Thank you.

Kristina Grubb

Dear Ron Santos,

As a Portola Hills resident I wanted to write you this letter with some of my concerns regarding the new development of "Portola Center" which will be invading our quiet neighborhood on the hill in the coming months/years. While I know that we are at a point that there is nothing we can do, this IS going to happen; I have been told that there is still time to voice our concerns regarding the project. I have a few issues that I wanted to make you all aware of so you can consider these when planning. I'm sure this is the not the first time you will be hearing these, but the more you hear it, the more it will stick and perhaps it will be enough to be considered.

All of my issues are mostly related to the overall traffic that this new development will bring. The existing streets up here are not meant to have as many cars that you are planning to bring in with all these families. The school itself has a horrible drop off and pick up system, leaving all residents in a traffic jam as if they were on the 5 freeway at rush hour. People have to leave much earlier just to account for the delay to be able to get out or anywhere on time. I'm not sure what your plans are to accommodate all these new families, but I hope you are considering some options. As a mother of two young girls who will be attending this school in the next few years to come, I have huge concerns with all the cars that will be coming in and out of our small neighborhood.

The other major concern is regarding where the new entrances will be for the two neighborhoods on either side of Saddleback Ranch. I understand that they are set to be off of Saddleback Ranch, with a stop light and gates. I don't think this was very well thought out. That small road cannot accommodate more traffic, let alone another delay at a light for those residents to get in and out of their gated neighborhoods. It will also create a traffic jam for those turning onto Saddleback Ranch from Glenn Ranch. It seems more appropriate to have the entrances off of Glenn Ranch which has more lanes is much wider, not to mention, people won't be coming right out of another light and up a hill as they would on Saddleback Ranch. I encourage the planners and builders of this community to really spend some time, perhaps an entire day, maybe more than one, to see the traffic up here. It's different at each time of the day; 11:00 AM is very different than 7:45 AM or 5:30 PM. Take the time to really know our community so you can make the best decisions for us.

In addition, I find it very interesting that you are planning commercial building up here as well when there are so many places at the bottom of the hill that can barely make it or have gone out of business. Why not have those places filled in before adding more that need to be rented? In this economy is it really the smartest investment? If it is necessary and part of the plan, please consider what is really needed up here, what does the community want. The last thing we need is a gas station or another nail salon.

I really hope that you all take the time to read our concerns because we know this area best. You may be in the business of home building and planning, but we know our community better than anyone.

Thank you for your time.

Kristina Grubb

Torres, Eddie

From: Michelle <jossmamma@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 5:40 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Lake forest new development

Please consider the environmental impact, the overcrowding of streets and shopping centers and schools. There is one local middle school that is over 3 miles away with over 3000 students.

Please consider a tear down and rebuild of old properties in the area.

Michelle

Torres, Eddie

From: TanaAndJohn@aol.com
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 5:03 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: comments re: Portola Center

Dear Mr. Santos,

As a resident and homeowner in Portola Hills, I'd like to list some of my concerns regarding the Portola Center project:

- **POLLUTION:** As a pregnant woman, mother to 3 young children, and wife to a husband with a lung nodule and whose father died at 59 of lung cancer, we are concerned about the amount of dust and industrial pollution that will be created by this project.

- **TRAFFIC:** The traffic near Portola Hills Elementary is terrible during drop-off and pick-up times. Adding more students and therefore more cars will only compound the problem. The most recent traffic study was conducted on the upper portion of Saddleback Ranch Road near Cedar Ridge on Sunday, July 2, which would not provide a typical picture of the traffic situation in Portola Hills.

- **STABILITY:** We live in Canyon Rim, where geological studies were conducted approximately 8 years ago due to instability of the hillside south of Canyon Rim Drive, above the fire station. Furthermore, St. Michael's Abbey, across El Toro Road from us has been forced to purchase new land due to the instability of their current site. We are concerned for those residents of Malabar and Millwood as the massive grading project could cause instability under their homes.

Thank you for your consideration,
Tana Jimenez

Torres, Eddie

From: Hoy, Greg <GHoy@cci.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2012 12:46 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Destroying our beautiful Portola Hills

Ron,

Baldwin and Lake Forest are going to negatively impact the beautiful neighborhoods of Portola Hills forever. Here are my concerns:

Traffic Congestion: Seriously, who in their right mind would come up with a traffic light situation like the proposed lights? This is a planned community, correct. Because this looks like something a child would draw up. Do the right thing! Baldwin could scratch 4-6 pads near the Whitting Ranch parking lot, move some dirt and allow for a second entrance on the NW parcel. This would avoid the infantile plan of putting two signals so very close together.

Parking: Go ahead and visit any area with apartments and condos. What do you see... cars parked everywhere because they never "plan" for enough parking. Why because parking doesn't create revenue for the builder or the city. Do the right thing! Keep the area looking clean and uncluttered with low income cars leaking oil all over the place. The same goes for the park, we don't want cars parking up and down the streets "plan" for enough parking to keep streets clear for auto and cycling traffic for safety and aesthetic reasons.

Quality of Life: Portola Hills in various build outs has been in existence for 25 years. And now with this max density dump on us we are going to see our prideful neighborhood wrecked by this low income density push which will destroy our beautiful neighborhood on the hill.

Property Value: I don't believe you live in Portola Hills. But I am sure if you did you would not be for this expansion. Baldwin and the city of Lake Forest are taking money out of my pocket when and if I sell my home. This will negatively effect my property value.

Additional areas of concern: School impact/performance, fiscal impact on city services, trash, crime...

I don't have much faith in anyone in any area of the politics. To be truthful they all appear to be sell outs to the almighty dollar and re-election. Usually doing whatever will get them additional taxes without understanding the impact on the current home owners. It would be refreshing for someone in the political arena to just once, DO THE RIGHT THING!

Sincerely,
Greg Hoy
Senior Broadcast Producer
Corinthian Colleges, Inc.
714-825-7988
ghoy@cci.edu <<mailto:ghoy@cci.edu>>
6 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 400, Santa Ana CA 92707 www.cci.edu <<http://www.cci.edu>>

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it contains information from Corinthian Colleges, Inc. that is confidential. Employees are reminded of their obligations regarding confidentiality and trade secrets as stated in the Employee

Handbook and CCI policies. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. We respectfully demand that you notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail in error and permanently delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited, will cause damage to CCI and may result in legal liability.

Torres, Eddie

From: Valerie Kester <vjkester@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 11:57 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Center

Mr. Santos,

My name is Valerie Kester and I am a resident/homeowner in Portola Hills. Along with my family of four, my mom lives around the corner from us, also in Portola Hills. We sought for her, and later ourselves, to live here because we valued the quiet, the relative low density/large lots compared to neighboring tract homes at similar price points, and the great schools and neighborhood amenities. Like most of the residents here, who are communicating daily in a number of forums, I have been following the Baldwin development of Portola Center. As a collective that I will speak on behalf of, we are concerned about a number of factors regarding the project.

The biggest issue for most everyone I talk to is traffic. We already have a precarious situation that begins when the routine flow of traffic is traveling at 65 mph (or more) up Glenn Ranch. The left turn onto Saddleback Ranch Road ends up a chicken fight as those who are in the right lane, turning left, attempt to overtake the left lane before they are forced to turn on Malabar. The street continues to follow a number of somewhat blind curves, including by the school where traffic slows only when it has to. The left turn onto Cedar Ridge, where there is no turn bay, is always one that needs the driver's full attention, and then some. The oncoming traffic is doing 50 and because of the blind curve, you get maybe a 2 second window to move or be broadsided. Similarly, turning right onto Saddleback Ranch Road from Cedar Ridge is also treacherous. Because of the blind curve, by the time you see the traffic coming at you, often you have already turned in front of them. Now imagine not one but two lights, distanced very close together, both at the bottom of a fast, steep descent. The issue isn't if, but how bad the accident will be. With the neighborhood more than doubling in size, you will have more foot traffic, more kids attempting to cross these various streets to get to school, etc. Someone from the Baldwin team really needs to come out during a school day to look at this. Likewise, a Sunday morning in summer is really not going to provide a feasible, accurate traffic study. The Baldwins know this, and rest assured, the residents do too, and aren't going to let this slide. I am not sure why the actual traffic data (and not Baldwin's interpretation of it) has yet to be presented to the group. They aren't going to be able to skate around this anymore. We haven't even started the discussion of ingress/egress during fire season, but we will be looking for that in the EIR.

Another area of concern is the school itself. As the parent of two who attend PHE, and a VERY active mom to boot, I can assure you there is nowhere left to go to expand the school facility. I would love to hear at a meeting what discussions with Saddleback Valley Unified School District have taken place, and how they plan to absorb the new neighborhood children. While we are discussing facilities, why has Baldwin declined to build any kind of pool or clubhouse for the new homes? Portola Hills has 2 major clubhouses, along with several pocket pool/recreation facilities within the sub-communities here. Many homeowners have backyard pools as well. It concerns us all that the facilities we pay for are going to be compromised as kids from the neighboring areas come looking to use our facilities, since they lack their own. It would not be hard to jump the fence or climb up the slope to access the clubhouse. Given the density of the neighborhoods they are planning, coupled with the lack of responsibility to develop the park facilities they allude to, we in Portola Hills are concerned what the fallout from that will be. Does the city of Lake Forest have an active plan and timeline to develop the parks that Baldwin is allocating the land for? Has Baldwin addressed why this time around, they are not offering any sort

of recreational amenities to the new communities? Of course it will cost more money, but that can be more than compensated for when the Baldwin Company sets the home prices.

People are on the city website, looking at the pictures, reading what they can find regarding the EIR and how much has changed since Baldwin first submitted it. An updated development plan, accompanied by a realistic and well-documented traffic study needs to be submitted along with a new or updated EIR. The Baldwin reputation was seriously blemished by their handling of the initial Portola Hills project. Using bankruptcy as a tool to dodge many of their responsibilities, they have regrouped and are ready to continue building homes. Many of the people who they sold homes to are still here, and want this done responsibly and honestly. After the last few years, it is nice to see homebuilders getting ready to start new projects, and if done correctly, will be welcomed by the current community. With honesty, and a realistic look at the challenges this project faces, I am sure the Baldwin company can build in such a way that everyone wins. The last thing they need to have in the background of their new sales office is an entire community that is furious, and vocal, about their lack of good faith business ethic. There will be many new communities building in our immediate area; as a homebuyer I would be dissuaded from buying in a community where many long time homeowners, on intimate terms with the homebuilder, decide to get vocal and let people know exactly what they are getting themselves into at Portola Center. I hope Baldwin has the good sense to consider this, and I hope that the City of Lake Forest will be open-minded in assisting the current community of Portola Hills in advocating for the best possible new community for all involved.

Thank you for your time and consideration, I look forward to meeting you and/or your colleagues at a future meeting.

Warm regards,
Valerie Kester

Torres, Eddie

From: Bjorg <bjorg.gudjons@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 11:50 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Concerns over proposed Portola Center

To whom it may concern:

As a resident of Portola Hills I am concerned about the proposed new development for the following reasons:

- increased traffic, with increased noise and pollution
- safety concerns due to increased traffic
- added pressure for placement of students at Portola elementary school
- environmental impact
- poorer water quality

I would like to see the City of Lake Forest apply themselves to negotiate and mitigate some of these issues that I and others have raised.

Thanks in advance.
Bjorg Gudjons
Portola Hills resident

Torres, Eddie

From: Ginger Aliotta <ochomesdirect@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 7:13 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Center

Dear Mr. Santos,

My name is Ginger Aliotta and I reside in Portola Hills with my husband and two young children. We researched MANY neighborhoods before deciding where to purchase our home. We chose Portola Hills because we love the quiet peaceful neighborhood perched up in the hills and the *feel* of being out of the hustle and bustle of the city below. Although there are certain times of the day when traffic on Glen Ranch Road and Saddleback Ranch Road can be a bit hectic, for the most part it flows and is tolerable. With that said, the proposed plans for Portola Center will not only create huge traffic jams, but frankly seems dangerous. If challenged by the city of Lake Forest, I'm quite sure the Baldwin's would be able to come up with a better proposal for ingress and egress... after all the Baldwin's are selling the idea that their new development will be an asset to our community and should be considered an improvement.

Although we say "hello" and have brief conversations at the mailboxes, most of my neighbors, myself included are busy juggling family and work obligations, as I'm sure you, yourself can relate. I am not surprised that only a small percentage were able to attend the last Baldwin sponsored meeting, that was scheduled before most could get home from work. In fact, at the last minute, the meeting was changed from 6:00pm to 5:30pm. I belong to a couple of small social groups here in Portola Hills. I'd venture to say there are easily 500+ people who are paying close attention to how the city is going to handle these proposed plans. There are many original homeowners in my neighborhood who remember all too well the Baldwins filing BK and leaving the homeowners holding the bag with abandoned projects and geological problems. They may call themselves by another name, but as far as most are concerned a Baldwin, is a Baldwin, is a Baldwin. The most recent traffic survey done on Sunday morning, July 1st was criminal in many peoples eyes. How can one honestly get a read on traffic on a Sunday morning. We purchased our home just after the 2007 wildfire that enveloped the canyon behind our home. The fire burned almost up to our property line and I've often thought how difficult it might be to make a quick exit with only two ways in and out of our community in case of an emergency. Another 900 homes may put a bit of a monkey wrench in my escape plan.

One thing that was very important to us when choosing a place to raise our family, was the children's education. Our children will attend Portola Hills Elementary. We are comforted in knowing that they are in a safe, clean school that has received recognition by the state as a "Distinguished School". Despite the state cuts, thanks to an amazing, dedicated PTA and very generous parents, PHE has managed to keep their librarian, computer programs, art masters and music programs that so many other SVUSD schools have lost. We feel very fortunate that Portola Hills Elementary is our home school. We are however, very concerned that the school seems to be bursting at the seams already. I can't imagine where or how the school will accommodate 300+ more children and fund additional programs. Lastly, and this is talked about a LOT in my circles, the before and after school traffic at PHE is extremely chaotic, frustrating and quite often dangerous. It is only a matter of time before there is a horrendous accident, mark my words.

Portola Hills residents may not have been very vocal up to this point, but I suspect this quiet little community is about to get very loud. Without revisions to the current proposed plans for Portola Center, what we treasure most in Portola Hills is being threatened. The general consensus is there is going to be huge traffic problems, particularly up Saddleback Ranch Road and overcrowding/underfunding for Portola Hills Elementary. It's also been noted that there does not appear to be any provisions for Portola Center facilities, such as club houses, pools etc., the tracts are extremely dense and there is concern over what types of businesses will be allowed in the center.

We hope you can assist us Mr. Santos, so that Portola Center can move forward, but in a way that we can all live with, taking the entire community, including the existing residents into consideration.

Warmest Regards,
Ginger Aliotta
Portola Hills Resident

Torres, Eddie

From: Dennis <dwestergard@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 10:08 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Cc: Ackerman, Gayle
Subject: Portola Center Development

Dear Mr. Santos - I went to City Hall last week on a separate matter and then spoke with Carrie Tai about the Portola Center. She was very approachable, as informative as she admitted that she could be on your behalf (she said that you were in a meeting), and she was very professional. I was impressed as it was my first visit to City Hall in my 20 years living in Lake Forest. Sadly, I expected to be ignored! Kudos, so far, for the quality public service!

My husband, Dennis Westergard, and I have two properties in Lake Forest. We diligently pay our taxes and serve the community. We chose to own a home in Portola for the quiet, rural quality that's rare in Orange County. Now we are facing big-city, over-kill traffic signals and gated entrances! The plan is illogical to me.

With 930 units now planned that could be nearly 2,000 more vehicles! (Projecting 2 adults per home unit.) With the commercial structures, add more. But to have gated entrances for a relatively few (280) new homes? And the proposed location? That will be very disruptive to the current flow of traffic.

In eight years living in Portola, I have ownly recently seen a traffic counter (the lines across the road) on Saddleback Ranch between Adler and Concourse Park. This is true because I walk my dog everyday on Saddleback. So where has the live data come from to support this ridiculous traffic plan? A computer model doesn't cut it. Why not blend City forces (for the greater good) and ask the Portola Hills community for volunteers to help count?

Furthermore, I hope that you are reconsidering the 5-acre Sports Park. With the large one underway off Portola, why can't this new park be downsized to something like Concourse? That too would help with the anticipated increase in traffic disruption. Adding crosswalks to accommodate outside adults who want to play soccer on Sundays (and take over the park) like they do in Foothill Ranch? Oh, please! I'm all for parks, but usage needs for this one needs to be rethought.

Please provide more details of *actual* traffic data and rethink any adoption of this current version. It just doesn't make sense.

Thank you.

A very concerned citizen,

Debbie L. Whited

Torres, Eddie

From: Sandy Graham <sandygraham8@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 5:10 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Hills/Baldwin development

This is in regards to the planning of the new Baldwin housing development in Portola Hills. We have lived here in the JMPeters homes since 1992. The traffic has become heavier and heavier in those years, and at all times of the day-----In the morning there are cars trying to get up Saddleback Ranch Rd. to take children to school, then again at Kindergarten release time, then again in the afternoon. In addition to that, there are the two rush hours in the morning and evening when cars are coming up Glenn Ranch Rd. and in the left hand turn lane (sometimes as many as 20 cars) waiting at the signal at Glenn Ranch Rd. and Saddleback Ranch Rd. There would be huge jams of cars trying to turn in to new gated areas so close to that signal. When we originally looked at homes here in the 1980's, this whole area was a Baldwin Development, which then had money issues and JMPeters, and other builders finished building homes here. The residents were left to "fight" to get the Rec. Center built and then faced millions of dollars assessed on our homeowners association because of the failure of the slopes (Baldwin's grading problems), and the issues with the Elementary School having to close one wing to shore up foundation damage. Originally there was a plan to have gates at the old Ridgeline entrances, and then at the Saddleback Rd. entrance. At that time, they said there would be a traffic issue on Saddleback Rd.---so we're wondering why now there isn't a traffic issue for Baldwin to build gates for this small number of homes compared to our whole development. It was brought up years ago to have a manned gate on Saddleback Rd. (right near Millwood St.) and unmanned gates at Ridgeline. This seems to work efficiently for Dove Canyon and Coto. Either the new development should give up the idea of gates for the good of ALL THE PORTOLA HILLS RESIDENTS , planning people should look at Gates for all of us to help slow down and monitor traffic for all of us. If Baldwin wants a gated community, then they should have to "grade" an area for entrances off of Glenn Ranch===NOT ON SADDLEBACK RANCH RD. Our Homeowners Association should have some say in this idea for more signals and gates---we will be the ones affected by this. Baldwin should be more "thoughtful" to his "old development" and how the lack of planning created these huge traffic issues. Why should we now bend over backwards to "appease" this new development when we have been treated like second class citizens by the Baldwin Company. The Grahams, Dan and Sandy, 19152 Jasper Hill Rd.

Torres, Eddie

From: Atrabucocanyon@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 2:10 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: PORTOLA CENTER DEVELOP.

JULY 8, 2012

TO: RON SANTOS & THE CITY OF LAKE FOREST

WE ARE RESIDENTS AT PALERMO & ARE TOTALLY AGAINST THE PORTOLA CENTER PROJECT.

SINCERELY,

JAMES & BEVERLY ASIMAKIS
19643 ORVIENTO DR.
TRABUCO CANYON, CA 92679 (PORTOLA HILLS)

Torres, Eddie

From: Gayle Richter <grichter@hanoverdevelopment.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 11:49 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Cc: McCullough, Kathryn
Subject: Baldwin Development

Mr. Santos

The city's lack of interest in homeowner opinions makes me feel that taking the time to write this communication is wasted effort. But still I have to express my deep disappointment with the poor planning that is taking place on Baldwin's Portola South project.

This poor planning is most evidenced by the fact that potential (builder) buyers that wanted to buy Baldwin's Portola South thought the project's site plan was junk and insisted they would only submit offers if-and-after the city would consider and review a less dense site plan; i.e. 400 units rather than 600 units and with different traffic patterns. That is the opinion of experts in the business. It also reflects the opinions homeowners have tried to convey to you, the City Planning Commission and the City Council, which have been ignored.

That being said, Baldwin's steering committee is ineffective and a further insult to the Portola Hills homeowners. They tell us what they are doing and do not accept or include our thoughts. We suspect they tell you they have our input which is not true.

We insist the City take a proactive approach in seeking community input to not only to hear our concerns but to act upon them. Otherwise we feel we will be forced to start a lawsuit.

Gayle Richter
Portola Hills

Torres, Eddie

From: Alesha Doherty <seanandalesha@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 11:37 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Hills Development

Mr. Santos,

As an 11 year resident of Portola Hills, I feel compelled to write to you regarding the Baldwin development of Portola Hills. My husband and I are residents of the Portola Hills community within Lake Forest. Prior to my family's current residence in Portola Hills, we were residents of Lake Forest zip code area 92630. We love living in Lake Forest and appreciate the community services you offer to our residents. Our family attends the annual Snowfest, we go to the concerts in the park, and my children have been a part of the classes you offer.

It is also important to know that I am personally not opposed to growth and development. I understand its necessity and I realize that the land currently set aside for development in Portola Hills will move forward with some form of development. I am asking for responsible and respectful development.

1. My first concern pertains to the density of proposed housing units. The plan for over 900 new units adds an enormous amount of population, traffic congestion, and a huge burden to Portola Hills Elementary which is already experiencing need for improvement. A higher density neighborhood entirely changes where we live – through traffic, school and park usage, and inevitably in public safety issues. In the spirit of recognizing that development is inevitable, I would like to request that the density issue be reconsidered. I would suggest that the density be equal to what currently exists within the Portola Hills community or that you would consider a mixed use development for this area.
2. Next, I am aware of a proposed new 4-way intersection with traffic signals and two gated entrances for the new developments. There are so many logistical problems with this spacing and placement that I think it would be easier if you personally come see what the traffic looks like at the evening rush hour and visually see where that light would be. It is an untenable option.
3. With regard to the traffic study, I am under the impression that it took place on a Sunday during the summer before the 4th of July holiday. Can this be right? When would there be LESS traffic? That would in no way be representative of what the traffic patterns look like during the school year, non-holiday, peak traffic times of 7:30 a.m.-8:30 a.m., when school lets out at 2:15 pm. (12:30 on Thursdays), and the evening commute times. I hope the City is savvy enough not to accept the traffic data as given, unless they include our "real" traffic times of the day and most of the school year.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns. I trust that you will take these items into considerations as you move forward with the plans for Portola Center.

Sincerely,

Alesha Doherty

19265 Sleeping Oak Dr.
Trabuco Canyon, CA 92679

Torres, Eddie

From: Jane Blasingham <janeblasingham@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 07, 2012 5:09 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Hills - Proposed Traffic Signals

Dear Ron,

I own a home in Portola Hills. My address is 19056 Woodland Way. I received a flyer on my doorstep that there are traffic signals with ingress and egress proposed for the vacant land adjoining Saddleback Ranch at Glenn Ranch. I am concerned with these proposed traffic signals and points of ingress and egress. Although it may require the builder to do some re-design, I think a good solution would be to require all ingress and egress to be on Glenn Ranch Road and for no points of ingress or egress to be located on Saddleback Ranch. I am concerned it will decrease the value of my home as well as my enjoyment of my home and neighborhood because of traffic/safety concerns on Saddleback Ranch.

I worked as a land development project manager for a national home builder and built residential subdivisions. The cities that I worked with routinely required that I hold homeowner forums to allow existing homeowners to voice concerns, make suggestions, and most importantly be involved in the planning process. I am disappointed that the City of Lake Forest did not require Baldwin to hold such a forum. If there was a forum, there was no proper notification.

I understand that the Baldwin development has already been approved, but I want to add an additional concern that I have regarding the builder. My home was built by Baldwin in the late 1980's. This past April, the master bath/shower tiles started bulging and cracking away from the wall. The bath/shower is original. I hired a contractor to discover the problem. He removed the tiles and found that when Baldwin built the bath/shower, they adhered the tiles directly to the drywall with no moisture barrier. So, the tiles were adhered directly to the drywall with only insulation behind it and then the outer wall. Over the years, the water had been building up behind the walls and dripping down to the beams between the first and second floors. Fortunately, the beams did not have to be replaced but most of the wood framing around the shower and the floor of the bathroom had to be replaced. When my contractor rebuilt the shower, he did it correctly with a moisture barrier and a solution of concrete. I submitted a claim to my homeowner's insurance, but they rejected it because they stated the damage was due to faulty original construction, which is not covered under my policy.

Based on my experience, I would never buy a home from Baldwin, and I do not have a good impression of them. I hope for the sake of the future owners of Baldwin's new homes that the building inspections will catch their shoddy construction practices.

Thank you for reading this email and letting me voice my concerns. If you require further information, I may be contacted at 949-292-4977 or by email at janeblasingham@hotmail.com.

By the way, I think the City did a great job on Concourse Park. It looks beautiful, and I enjoy walking through it.

Thank you,
Jane Blasingham