

Torres, Eddie

From: Bob Tamosaitis <Bob@4adinc.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 07, 2012 1:33 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Preparation for July 10th meeting about Portola Hills

Ron,

I'll be attending the meeting on July 10th about Portola Hills expansion.

I hope to get details related to my 2 major concerns:

1. The specifications and locations of the entrances to the expansions. (Entries off of Saddleback Ranch Road would seem impractical).
2. Long term insurance coverage provided by the developer to repair unanticipated ground shifting problems, as have been experienced in the existing portion of Portola Hills.

thanks

Bob Tamosaitis
19462 Jasper Hill Road

Torres, Eddie

From: Mel <pooltenders@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 11:42 AM
To: Santos, Ron

My family is concerned about traffic congestion on Saddleback Road if a Signal and gate guards are put into place. Simply not enough room. Also any negotiations with builder should include added schools and parks for this whole new added community. These items were promised to this community 20 years ago by the same builder developing these new communities. Compensation for those short falls should be heavily over stated and required before any building. Please protect this neighborhood with disclosed traffic studies and a master plan that does not effect the existing community.

Sent from my iPad

Torres, Eddie

From: Martz, Patricia <pmartz@exchange.calstatela.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2012 1:16 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Center Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Santos:

I was unable to access the Draft Subsequent environmental Impact report for this project on your webpage.

As an advocate for the preservation of cultural resources and especially archaeological sites, I have written several letters to Senior Planners for the City of Lake Forest expressing my concern for the destruction of archaeological sites as the City develops the remaining open space. I have lost count, but by April 2012 there were at least 9 planned community projects on your web site. For all of these, the "mitigation" is monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and salvage archaeology if anything is found.

This is a tragic and unnecessary loss of archaeological sites that have special meaning for the Juaneno/Acjachemen descendants as the places of their ancestors and all they have left of their cultural heritage. The sites are and should be respected and preserved by the majority population as an important part of our cultural heritage. Thousands of archaeological sites have been destroyed in Orange County. If they are considered significant, they are dug up and a very inadequate report is written. The artifacts may be offered to the Orange County curation facility, which is a warehouse crammed full of fossils and artifacts or Cal State Fullerton, which is full as well. So they are stored with the archaeological contractor and eventually thrown out.

As it is practiced today, archaeology is a destructive process and sites need to be preserved for a future archaeology using remote sensing that is less destructive. Projects like the Portola Center, the Pinnacle at Serrano Highlands, Baker Ranch, Sports Center to name a few have good opportunities for the preservation of archaeological sites, if only you planners would require it. The sites can be buried under parks, avoided and left in open space, and even buried and preserved under a parking lot. This has been done in Irvine.

Archaeological excavations are labor intensive and expensive. Site preservation will save the developer money.

Please give serious consideration to preserving the archaeological sites instead of destroying them.

Sincerely,

Patricia Martz, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
California State University, Los Angeles
President, California Cultural Resources Preservation Alliance

From: Chris <christopher1213@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 15, 2012 6:25 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: FW:
Attachments: The Great Walled City of Portola Center.doc

The Great Walled City of Portola Center

In meeting with the city Planning Commission on July 12 Stephen Haase, senior vice present of Baldwin and Sons and lead on the project to build on Portola Center 2 site gave an eloquent presentation over one hour in length.

Almost exclusively the subject of this presentation was the walls that they were to build. He boasted that they had over 100 different designs that they could show to the planners of walls that they would be using on the property. He spoke of small walls, big walls, medium size and large. He spoke of walls being hidden from view and walls that would be masked, and walls that would be beautiful with a sense of aesthetics. He spoke of wall sections of 35 feet in height and one should assume that by sections that there would be more than 1 section used in any given location so even at a minimum this would be 70 – 105 feet in overall height. Though there was a brief mention of some homes of some kind being built the topic of the night was walls, walls, and more walls.

This to me raises many questions some simple but some of deeper more troubling issues. Why so many walls. If you read of the new guidelines of the city on walls you would get the clear sense of one thing. The city does not want or like them. To go so far as to write a whole section of policy prohibitions shows the commitment of the city, reacting to their own sense of aesthetics of course but also to the will of the people. Yet the developer of this project seems to have ignored this sensitive issue and instead is determined to build his own private community of walls.

It was clearly expressed that it is there is no desire to become part of the community that is Portola Hills or the community at large that is our city of Lake Forest that we as residents love as “our community”. The concept presented was one of a walled separate and gated city. One has to question if all of the walls and the gates proposed are to keep out the residents of the “lower” residential section with its apartment dwellers and convenience stores that the builder himself has put in place as part of the design of an unequal and separate class of residents in his grand design of his walled city. Maybe it will be a good place for those who serve those behind the gates. They could look up in awe and envy.

More disturbing than this is the necessity for these walls. Why are so many walls, and why so much emphasis on them and why are there so many different designs for walls. The answer is simple. Without walls, and hundreds of them the property would simply collapse and wash away with the first rains with what is proposed.

The land is not suited to what is proposed unless you are only looking at it as a way to make some quick money and get out as Baldwin has done here in this city in the past. If the property were looked at without any financial considerations of how much was paid for it and how much profit can be made by someone who is less influenced by how to maintain their own lifestyles, and more concerned about doing what is ethical and right for “we the people” of this community, I

believe that the concept for development of this property would be substantially changed to something that would be welcomed by our great community of Lake Forest.

Though we treasure our blend of rural / country / city we feel responsible development is possible at this location and we know it will happen. But, we urge you not at the cost of "community", community safety and plain common sense.

Torres, Eddie

From: Dan Grubb <dgreptiles@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 15, 2012 3:46 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Cc: Kuta, Cheryl
Subject: Re: Portola Center
Attachments: Portola Center Letter to Lake Forest.docx

Not a problem, here it is. Thank you.

Dan Grubb

From: "Santos, Ron" <rsantos@lakeforestca.gov>
To: "dgreptiles@yahoo.com" <dgreptiles@yahoo.com>
Cc: "Kuta, Cheryl" <Ckuta@lakeforestca.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 5:44 PM
Subject: Portola Center

Hi Dan.

I believe that you recently sent me an e-mail regarding the Portola Center project. I'm having trouble finding it and am afraid that I may have accidently deleted it. Would you mind re-sending it? Sorry for the inconvenience.

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

The Great Walled City of Portola Center

In meeting with the city Planning Commission on July 12 Stephen Haase, senior vice present of Baldwin and Sons and lead on the project to build on Portola Center 2 site gave an eloquent presentation over one hour in length.

Almost exclusively the subject of this presentation was the walls that they were to build. He boasted that they had over 100 different designs that they could show to the planners of walls that they would be using on the property. He spoke of small walls, big walls, medium size and large. He spoke of walls being hidden from view and walls that would be masked, and walls that would be beautiful with a sense of aesthetics. He spoke of wall sections of 35 feet in height and one should assume that by sections that there would be more than 1 section used in any given location so even at a minimum this would be 70 – 105 feet in overall height. Though there was a brief mention of some homes of some kind being built the topic of the night was walls, walls, and more walls.

This to me raises many questions some simple but some of deeper more troubling issues. Why so many walls. If you read of the new guidelines of the city on walls you would get the clear sense of one thing. The city does not want or like them. To go so far as to write a whole section of policy prohibitions shows the commitment of the city, reacting to their own sense of aesthetics of course but also to the will of the people. Yet the developer of this project seems to have ignored this sensitive issue and instead is determined to build his own private community of walls.

It was clearly expressed that it is there is no desire to become part of the community that is Portola Hills or the community at large that is our city of Lake Forest that we as residents love as “our community”. The concept presented was one of a walled separate and gated city. One has to question if all of the walls and the gates proposed are to keep out the residents of the “lower” residential section with its apartment dwellers and convenience stores that the builder himself has put in place as part of the design of an unequal and separate class of residents in his grand design of his walled city. Maybe it will be a good place for those who serve those behind the gates. They could look up in awe and envy.

More disturbing than this is the necessity for these walls. Why are so many walls, and why so much emphasis on them and why are there so many different designs for walls. The answer is simple. Without walls, and hundreds of them the property would simply collapse and wash away with the first rains with what is proposed.

The land is not suited to what is proposed unless you are only looking at it as a way to make some quick money and get out as Baldwin has done here in this city in the past. If the property were looked at without any financial considerations of how much was paid for it and how much profit can be made by someone who is less influenced by how to maintain their own lifestyles, and more concerned about doing what is ethical and right for “we the people” of this community, I believe that the concept for development of this property would be substantially changed to something that would be welcomed by our great community of Lake Forest.

Though we treasure our blend of rural / country / city we feel responsible development is possible at this location and we know it will happen. But, we urge you not at the cost of “community”, community safety and plain common sense.

Torres, Eddie

From: Barbara Taylor <btaylor@itstime.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 5:15 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Re: Portola Center - Comment Received

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Ron,

I just learned about this project last week, so have not had time to read all the documents. In addition to my previous comments about traffic, I am very concerned about construction noise and dust/dirt, and the wildlife that is on the site now.

I work at home most of the time and like to have my windows open most of the time, so will be impacted by the construction process. I can see some of the construction site from inside my condo, and can see the rest of it with just a short walk down the sidewalk in front of my building. I am at the crest of the hill overlooking the site, in the Bella Palermo development.

I live within a stone's throw to the project site so I was very surprised to see on your website that a letter supposedly went to homeowners within 1,000 feet, which I clearly am.

I have lived here less than a year, so do not have the background that many of the people at the meeting last night have. I attended the meeting last night to learn more, and plan to attend the walk-through tomorrow to understand more about the project.

Barbara

Barbara Taylor, 28454 Sassetta Way, Portola Hills, CA 949-599-4701

Barbara Taylor, Rainbows & Miracles etc. (<http://www.itstime.com>)

Co-Author: "Income Without a Job" <http://www.income-without-a-job.com>

"Be kind to each other, for these teachings mean nothing without agape." [Michael]

>

> On 7/11/2012 1:49:53 PM, Santos, Ron (rsantos@lakeforestca.gov) wrote:

>> Dear Portola Hills Resident:

>>

>> Thank you for your e-mail regarding the proposed Portola Center

>> project Your comments will be given careful

> consideration during the preparation of the Environmental Impact

> Report for the project and made a part of the public record. The City

> will also add your e-mail address to the notification list for future Portola Center related meetings and notices.

>>

>> RON SANTOS

>> Senior Planner

>> City of Lake Forest

>> Development Services Dept.

>> (949) 461-3449

>

Torres, Eddie

From: Dr. James Gardner <drjgardner@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 8:45 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Report for Portola Center Project
Attachments: Can Lake Forest Support More People.docx

Hi,

Attached is the report I spoke about at the Tuesday meeting. Please see that copies go to the Planning Commission, the IS authors, and Gayle. Thanks.

Jim Gardner

Can Lake Forest Support More People (and Cars)?

A Response to the “Portola Center Project
Modified Initial Study” June 14, 2012

Dr. James Gardner

July 12, 2012

Summary

In their June 2012 report, RBF Consulting considered a number of issues that impact the City of Lake Forest if they approve the Portola Center project. Among the issues under study were "Population and Housing" (4.13), "Public Services" (4.14), and "Transportation/Traffic" (4.16). Upon further investigation, the RBF report failed to adequately address these areas. Specifically, the report ignored the current usage patterns for Post Offices, DMV, and Court services, failed to address the usage problem for Libraries, and ignored many substantial traffic problems in the city. **When these issues are examined more thoroughly, it appears that current public services and traffic patterns in the city of Lake Forest are already at the breaking point, and the addition of 3000 people and 2000+ cars would seriously impact the quality of life.** Unless these problems are solved, further population growth for the city should be curtailed.

Introduction

Developers want to build 900+ new dwelling units with some 3,000 new residents as well as 10,000 square feet of commercial space in an undeveloped area in Portola Hills. The City hired RBF consulting to examine environmental issues and RBF issued a report on June 14, 2012. This report looks more closely at sections 4.14 ("Public Services") 4.16 ("Transportation/Traffic").

Public Services

The RBF report asked the question -

"Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services."

Under this topic the report examined Fire, Police, Schools, Parks, and "Other public Facilities". Under the later heading they considered only Library services. They ignored several significant public services – Post Office, DMV, and Court – which are used by tens of thousands of people and are integral to the wellbeing of any community.

Post Office – The Post Office on Raymond Way is often overcrowded and waits for service can be 15 minutes or more. In addition, during certain times of the day the parking facilities are inadequate and people are forced to park in residential areas. See Appendix A.

DMV – Lake Forest residents use the DMV located in Laguna Hills. This branch of the DMV is notorious for the long wait to get inside the building, much less get services once you are inside. See Appendix B.

Court - Lake Forest residents use the Superior/Small Claims Court located in Laguna Hills. Waits to get into the building for the morning session can be as long as 30 minutes given the screening that is required. Parking is difficult. One can rarely park in the designated parking lot and even the overflow parking lot is full during the day. See Appendix C.

Ignoring these three substantial public services means that the RBF report does not address this issue in an adequate way. In addition, the report did not look at several issues concerning the Library.

Library – Parking at the Library on Raymond Way can be problematic, and several times a day people are required to park in the adjacent commercial area since the lot is full. See Appendix D.

In addition, the existing computers are almost always fully used and people who want to have access to the computer often have to wait. Since the lookup system is computer based, this can be a serious problem.

Traffic

The RBF report deals almost exclusively with traffic in and around the Portola Center area. However, the addition of 2000+ cars means that traffic everywhere will be impacted.

Freeway Access - The main areas of significance are the entrances/exits to Rte. 5 on El Toro, Lake Forest, and Bake. See Appendix E.

Great Park - In addition, no consideration has been given to the creation of the Great Park in Irvine, which will be approached through several streets such as Trabuco and Portola. Many residents from RSM and MV will use Lake Forest to get to the Great Park rather than going to the 5 Freeway.

Conclusion

The RBF report on the Portola Project is inadequate in two of the areas examined by this report. The report should be revised. Right now, at least with respect to the two areas studied, it appears that the city of Lake Forest has significant problems in the areas of access to public services and traffic, and that further population growth should be curtailed.

APPENDIX A – POST OFFICE

PARKING SPACES IN FRONT OF THE POST OFFICE ARE COMPLETELY FULL AT BUSY PERIODS DURING THE DAY



APPENDIX B – DMV

CROWDS OF PEOPLE WAITING TO GET INSIDE THE DMV



APPENDIX C – COURT

NOT ONLY ARE ALL THE PARKING SPOTS IN THE SUPERIOR/SMALL COURT PARKING LOT FULL, EVEN THE OVERFLOW PARKING LOT IS FULL



APPENDIX D – LIBRARY

THE PARKING LOT OUTSIDE THE EL TORO LIBRARY IS OFTEN FULL TO
OVERFLOWING AND GETTING IN AND OUT IS OFTEN HAZARDOUS



Torres, Eddie

From: Jim LeBlanc <jlebl@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 11:36 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola center

You are kidding

Torres, Eddie

From: merspeedy@cox.net
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 3:15 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Center

Ron,

I just wanted to thank you for making the neighbor aware of the Portola Center proposals. I was so glad to attend the meeting last night and hear what was in store for our neighbor. I was so proud of everyone that spoke and couldn't agree more with all the issues and problems that were presented.

Thank you again for caring. We are all in this together.

Mercedes Natvig
Highridge Way, Portola Hills
Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

Torres, Eddie

From: Marty and Rodelle <brehm5@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 2:46 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: RE: Portola Center - Comment Received

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thank you, but I was asking where I can get information regarding the proposed plans. Could you tell me where I can get information?

Thank you.

Rodelle

From: Santos, Ron [<mailto:rsantos@lakeforestca.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 1:53 PM
Subject: Portola Center - Comment Received

Dear Portola Hills Resident:

Thank you for your e-mail regarding the proposed Portola Center project. Your comments will be given careful consideration during the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report for the project and made a part of the public record. The City will also add your e-mail address to the notification list for future Portola Center related meetings and notices.

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

We as the residents clearly remember who is selling this Fantasyland to the city

Allowing Baldwin to “responsibly” develop and maintain “in perpetuity” (in the words of Stephen Haase, senior vice present of Baldwin and Sons) is tantamount to allowing the 9/11 bombers to develop and rebuild the world trade center.

Baldwin originally developed the homes slopes, drainage, and all other parts of the Portola Hills development. I am certain that if the city council take the time to examine the record of their promises to the city at that time they are using the same words that they use today, a promise to build with responsibility, expertise, and offering their commitment to build a quality “in perpetuity” sustainable community. This was a lie.

Lest we forget that Baldwin in 1994 abandoned this same community that they vowed to sustain. Though issues of drainage, roofing, and endless major building and code violations plagued and continue to plague the neighborhoods it seems that the city and we are simply supposed to forget history.

I am not sure if the city just has amnesia, they have simply chosen to forget what the Baldwin’s did or just love the abusive relationship. Neither the city nor Baldwin even cares to acknowledge that there has been no responsibility in the past. They seem to expect that Baldwin have now reformed their ways that they go to church and wear a halo.

History repeats itself unless you chose to break the cycle. This is just a proven fact and there is no defense. If Baldwin had taken responsibility then or **chooses to take responsibility now for what they have done here in Portola Hills in the past,** I am sure that the tone (and development they are proposing) would be different.

Remember, that through the Bankruptcy process the Baldwin’s were able to somehow hold onto their personal fortunes and just let those who bought from them suffer the consequences of their irresponsibility. While we, the city, their investors (and several Wall Street firms) suffered from their irresponsibility their ... *”posh family homes in exclusive Emerald Bay, the 100-acre Wyoming ranch and vacation haciendas in Cabo San Lucas, the yacht and stable of off-road racing cars all appear safe as Al and Jim steer their Baldwin Co. through the tricky waters of a Chapter 11 bankruptcy reorganization.”* (Source Los Angeles Times)

Quoting the same article it further go on to say *“Although the Baldwin’s aren’t talking about their fortunes, others in the building industry who have watched the brothers with varying degrees of awe and envy since the bond issue say that the brothers have not changed their personal lives--even as their businesses have defaulted on millions of dollars in loans and have been sued for non-payment by subcontractors and suppliers.”*

“I’ve been in this business around here for many years, and I know that in the last four or five years nobody has made any money,” said one longtime Orange County home builder who would speak only on the condition that he not be identified. “We’ve all had to make adjustments in our personal life styles, except for the Baldwin’s. And we all talk about them and wonder how they are doing it.”

These are the same people that we are being asked to again believe “in perpetuity”. The city should consider the old adage well that history will prove out:

Fool me once shame on you. Fool me twice shame on me

If the city chooses to continue to believe that this time they mean it, they should make them at least do a bit of a 12 step program and make a mends. Oh and by the way maybe an apology, but I guess that is unnecessary as they are now reformed, maybe they went to rehab.

Torres, Eddie

From: Dave Herzberg <davechaco@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 9:36 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Center - Question

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Ron,

Could you please tell me how many emails & letters the city has received commenting on Portola Center from the July 4th holiday up to the present moment.

Thanks,

David

Torres, Eddie

From: LOU AND MARY SOTO <LHSMH7@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 11:12 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Fwd: Portola Center - Comment Received

Hi Ron,

can you provide any status from the results of recent meetings. Thank you, Lou Soto

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Santos, Ron" <rsantos@lakeforestca.gov>
Date: July 11, 2012 1:49:53 PM PDT
Subject: Portola Center - Comment Received

Dear Portola Hills Resident:

Thank you for your e-mail regarding the proposed Portola Center project. Your comments will be given careful consideration during the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report for the project and made a part of the public record. The City will also add your e-mail address to the notification list for future Portola Center related meetings and notices.

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

Torres, Eddie

From: Chris <christopher1213@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 11:26 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: FW: Meeting Comments
Attachments: Meeting Comments.doc

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Chris [<mailto:christopher1213@cox.net>]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 10:51 AM
To: 'Kuta, Cheryl'
Subject: FW: Meeting Comments

We as the residents clearly remember who is selling this Fantasyland to the city

Allowing Baldwin to “responsibly” develop and maintain “in perpetuity” (in the words of Stephen Haase, senior vice present of Baldwin and Sons) is tantamount to allowing the 9/11 bombers to develop and rebuild the world trade center.

Baldwin originally developed the homes slopes, drainage, and all other parts of the Portola Hills development. I am certain that if the city council take the time to examine the record of their promises to the city at that time they are using the same words that they use today, a promise to build with responsibility, expertise, and offering their commitment to build a quality “in perpetuity” sustainable community. This was a lie.

Lest we forget that Baldwin in 1994 abandoned this same community that they vowed to sustain. Though issues of drainage, roofing, and endless major building and code violations plagued and continue to plague the neighborhoods it seems that the city and we are simply supposed to forget history.

I am not sure if the city just has amnesia, they have simply chosen to forget what the Baldwin’s did or just love the abusive relationship. Neither the city nor Baldwin even cares to acknowledge that there has been no responsibility in the past. They seem to expect that Baldwin have now reformed their ways that they go to church and wear a halo.

History repeats itself unless you chose to break the cycle. This is just a proven fact and there is no defense. If Baldwin had taken responsibility then or **chooses to take responsibility now for what they have done here in Portola Hills in the past**, I am sure that the tone (and development they are proposing) would be different.

Remember, that through the Bankruptcy process the Baldwin’s were able to somehow hold onto their personal fortunes and just let those who bought from them suffer the consequences of their irresponsibility. While we, the city, their

investors (and several Wall Street firms) suffered from their irresponsibility their ... "posh family homes in exclusive Emerald Bay, the 100-acre Wyoming ranch and vacation haciendas in Cabo San Lucas, the yacht and stable of off-road racing cars all appear safe as Al and Jim steer their Baldwin Co. through the tricky waters of a Chapter 11 bankruptcy reorganization." (Source Los Angeles Times)

Quoting the same article it further go on to say "Although the Baldwin's aren't talking about their fortunes, others in the building industry who have watched the brothers with varying degrees of awe and envy since the bond issue say that the brothers have not changed their personal lives--even as their businesses have defaulted on millions of dollars in loans and have been sued for non-payment by subcontractors and suppliers.

"I've been in this business around here for many years, and I know that in the last four or five years nobody has made any money," said one longtime Orange County home builder who would speak only on the condition that he not be identified. "We've all had to make adjustments in our personal life styles, except for the Baldwin's. And we all talk about them and wonder how they are doing it."

These are the same people that we are being asked to again believe "in perpetuity". The city should consider the old adage well that history will prove out:

Fool me once shame on you. Fool me twice shame on me

If the city chooses to continue to believe that this time they mean it, they should make them at least do a bit of a 12 step program and make a mends. Oh and by the way maybe an apology, but I guess that is unnecessary as they are now reformed, maybe they went to rehab.

http://articles.latimes.com/1995-07-21/business/fi-26435_1_baldwin-building

Torres, Eddie

From: Bourgault, Phyllis T <Phyllis_Bourgault@crownbolt.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 11:34 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: New 4-way intersection on Saddleback Ranch Road by Baldwin Companies

Dear Mr. Santos,

I am hearing that the Baldwin Companies are asking for a 4-way intersection with traffic lights on Saddleback Ranch Road to accommodate new homes being build there. This will create traffic congestion and impact the flow of traffic. An alternative suggestion would be to use Glenn Ranch Road for the entrances for these new developments.

I would appreciate if you would consider this alternative to keep the traffic in our community in the Portola Hills area of Lake Forest less congested.

Thanks and Regards,

Phyllis Bourgault

Sr. Cost Accountant, Crown Bolt • 26940 Aliso Viejo Parkway, Aliso Viejo, CA 92656 • (O) 949.643.4736 • (F) 949.643.4136 • Phyllis_Bourgault@crownbolt.com

One Team Driving Customer Success and Value Creation

 Please consider the environment – think before you print

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This e-mail message (including any attachments) is intended solely for the use of the addressee(s) and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail message, you are not authorized to review, print, copy, disseminate, disclose or use this message, or otherwise take any action in reliance upon this message or its contents. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message and all copies thereof from your computer systems (including servers, laptops, handheld devices and back-up systems).

Torres, Eddie

From: Traci DeAngelis <tndeangelis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2012 10:58 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: New Intersections in Portola Hills

Hello Ron,

I would like to write you regarding the potential new intersections that are going to be created for the Portola Center new development. Based on how the traffic study has been presented to the homeowners of Portola Hills, the new intersection(s) are going to create great congestion getting up the hill to our homes. The traffic study has been poorly presented during public meetings. We as a community need total access to traffic study and for this to be well researched and executed.

Sincerely,

Traci DeAngelis
Portola Hills Homeowner

Torres, Eddie

From: Barbara Dunkle <bdunkle1@cox.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2012 8:34 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Hills

Hi Ron,

I am writing in regards to the Portola Hills traffic congestion that will be caused by the proposed 4-way intersection with traffic signals and two gated entrances for the new developments in Portola Center. Do you realize that these traffic signals would only be 450 feet above the existing Glenn Ranch intersection with Saddleback? Building the gates and new intersection for only 280 new homes in Portola Center would cause much consternation for the 2,181 original households that currently reside in Portola Hills.

Please rethink this plan. Clearly the traffic study was flawed to allow such a plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara Dunkle

Torres, Eddie

From: L Vitullo <vitullofamily@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 7:59 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Hills

Dear Mr. Santos,

We would like you and the city of Lake Forest to be aware of our concerns about the proposed intersection and gated entrances in the new developments in Portola Center at the base of the hill on Saddleback Ranch Road. This new intersection is a mere 450 feet above the existing Glenn Ranch intersection with Saddleback Ranch Road, and would create traffic congestion where it did not exist before. It would also adversely impact the traffic flow for the residents of Portola Hills. We are one of those residents and would have a very difficult time entering and exiting our neighborhood. Additionally, a proposed five acre sports park will be located in the southern parcel across from this intersection paralleling Glenn Ranch downhill toward Portola Parkway. This means that children and residents will be using the crosswalks there in ways we have never seen before. The Saddleback Ranch/Glenn Ranch intersection is already the busiest intersection in Portola Hills. It will become even more busy and dangerous if this proposed intersection goes through.

We are in favor of putting a gated entrance along Glenn Ranch for the NW Parcel similar in design to the entrances for the Painted Trails neighborhood on El Toro Road. This means the Baldwin Company will have to move some dirt that they do not want to move and build on less lots. However, they will end up moving a lot of dirt regardless and this is a much safer and less congestive proposition. There is plenty of room to put both entrances for the NE parcel on Glenn Ranch rather than using Saddleback Ranch as an entrance.

We would also like to request that the traffic study data be adequately disclosed to our community in a detailed manner and that the traffic study numbers be presented during public meetings. We as a community need total access to all data in order to address our concerns.

Thank you for your time and attention. We appreciate your service to our community and we look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

Linda Vitullo
19481 Misty Ridge Lane
Portola Hills, CA

Torres, Eddie

From: Greg Spangler <gregspangler@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 5:00 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Hills Development

To Whom it May Concern,

I would like to express some of my concerns for the proposed development in Portola Hills.

My first is traffic. Starting from getting up to PH, there is often a bottleneck coming south on Portola Parkway turning left onto Glenn Ranch. Quite often during rush hour, it will be backed up past the next light. At the top of Glenn Ranch and Saddleback, it seems there is often unnecessary waiting when there is no other oncoming traffic coming down Glenn Ranch. A flashing left turn arrow would seem effective for this intersection as well as at the corner of Ridgeline and El Toro. I don't know what the city policy on left turn yield lights (a light that allows you to turn when it is safe to do so after the initial Green Arrow), but I think they are effective at keeping the traffic flowing and not having to wait for the light to turn and waste unneeded fuel.

I am also concerned about the increased traffic load coming into the top development of Portola. The main reasons for increased use will be that the other main exits out are closed for some reason, taking kids to school, using Concourse Park, and accessing the canyons. I live on Pendleton and I can tell you already that the traffic during the school year around drop off times are not pleasant. My street is packed full of cars dropping off kids, and there is lots of activity. Furthermore, there is very poor traffic control at the uncontrolled intersections of Pendleton and Highridge, and I have seen many close calls with people not properly yielding. I believe that more effort needs to be put into controlling traffic in this part before we add additional homes and traffic into the area.

Greg Spangler
28731 Pendleton Rd
LF, 92679

Torres, Eddie

From: Elizabeth Wallace <eltwallace@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 2:44 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Response to Portola Center Initial Study
Attachments: response to initial study july 2012.doc

Dear Mr. Santos:

Please include the attached comments to the City of Lake Forest's compilation of comments in response to the Portola Center Initial Study and Environmental Checklist.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Wallace
949 858 3014 - home

--
Elizabeth Wallace
Wallace Fine Art
www.etwallace.com

Trabuco Canyon, CA
cell: 949-370-0590

Torres, Eddie

From: Jina Lee <waterlily.jina@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 5:24 PM
To: Santos, Ron

Dear Mr. Santos,

I am concerned about putting the 4 way intersction with traffic signal on Portola center on Saddleback Ranch road in Trabuco canyon. The traffic study data was not very convincing nor did it provide adequate information as to how it will serve the community by preventing traffic as well as any foreseeable accident.

Torres, Eddie

From: John Kearns <jkearns2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2012 7:53 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Saddleback Ranch/Glenn Ranch Intersection

Dear Mr. Santos,

I respectfully request that more time and study be given to the Baldwin request to install a second traffic signal at their project entrance.

Two traffic lights within 450 feet of each other only complicates the traffic flow on one of our main roads here in Portola Hills.

Future development will make this 3 way intersection a four way intersection in the future. We as community residents are just now getting information about the proposed traffic signal.

I believe the community as a whole needs more time and input before the Baldwin installation is approved.

Sincerely,

John Kearns

29006 Canyon Vista Drive
Trabuco Canyon, Ca 92679

Torres, Eddie

From: Gary Bickal <gary.bickal@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 2:36 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Glen Ranch Rd. / Saddleback Ranch Development

As both a current Portola Hills resident and someone who appreciates the local wildlife, I do have several concerns about the proposed development.

My first concern would have to do with both the impact on Portola Hills Elementary and the morning traffic. The school is already filled to capacity it seems, and morning traffic down Saddleback past the school is already at a near standstill. How will the school be able to accommodate any additional students from the new development, and how will the roads be able to handle the added traffic, intersections, etc, considering that it's already crowded in the mornings during the school year.

I'm concerned as to what will happen to the wildlife (including several deer) that now roam over the area between the corner of Glen Ranch/Saddleback and the Whiting Ranch parking lot.

Gary Bickal
19531 Highridge Way
Portola Hills

Torres, Eddie

From: Kristie Nakamura <kris.naka8@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 1:20 AM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Hills intersection construction

I am extremely concerned about the new traffic signal Baldwin Companies is planning on constructing in Portola Hills. The Glenn Ranch/Saddleback intersection is one of the busiest in the community. Another traffic signal just a few hundred feet from this intersection will increase an already congested area, especially during prime traffic hours. I do not think the developers have properly assessed how this development will impact our community and our streets. Please reconsider the location. There is plenty of room on Glenn Ranch Road for the intersection and constructing it further away from the Saddleback intersection will help the flow of traffic.

Thank you for your time,

Kimiko

Torres, Eddie

From: Rex Thomas <rextho@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 6:17 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Oppose - Baldwin Portola Center gated access on Saddleback Road

Ron,

I am a homeowner in Portolal Hills. I have reviewed the information on proposed plan to install a traffic signal and gated access from Saddleback Road to the Baldwin development.

Granting an access such as this, makes a situation which is already bad into something worse. It is our hope the successors to the council members who approved the traffic design for Portola Hill Elementary School would have learned from their mistake. The congestion along Saddleback Ranch Road, when parents are dropping their children off, or picking them up from Portola Hills Elementary School is atrocious. If you have not observed the phenomina, you owe it to your constituents to go and see what I am talking about.

The subject site has no need for the access along Saddleback Road. The property has enough footage along Glenn Ranch Road. There is no reason to further burden the poorly designed traffic situation of access to our neighborhood, with more traffic congestion which will be caused by people trying to get into their gated community, should you allow access to the subject site via Saddleback Road. The cost of providing an alternate access to the subject property should be born by the developer, not the people who do not have a vested interest. Baldwin will still build.

I have discussed this with a number of my neighbors. None of them have thoughts any different than my own. We live here and already pay the price of access to our neighborhood daily. There is no need to make make it any worse.

With kindest regards,

T. Rex Thomas

Torres, Eddie

From: vatodio <vatodio@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 6:13 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: New 4-way traffic signal in Portola Center

Dear Sir,

I understand that Baldwin Company is proposing a 4 way traffic signal merely 450 feet from the Saddleback cross section at Glenn Ranch.

That is a ridiculously shorter distance so close to a very very busy intersection.

Please consider the current traffic flow as well as future growth from Baldwin's new project and put it in perspective with the distance between current traffic signal the proposed one, apply some common sense and reject Baldwin's proposal.

Builder has the right to develop properties on his land, but he doesn't have the right to screw the neighborhood for his monetary gains.

Baldwin should consider some land fill/leveling the terrain and develop the approach to the main roads in a sensible and reasonable manner.

Baldwin can pass the additional cost of the development to the future occupants at the new Portola Center.

Sincerely,

Harshad Patel
19495 Highridge
Lake Forest
CA 92679

Torres, Eddie

From: Sharon Duffy <sbduffy@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 6:04 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Saddleback Ranch/Glenn Ranch intersection

Dear Mr. Santos,

It has come to my attention that the Baldwin Companies is wanting to put a new, 4-way intersection with traffic signals and two gated entrances for their new developments at the base of the hill on Saddleback Ranch Road. My concern is that the traffic study data has not been adequately disclosed to our community in a comprehensive and detailed way, nor have the traffic study numbers and their impact been properly presented during public meetings. As a 20 year resident of the Portola Hills community, I feel it imperative that the public be granted total access to all traffic study data rather than limited computer model simulations. These computer simulations tend to confuse this important issue rather than truly address community concerns. The issue of traffic congestion is important to me, and I respectfully ask you address these concerns.

Sincerely,
(Mrs.) Sharon Duffy
28872 Canyon Point

Torres, Eddie

From: David Hussey <dhussey@cannonandco.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 3:48 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Concern about Baldwin plans for Signal on Saddleback Ranch Road

It has been brought to my attention that the Baldwin Company, in their plans to develop the properties at Glenn Ranch Road and Saddleback Ranch Roads, is planning to install a four Way traffic light with turn arrows into gated communities off of Saddleback Ranch Road. As a resident of Millwood Rd since Portola Hills was developed in 1994, I overlook the property to the west of Saddleback and I make several trips daily from Millwood Down Saddleback Ranch towards Glenn Ranch. That distance is very short along Saddleback Ranch, and the addition of a long Red light and Left Turn Arrows will add greatly to the congestion, safety and travel times to the hundreds of Portola Hills residents that travel on Saddleback Ranch Rd to benefit the 40 homes planned on the West side. With the addition of a guard house and gate in such a short distance from Saddleback into the development will add to the congestion as cars back up for entrance.

I have searched the Lake Forest web site and so far have been unable to find any documentation as to the actual plans. With a meeting on the subject scheduled for Tuesday, July 10, 2012, not being able to find any supporting evidence is disturbing. The City does not seem to know what is going on with this project. Several months ago when Baldwin cut a road along the slope below the Millwood properties to provide access for drilling core samples on the prospective property, I went to City Hall and the Planning department had no idea what was going on.

I want to be on record as opposing the installation of a four way traffic light on Saddleback Ranch Road between Glenn Ranch Road and Millwood Rd.

David Hussey
28332 Millwood Rd
Trabuco Canyon, CA

(949) 584-5668

Torres, Eddie

From: Barbara Taylor <btaylor@itstime.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 08, 2012 2:10 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Plan for Saddleback Ranch Road

Dear Mr. Santos,

I recently learned about a plan to add a new 4-way intersection on Saddleback Ranch Road, very near the existing 3-way intersection of Glenn Ranch Road in Portola Hills, to support a new development. I live in the Bella Palermo condo development very close to that location and am very concerned about the traffic flow and safety should an additional intersection be added at that location. I have not seen any previous notices of public hearings nor have I received anything from the city about the development so close to where I live that affects my daily life.

I do hope you will reconsider the proposal to add another intersection so close to the existing intersection, and look more deeply into the ramifications for the neighborhood, traffic and safety for residents.

I am also surprised and very disappointed that there has been no notification at all to the people who own property nearest to the proposed development.

Barbara Taylor
28454 Sassetta Way
Portola Hills, CA 92679
(949) 599-4701

--
Barbara Taylor, Rainbows & Miracles etc. (<http://www.itstime.com>)
Co-Author: "Income Without a Job" <http://www.income-without-a-job.com>
"Be kind to each other, for these teachings mean nothing without agape." [Michael]

Torres, Eddie

From: Eiji <eiji.naka@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2012 4:00 PM
To: Santos, Ron
Subject: Portola Hills Traffic Signal

I am writing due to a concern about the new traffic signal Baldwin Companies is planning on constructing in Portola Hills. The Glenn Ranch/Saddleback intersection is one of the busiest in the community. Another traffic signal just a few hundred feet from this intersection will increase an already congested area, especially during prime traffic hours. I do not think the developers have properly assessed how this development will impact our community and our streets. Please reconsider the location. There is plenty of room on Glenn Ranch Road for the intersection and constructing it further away from the Saddleback intersection will help the flow of traffic.

The traffic study data has not been adequately disclosed to our community in a comprehensive and detailed manner. The traffic study numbers and their impact have been poorly presented during public meetings. We need a total access to all traffic study data rather than limited computer modeled simulations that confuse rather than address our concerns.

Sincerely,

Eiji Nakamura