Chapter 3 Comments and Coordination

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process to determine the scope of environmental documentation, the level of analysis, potential impacts and mitigation measures and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including: project development team meetings, interagency coordination meetings, and public participation hearings. This chapter summarizes the results of the City of Chino Hills' efforts to folly identify, address and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

3.1 Agency Consultation

During the preparation of the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study (EA/IS), monthly Project Development Team (PDT) meetings were held to discuss design options, factors to be considered during the environmental study process, and scheduling issues. Staff from the Department of Transportation (Department) District 08, City of Chino Hills, and several consulting firms attended these meetings.

As part of the coordination necessary for the environmental study process, the following Federal, State, and local agencies were consulted:

- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
- California Department of Transportation District 08 Local Assistance
- City of Chino Hills (City)
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- San Bernardino County Flood Control District (SBCFCD)
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

Staff from these agencies provided substantive information regarding the presence of environmental resources within the project area, regulations governing these resources,

impact assessment methodologies, significance of environmental impacts, and the design of any necessary mitigation measures.

Consultation History with USFWS

On May 18, 2004, the USFWS met with representatives from the Department and City of Chino Hills to discuss potential project-related impacts to threatened and endangered species and potential conservation measures. On June 16, 2005, the USFWS provided a list of federally threatened and endangered species that may be in the vicinity of the proposed project. On September 23, 2005, the USFWS received the Biological Assessment (BA) for the proposed project and a request to initiate formal consultation. Formal consultation was initiated on October 31, 2005.

On November 19, 2005, a meeting was held at the project site to discuss how the proposed conservation measures would be clarified to provide sufficient information for analysis in the Biological Opinion (BO). On February 3, 2006, the USFWS (Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office [CFWO]) received the revised project description, including updated conservation measures. On March 7, 2006, the CFWO issued the BO for the proposed project. All conservation/minimization measures stipulated in the BO are included in Section 2.3.5, Threatened and Endangered Species, of this environmental document.

3.2 Public Involvement

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations do not require formal scoping for projects for which an EA/IS is prepared. Nonetheless, a public scoping process was conducted for the proposed project to ensure that all concerns were presented for consideration and inclusion in the environmental studies. As part of ongoing consultation for this environmental process, a "Notice of Opportunity for a Public Meeting" was mailed to property owners within a 152-m (500-ft) radius of the proposed improvements.

The City of Chino Hills conducted a public information meeting at McCoy Equestrian Center in the City of Chino Hills on May 12, 2004. During the meeting, comment cards were passed out and collected. Public comments have been accepted through the environmental development process. There has been both support for and opposition to this project from elected officials and the affected community. Those opposing the project generally cited concerns of increased traffic, increased noise, aesthetics, and safety. The meeting was advertised in *The Champion* (a newspaper serving Chino Valley

and the City of Chino Hills) on May 1 and 8, 2004; a copy of the advertisement is provided in Chapter 5.

3.3 Tribal Coordination

Request for information letters were sent to the following local historical society/historic preservation groups. Refer to the HPSR for a detailed record of correspondence efforts with local community and Native American representatives in the project area. The SHPO Concurrence Letter is also included after Section 3.4, *Other Coordination Efforts.*

1. La Jolla Band of Mission Indians
2. Pala Band of Mission Indians
3. Pauma and Yuma
4. Pechanga Band of Mission Indians
5. Rincon Band of Mission Indians
6. San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
7. Soboba Band of Mission Indians
8. Samuel Dunlap
9. Ti'At Society
10. Gab/Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
11. San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
12. Gabrieleno/Tongva Tribal Council
13. San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
14. Gab/Tongva Council/Gab Tongva Nation
15. Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians of CA

3.4 Other Coordination Efforts

1. U.S. Department of Agriculture
2. Old Schoolhouse Museum
3. Chino Valley Historical Society
4. Chino Hills Library
5. Chino Champion Newspaper
6. San Bernardino County Building & Safety, Land Management
7. San Bernardino County Assessor's Office
8. San Bernardino County Archive

STATE OF CAUTORKtA- THE RESOUBK^S AOENCY

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
TEPARTWEWT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
.O. BOX [illegible]
SACRAMENTO, CA [illegible]
(916) [illegible] Fax (916) [illegible]
calshpo@ohp.parks.ca.gov
www.ohp.parks.ca.gov

August 29,2005

Reply To: FHWA0508Q8A

David Bricker, Office Chief
Department of Transportation, District 8
Environmental Planning (MS 825)
464 W Fourth Street, 6* Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92401-1400

Re; Determinations of €»s^bi% for the Proposed Peyton Drive Fk>aoH^y Jrt^rovenient Project, Chino Hills, CA

Dear Mr, Bricker:

Thank you for c o n s u l wM me about the subject u r K k ^ng in accordance with the *Programmatk: Agreement Amor® the Federay Adtgnistration, AcMsory Council on Historic Preservation, the CaMomia State Histo^Preeer^thnOffk^, and the Cmcmiia Deptutmerrt of Transportation RegartirqCon^lance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservatkn Act, as n Pertains to me Admfnistmtion of mFe^ral-Aid Highway Program in California (PA).*

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is requesting my concurrence pursuant toStiputatk>nVIII.C,5crfthePAmatthefa^ ng properties are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP):

- 3320 Chino HHla Parkway, Chino Hills, CA
- 14566 Peyton Drive, Chino Hills, CA

Based on review of the submitted documentation, I concur with this determination.

TnankyoufcH-cortskieringhistorrcp roperties during project planning. If you have any questions, [illegible] Vndquist of my staff at (016) 654-0631 or e-mai at

Sincerely,

Mitford Wayne Donaldson, FA!A
State Historic Preservation Officer

RECFJVED
SEP 0 2 2005
BY: