

Etiwanda Heights: Cited Pages from the Administrative Record

Compiled by the Rancho Cucamonga Preservation Society. This file contains only the pages cited on our website, reproduced from the City of Rancho Cucamonga's administrative record for the Etiwanda Heights Neighborhood and Conservation Plan amendment. Each page keeps its original "AR" stamp in the lower right corner.

Included: the transcript of Item D2 of the December 10, 2025 Planning Commission meeting (cover page AR 02159 and pages AR 02277 through AR 02287), and selected emails from Section I (AR 07952 through AR 09362). Where a cited page falls in the middle of an email, the page or pages where that email begins are included for context.

Redaction: on AR 09332, the name and email address of a private resident have been redacted by RCPS. No other changes have been made.

The complete record is available from the City of Rancho Cucamonga under the California Public Records Act.

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

TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIO-RECORDED
ITEM D2
OF THE RANCHO CUCAMONGA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING
DECEMBER 10, 2025

1 We'll have species. I think the other one is the
2 butterfly. Uh, so we'll have to do additional
3 preconstruction surveys on those new species and make
4 sure we don't impact those because those didn't exist
5 and they weren't protected species in 2019.

6 So that'll be a requirement and maybe a new
7 product group addressing those. And then I think I hit
8 as many as I could. Probably forgotten some so I very
9 much welcome the commission's questions.

10 CHAIR MORALES: Okay. Thank you. Do the
11 commissioner have any questions for the applicant
12 before I close the public hearing? Commissioner Dobb?

13 COMMR. DOPP: Sure. Okay. Hi. You got a lot of
14 big asks in this plan. I've got a few topics
15 conversation.

16 Um, I'm sure some of other commissioners do as
17 well. Um, I know you kind of picked and chose the
18 questions you kinda wanted to answer from the public.
19 Um, my big 12,000-foot question, and I'm -- I'm going
20 to probably ask you to defend why you're looking for a
21 specific ask for the next few minutes here. But, um,
22 holistically speaking, right, you know, we've got a
23 plan that's on the books. You knew what that plan was
24 when you bought the property.

25 Um, and a lot of residents are upset prospect of

1 a plan that was community oriented being compromised
2 by the number of units that mathematically could work
3 out in your favor. This does include me because my
4 name is on that document. Alright? I did vote for
5 that. I'm the only commissioner up here who did.

6 And I do remember saying that there were going to
7 be some negative impacts but that it was still a good
8 plan that achieved a lot of goals that the city wanted
9 to achieve to create diverse housing types, slightly
10 more affordable options, walkable communities. Um, so
11 I guess my first real question that I'm asking you is
12 why exactly, um, are you seeking, right, after x
13 number of time, the -- the greatly increased number of
14 units?

15 You know, when -- when you kind of knew that this
16 was the plan moving forward and I understand that the
17 laws in the books are what they are, they kind of work
18 in your favor. We've had a lot of these conversations,
19 um, at the Commission over previous years, but it
20 greatly greatly concerns me when a developer comes in
21 and sees a plan and just kinda says, well, I'm gonna
22 go kinda sort of use the laws to my advantage and
23 kinda do what I need to do. The floor is yours.

24 MR. VOGTLE: Thank you Commissioner Dobb. Great
25 question. And to answer your question, when my client

1 got the property, uh, last year, there were two
2 documents in place. There was the 2019 specific plan
3 but there also was the 2021 general plan. And -- and
4 although the specific plan did cap it at 3,000, the
5 general plan opened the door for additional units.

6 And using the housing law, there's an opportunity
7 to obviously hit the general plan, what we talked
8 about this evening. And to do so, we would have to
9 spread that density all over. You'd have units per
10 acre in every planting area. And we knew there'd be
11 sensitivity to the -- so to answer your question, it
12 wasn't just the 2019 specific plan. There also was the
13 general plan and it's eight units per -- per acre.

14 And we knew we weren't limited by the 3,000 cap
15 in the specific plan because of the general plan. And
16 so the idea was to work with -- work with the city and
17 figure out what would we had several meetings. We
18 talked a lot about the 2019 specific plan, what the
19 goals, what -- what the community wanted and the
20 decision. That's probably why we started the transfer
21 of density was to be able to create better edge
22 treatment. And again, we're capped at three stories,
23 um, capped at 40 feet. The product types we're
24 building; you don't have any podium.

25 There's no wrap product. There's not the giant

1 apartments you're seeing when you're driving up and
2 down the city. You're not going to have a six story, a
3 big project with -- with 300 units all packed into one
4 building.

5 The most we're limited is -- is -- is to, you
6 know, we're limited to these buildings we have and --
7 and it's the 12 pack and that's what you're going see.
8 So you don't see large apartments. And we knew people
9 in the community didn't want to live right next door
10 to that. So that's why we created the density
11 transfer, was to -- to take advantage of the general
12 plan density but also not to be sensitive to the -- to
13 the edge communities.

14 COMMR. DOPP: Okay. I -- I get that. And you
15 know, we're going to probably have a discussion about
16 laws a little bit later here and kind of what's
17 applicable. Like I said, we've had a lot of these
18 conversations before, and we've kind of been down this
19 road.

20 MR. VOGTLE: Yeah.

21 COMMR. DOPP: Um, so I get it. But it still
22 doesn't answer the concern that the community has.
23 Right? There was already a -- a perception six seven
24 years ago when I sat up here that that land was gonna
25 be strained in terms of number of people. And now

1 you're coming in potentially, and again mathematically
2 I've been doing a lot of math up here tonight. Yeah.

3 Just kind of thinking about possible scenarios
4 and what ifs, Right? And no, there's no way to
5 calculate exactly the number is gonna be, but it's
6 gonna be more than, you know, the number of residents
7 that's in the specific plan already, you know, and to
8 be totally fair, some of the concerns are valid, you
9 know, and I still haven't really heard how and why
10 you're seeking to alleviate or how you're going to
11 address those pressure points that the community
12 probably fairly has.

13 You know, when they see, even if you don't see
14 the podium styles on Foothill or, you know, the super
15 intensive development that it's gonna have on the
16 quality of life, the traffic. You know, you mentioned
17 the fire, but honestly, the one thing you didn't
18 mention was how to get out. You mentioned a lot about
19 how buildings were gonna protect in the area from the
20 fire, which is great. Awesome. No disagreement here.

21 But you-- you didn't talk about some of those
22 logistics and the pressure points that you're putting
23 extra, you know, beyond, you know. So that's kind of
24 what I really kind of sort of need to hear at this
25 point a little bit, you know, rather than just, well,

1 the law's going do it and so let's just kind of make
2 it happen, right? So go ahead.

3 MR. VOGTLE: I appreciate the additional
4 questions and let me make sure I'm understanding them
5 so I answer all your questions. So I think when you
6 talk about the 2019 specific plan, there's a reason
7 we're in 2025 and that hasn't been built yet. I think
8 what was designed, it's beautiful but it's designed,
9 you know, a lot of times those plans, they don't hit
10 the market. They don't pencil. The development costs
11 to develop big lots like that, to bring in all the
12 infrastructure and to have that few of homes to sell
13 at the end of the day on this larger project when you
14 have all the CFD, all the school fees, they just don't
15 pencil.

16 And there's a reason this site and a lot of sites
17 like this, they sit empty for years is because they
18 just don't work with half acre lots. What worked in
19 1980 and 70s, developers can't afford to bring that
20 kind of infrastructure and the price points they
21 deliver to those homes, they just don't pencil. And
22 so, I mean, I'm just trying to answer your question
23 one time.

24 You asked, why don't you just build a 2019
25 specific plan like everyone wants? And the answer is

1 it just doesn't pencil. It doesn't work. It doesn't
2 work in today's - - -

3 COMMR. DOPP: Excuse me. We're going let him
4 speak. Thank you very much. All right? We're going to
5 be fair.

6 MR. VOGTLE: So I'm trying to be mindful of your
7 question. You said we bought the property and so we
8 bought it knowing about the 2019 specific plan which -
9 - which doesn't work and we couldn't build or we would
10 have bought it. We knew there was a 2021 general plan
11 which allowed additional density. We knew with that
12 additional density we'd be able to blend and make
13 things work. So I want to be mindful of your question.

14 That's a direct answer. Like if it was just a
15 2019 general plan, specific plan, it would probably
16 sit here empty for another twenty years or thirty or
17 maybe would never get built which I know is what a lot
18 of people want. A lot of people said, "Why are you
19 paving over our nature preserve?" And that this never
20 was a nature preserve. This was designed to be
21 developed. Several people here tonight have said
22 they've been developed and everyone wants it to be a
23 mindful development.

24 And we tried to make it that mindful development.
25 We're trying to produce, uh, houses that people want

1 to buy and can afford to buy given that the economics
2 are bringing in all the infrastructure, paying all the
3 school fees, building out all the traffic signals. Uh,
4 I want to be mindful of some of other questions you
5 asked about which was fire evacuation. And so there
6 will -- there will be definite road improvements. I
7 think the primary road improvement that'll go in is
8 the Wilson connection.

9 And I know the Lennar project on the street is
10 further going to connect that Wilson. So that'll be
11 another big route. Today, you cannot drive to the 15
12 on Wilson. And when we're done, when our project's
13 done, my understanding is -- I don't know that I'm not
14 involved in that project. But the goal is that Wilson
15 Quarter will create additional avenues of exit and
16 additional areas to vacate that don't exist today.

17 And they get down to you get the two freeway on
18 ramps up, they'll have access to you. They'll just
19 have to go to milk and you'll be able to get over. So,
20 it does increase the circulation. Now, acknowledge
21 you're adding more people, but you are adding
22 additional infrastructure to help with that
23 evacuation.

24 But I think the fire hardening really is
25 significant. The fact that we're gonna have pretty

1 major fuel modification breaks and then hardened
2 homes, it allows the fire department to know that they
3 can stop the fire at that point. They can go control
4 other areas where you don't have those protections.

5 COMM. DOPP: Okay.

6 MR. VOGTLE: I want to make sure I answered. Were
7 there other --

8 COMM. DOPP: Um, I think that's good for now on
9 that point. I kind of want to move on to building
10 types real quick because I know the other
11 commissioners don't want to steal the spotlight for
12 too long. I think briefly, you know, you're asking for
13 a 12 flex and a lockup is probably the most dense
14 types --

15 MR. VOGTLE: Correct.

16 COMM. DOPP: -- of housing. And again, that
17 doesn't exist, right? In the specific plan. So that's
18 a pretty big ask, right, from a development standpoint
19 to say, hey, you know, we're going to put in
20 potentially, and again, nobody can read the tea leaves
21 in the future, but most likely probably multifamily
22 for rent housing, right? Because that -- that's the
23 kind of style that -- that lends itself to
24 traditionally speaking. So what's the decision process
25 behind that ask?

1 MR. VOGTLE: So great -- great question. Thank
2 you Commissioner Dobb for the question. So I think the
3 issue is a lot of what staff alluded to earlier is we
4 have an inconsistency with the general plan density in
5 the specific plan. And nobody wants to see just the
6 same product type built across the entire project.
7 Frankly, we don't either.

8 You want a little -- you want a diversity of
9 product type. And so to -- to build that, the existing
10 specific plan was designed for essentially four
11 dwelling units to the acre. And so the highest product
12 would allow you to get there with a variety of
13 product. When you take that to eight, you need
14 additional denser product types to hit those. And
15 that's not that we're going to put 12 plexes
16 everywhere.

17 You can see right now we don't have any proposed
18 in these first two neighborhoods. Um, and -- and -- so
19 that was designed to create a broader diversity of
20 just like you saw in the original plan. You went from
21 state lots on half acre lots all the way down to
22 pretty tight single family homes. This is just giving
23 you a few additional product types in order to blend
24 that density and make sure you can still have a wide
25 variety of product types. Whenever you're selling

1 these communities, you want to go out and you see them
2 all the time.

3 When you see these big communities, they often
4 have a lot of segmentation. There's several different
5 product types and these additional product types are
6 one in a tool set. And again, think that's all they're
7 going build.

8 No developer has a desire just to build and
9 they're just a string of 12 plexes when you can also
10 build single family detached, you can build duplex,
11 you can build a courtyard. A lot of this, you'll see
12 almost every one of those product types you're going
13 to see in this community because we're trying to hit
14 the market and what people want when they're looking
15 for homes.

16 And not everyone can afford family detached. And
17 so they may get a condo and a 12 plex and there'll be,
18 you know, for them that price point is the best they
19 can afford and they'll be happy to have that
20 opportunity because their only other opportunity other
21 than that would be large renting -- renting apartment
22 complex.

23 COMMR. DOPP: Okay. Uh, kind of similar along
24 those lines, I do want to spend a little bit of time
25 on the specific plans for Area 1 too just real fast.

From: Stratos Georgopoulos <sgeorgopoulos@theprevitigroup.com>
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2025 2:08 PM
To: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Cc: Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: Etiwanda Heights - SPA Kick-Off

CAUTION: This email is from outside our Corporate network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and can confirm the content is safe.

Hi Jennifer-

We were discussing the SPA and the various product types. Can you please start an email chain with the Sergeant team so we can begin working through these questions? We want to look at and remove any language in the current SP that limits the product type in each PA.

We are going to request that they provide every conceivable product type that will fit in the following breakdown, which will allow for maximum flexibility in all planning areas:

- 8-12 DU/ Acre
- 12-16 DU/ Acre
- 16-22 DU/ Acre

Note that the higher density listed above is for our future 3-story walk up, multi-family project.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,



STRATOS GEORGOPOULOS

Planning Project Manager

2151 E. Convention Center Way, Suite 114

Ontario, CA 91764

O:909-354-8013 | C:949-374-0249

SGeorgopoulos@ThePrevitiGroup.com



THEPREVITIGROUP.COM

Important Update: We're excited to announce that our company has rebranded to The Previti Group! We ask that you update your records accordingly. Thank you for your continued support during this exciting time. We look forward to continuing to work together.

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this electronic e-mail and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the intended recipient and may be confidential and/or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail, and delete the original message and all copies from your system. Thank you.

AR 07986

From: Stratos Georgopoulos
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2025 12:53 PM
To: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Cc: Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: Etiwanda Heights - Unit Count

Hi Jennifer-

It was nice to meet you in person yesterday. We discussed the various options internally and have decided to move forward with the 5,500 units. I look forward to hearing from you on the next steps.

Thank you,



STRATOS GEORGOPOULOS
Planning Project Manager

2151 E. Convention Center Way, Suite 114
Ontario, CA 91764
O:909-354-8013 | C:949-374-0249
SGeorgopoulos@ThePrevitiGroup.com



THEPREVITIGROUP.COM

Important Update: We're excited to announce that our company has rebranded to The Previti Group! We ask that you update your records accordingly. Thank you for your continued support during this exciting time. We look forward to continuing to work together.

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this electronic e-mail and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the intended recipient and may be confidential and/or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail, and delete the original message and all copies from your system. Thank you.

AR 07987

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Friday, March 7, 2025 5:28 PM PST
To: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Munkvold Rich <rmunkvold@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <SImhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Jeffers, Jennifer <jjeffers@allenmatkins.com>; Nichols, Matthew <mnichols@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: Etiwanda Heights

You don't often get email from mfogt@allenmatkins.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from outside our Corporate network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and can confirm the content is safe.

John/Nick:

Thank you (and the entire City team) for your time Thursday. It was a productive call and we made a lot of progress.

For everyone's notes, the critical threshold issues we discussed at length are as follows:

- Overriding Language rather than line by line edit
- 20+ denser product to supplement the existing produce
- Land plan planning area by planning area rather than land planning the entire 733 acres upfront
- John Gillison: Post Prop 13; adding in non-residential product; fiscal impact analysis; commercial; can do CFDs and fees to net things out; Jimmy: we will take the commercial option
- Conservation Dedications; decouple the conservation dedications from the 733 acres and address conservation later, possibly via a mitigation bank

A critical path item appears to be electrical service. Given that the project will be developed over several years and that there is power in the area, we are hopeful that there is a solution to power the first planning areas before the substation is completed (to the extent it cannot be completed prior to such date). Please get back to us soon re: power capacity to serve the initial phase and buildout of the project.

We looked into the park issue under the City's code (see below) and the General Plan density allows the developer to count the area within dedicated parks towards density calculations within the larger project area. As such, assuming we develop 20 acres of commercial, that would leave 713 acres to develop, or 5,704 units. How many acres of park would 5,704 units require?

It would be helpful to know if there are major utility thresholds, such as the substation could only serve 5,500 homes and anything beyond that would require a second substation (likely a bad example, but you get my point).

Please contact us with any questions and have a great weekend.

AR 08029

Best regards,
Matt

Matthew R. Fogt, Esq.

Partner, Land Use, Real Estate, and Energy
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
2010 Main Street, Suite 800, Irvine, CA 92614
949.851.5453 direct | 949.241.4043 mobile

Allen Matkins



The definitions of “density” and “residential development right,” also provided in RCMC Section 17.140.020, confirm that the calculation is based on gross acreage (pre-dedication):

- **"Density"** means the total number of dwelling units in a project site, divided by the gross area of the project site. The dwelling unit density range permitted under the applicable land use classification shall apply to the overall project site and shall not be literal to any division thereof.
- **"Residential development right"** means the residential development rights permitted on a parcel or parcels under the base density of the general plan and the title, measured in maximum dwelling units per acre based on gross acreage.

From: Fogt, Matthew

Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 9:22 PM

To: 'Nicholas Ghirelli' <NGhirelli@rwglaw.com>

Cc: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; John.Gillison@cityofrc.us

Subject: Etiwanda Heights

Hi Nick:

I hope your hearing went well. Sorry I could not get this to you sooner (ended up getting stuck on several calls and dealing with fire drills). Below is a very rough summary of suggested modifications to the Etiwanda Heights Neighborhood and Conservation Plan (“Specific Plan”) applicable to the development of the Neighborhood Area. This is not a final request, but is intended to facilitate a dialog to discuss potential revisions required to facilitate the higher general plan density.

As discussed, the other alternative is to revert to base zoning at the GP density if we cannot make the Specific Plan work with the higher density. We understand that the City would prefer to maintain the Specific Plan to the extent possible and this is our good faith effort to facilitate such goal. We look forward to our call tomorrow at 8:30 am.

- Supplement Section 2.7 to note the 2021 General Plan provides 8 du/ac to the entire Neighborhood Area (5,864 for 733 acres). Also note that density will be averaged over the entire NA; some areas will be up to 25 du/ac and others less so long as average to 8 du/ac across the entire 733 acres.

AR 08030

- Update Section 3.2 to reference Crotch's Bumblebee (not previously addressed) and Burrowing Owl (cannot relocate now that candidate species); preconstruction surveys. Possibly revise gnatcatcher to note not habitat and only a pre-construction inspection is required.
- Sections 3.3 through 3.6 likely do not need to be updated as the TDR only applies if utilized and likely will not be utilized for the NA. Conservation will come into play if and when plans are processed for the Rural/Conservation Area.
- Section 3.5. Update Strategy 2.1 and 2.2 to de-couple the 733 acres from conservation obligations; no nexus and no density needed. Conservation and mitigation will be addressed when the northern properties are developed. No express requirement to dedicate 375 acre Etiwanda Heights Preserve or 196 Deer Canyon Preserve; mitigation and conservation, per nexus and rough proportionality, will be addressed if and when the northern parcels are developed
- Section 4. Add general statement that now much denser and will apply to the extent not inconsistent with higher density allowed under the General Plan.
 - Address drainage feature through middle; ability to underground instead
 - Add note that pocket parks below Banyan; larger parks north of Banyan around most of the housing north of Banyan
- Section 5. Add general statement that now much denser and will apply to the extent not inconsistent with higher density allowed under the General Plan.
 - Add 20+ new denser product types and note that many of the less dense product types may no longer be possible
 - Note that Figure 5.2.2B is inconsistent with higher density and instead the TTM and site plan approval process will govern layout; but general backbone street layout will be maintained
 - Section 5.8. Note that park locations will be modified and consolidated to provide for GP density
- Section 6 – Transportation
 - May need to revise Section 6.3 as there is no offsite flow; only dealing with on-site flow
- Section 7.3. Note that chart will be updated by planning area precise plans to implement increased density, including relocating and reducing parks and commercial space
- Section 7.7. Mentions design review approvals **prior to** maps, improvement plans, landscape plans, architectural, site plans, building plans, Precise Neighborhood Plans, etc. Why? Does not the Specific Plan already have enough detail?
 - Then requires precise plan approval; should skip right to TTM and precise plan; all in one approval (possibly with Specific Plan Amendment)
- Appendix 1: Need to update to show uses; just two categories (residential and commercial); ability to move commercial so long as 20-25 acres and per precise plan approved by the City
- Appendix 2: Can we just do 2 steps instead of 4: Step 1: TTM and Precise Plan. Step 2: Final map, improvement plans and construction drawings
- Mitigation: We will need to modify the bio mitigation measures as noted above based on additional bio reports and a jurisdictional survey

Best regards,
Matt

Matthew R. Fogt, Esq.

Partner, Land Use, Real Estate, and Energy
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
2010 Main Street, Suite 800, Irvine, CA 92614
949.851.5453 **direct** | 949.241.4043 **mobile**

From: John.Gillison@cityofrc.us
Sent: Friday, March 7, 2025 6:32 PM PST
To: Matthew Fogt <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
CC: nghirelli@rwglaw.com; James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>;
Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>;
Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Munkvold Rich <rmunkvold@theprevitigroup.com>;
Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>;
Steven Imhoof <SImhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Jennifer Jeffers <jjeffers@allenmatkins.com>;
Matthew Nichols <mnichols@allenmatkins.com>
BCC: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Subject: Re: Etiwanda Heights

Thanks Matt. We will work on the park acreage question. I can tell you, however, that if the current density was 41 acres this higher density will be around 90+ acres.

On the electrical service, we do not yet have a construction phasing schedule. If you could provide us with the quarter and year when you expect to begin construction and will need temp power, the number of units you expect to do in Phase 1, how long Phase 1 will take, and when you expect to need C of O, then I can let you know if there will be a problem.

On Mar 7, 2025, at 5:29 PM, Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email is from outside our Corporate network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and can confirm the content is safe.

John/Nick:

Thank you (and the entire City team) for your time Thursday. It was a productive call and we made a lot of progress.

For everyone's notes, the critical threshold issues we discussed at length are as follows:

- Overriding Language rather than line by line edit
- 20+ denser product to supplement the existing produce
- Land plan planning area by planning area rather than land planning the entire 733 acres upfront
- John Gillison: Post Prop 13; adding in non-residential product; fiscal impact analysis; commercial; can do CFDs and fees to net things out; Jimmy: we will take the commercial option
- Conservation Dedications; decouple the conservation dedications from the 733 acres and address conservation later, possibly via a mitigation bank

A critical path item appears to be electrical service. Given that the project will be developed over several years and that there is power in the area, we are hopeful that there is a solution to power the first planning areas before the substation is completed (to the extent it cannot be completed prior to

AR 08033

From: Rich Munkvold <rmunkvold@theprevitigroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2025 10:22 AM PDT
To: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: RE: Etiwanda Heights
Attachments: Etiwanda Timeline 3-18-2025.xlsx

John,

Attached is a revised spreadsheet that projects through the entire balance of the project which has its last completion in 2038. The total units are 5,704.

Thanks!

From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2025 2:44 PM
To: Rich Munkvold <rmunkvold@theprevitigroup.com>
Cc: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: RE: Etiwanda Heights

Rich

I do have a few final questions. Your Spreadsheet tops at 3,476 units but Mr. Previti has mentioned a top-end cap of 5,407 units? Do you know where the remaining units would be?

Also, I notice that you do not have PA 9 built out, I am guessing because beyond 2032 is pretty speculative, but do you have an estimate of how many units would be in that PA? Is that the missing 1,931 units to hit the 5407 cap?

Finally, I noticed the large park acreage was in PA 8 and if you are adding 272 units in that area, I am guessing you are moving that acreage somewhere into PA 6-9? Just checking as 5,407 units would require about 86 acres of park, and that is a fairly good sized chunk of land to be set aside in one of the PA's. I was guessing you wouldn't want it too far north or it would be inaccessible to most of the development, so PA 6-7 or the southern part of 9 seemed likely possibilities, or in PA 5. Either way, just want to be sure nothing was overlooked.

We are looking now at the analysis for PA 1, 2 and 5 specifically.

John R. Gillison
City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga
2020 All American City

I value your work life boundaries.

Please do not feel pressure to respond to this message outside of working hours.

AR 08116

From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2025 12:16 PM PDT
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Munkvold Rich <rmunkvold@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <SImhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Nichols, Matthew <mnichols@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: Etiwanda Heights

It does. We need some level of specificity, not to be cute, but if it is 4 walls and a roof, it is so subjective there is no standard and everything works. Nick can reach out in more detail but Jennifer, based on our experience with VG and The Resort, has experience with interpreting standards over a 10-20 year time frame and we have had problems before when things were so gray and people changed and it was difficult or impossible in the future to tell what was meant in the past. Nick has more detail on it, but also, we have to have a certain level of objectivity these days or HCD will find the standard invalid.

John R. Gillison
City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga
2020 All American City

I value your work life boundaries.

Please do not feel pressure to respond to this message outside of working hours.

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2025 11:32 AM
To: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com
Cc: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Munkvold Rich <rmunkvold@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <SImhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Nichols, Matthew <mnichols@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: Etiwanda Heights

CAUTION: This email is from outside our Corporate network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and can confirm the content is safe.

John/Nick:

We are working on the Specific Plan revisions. Regarding how to add denser product types, we would propose less detail than is included for the current product types in order to add more flexibility as the market evolves through buildout. As this way more business than legal, we propose that Mark and Andrew discuss this concept with Matt and/or Jennifer to make sure that the parties are conceptually on the same page. Does that work for the City?

AR 08142

From: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Friday, April 4, 2025 12:59 PM PDT
To: Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>
CC: Stratos Georgopoulos <sgeorgopoulos@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: Re: Etiwanda Heights

Thanks Andrew, we are working on it now.

Jennifer

From: Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>
Date: Friday, April 4, 2025 at 10:21 AM
To: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Cc: Stratos Georgopoulos <sgeorgopoulos@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: FW: Etiwanda Heights

Hi Jennifer,

Please see below conversation with City Attorney where we get the green light to work with you on the new product types and engage Sargent.

From: Nichols, Matthew <mnichols@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 9:11 AM
To: Nicholas Ghirelli <NGhirelli@rwglaw.com>
Cc: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: Etiwanda Heights

Hi Nick,

Thank you for the reply. You are correct in your reading of Andrew's email below. If staff can please reach out now to Sargent regarding the product types that would be terrific.

-Matt

Matthew Nichols | Associate | Allen Matkins
mnichols@allenmatkins.com | Direct (949) 851-5576 | Main (949) 553-1313

From: Nicholas Ghirelli <NGhirelli@rwglaw.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 5:03 PM
To: Nichols, Matthew <mnichols@allenmatkins.com>
Cc: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: Etiwanda Heights

CAUTION: External Email

Matt,

AR 08144

Thanks. I will forward this to the City for review. Based on a quick glance, I didn't see the 20+ product types that Previti is proposing to add to the specific plan. Is this what Andrew was referring to in his email re. Sargent and, therefore, **should the staff reach out to Sargent to prepare the new product types?**

Nick

From: Nichols, Matthew <mnichols@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 4:43 PM
To: Nicholas Ghirelli <NGhirelli@rwglaw.com>
Cc: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: Etiwanda Heights

Hi Nick,

Thank you for your email. Matt F. was able forward along while out of town this week and requested that I follow up in his absence.

We have continued to advance the draft revisions to the Specific Plan text and provide the attached redlines for the City's review and consideration. These proposed edits are intended to capture the key points discussed to date, while preserving the overall structure and internal consistency of the Specific Plan document. In preparing these revisions, we have been mindful to ensure that the development standards remain objective and legally defensible under current State housing laws, including the Housing Accountability Act, while still allowing for a reasonable degree of flexibility.

Note that in the interest of facilitating review of these edits in a single comprehensive Word document, we generated a Word version of the Specific Plan document based on the original PDF. Due to file size and the complication in revising the source document, prepared with specialized software and including several embedded images, we thought it would be easiest to provide our revisions in this text-only version suitable for redlining and email distribution. Once the revisions are finalized between the City and Previti, the next step would be to incorporate the approved changes into the full version of the document containing all images and formatting.

With respect to Sargent, we agree in concept with the next steps outlined in your email.

Once you have had an opportunity to begin to digest these proposed revisions, please feel free to contact us with any questions or if it would be helpful to schedule a meeting to review them in detail. We appreciate the City's continued collaboration and look forward to hearing from you.

- Matt

Matthew Nichols | Associate | Allen Matkins
mnichols@allenmatkins.com | Direct (949) 851-5576 | Main (949) 553-1313

AR 08145

From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 8:03 AM PDT
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Steven Imhoof <SImhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Subject: RE: Etiwanda Traffic Study; Action Items

Thanks Matt.

Do you know where we are with the Bio and Market Study? The sooner we can review those the quicker we can determine if there are any fundamental concerns or disagreements we need to discuss, or if we are good to move forward on next steps.

John R. Gillison
City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga
2020 All American City

I value your work life boundaries.

Please do not feel pressure to respond to this message outside of working hours.

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 6:48 AM
To: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Cc: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Steven Imhoof <SImhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Subject: Re: Etiwanda Traffic Study; Action Items

Thank you John for the thoughtful response. I agree that it would be more efficient to have one unified consultant going forward and that dueling consultants is a waste of time and resources. We will get back to you shortly regarding the consultant so that we can kick it off.

Sent from handheld

On Jun 10, 2025, at 6:44 AM, Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us> wrote:

CAUTION: External Email

AR 08161

We can ask. To be honest Matt 2 weeks is a ridiculous time. UX, your consultant took far longer than that. If you just want them to write a few pages and agree or disagree with one of us, we could do that in a week. But if you want data driven analysis that is useful for the environmental, then a more reasonable time is 4 weeks but it will cost more and depend on workload.

This is why going forward it would be better if we don't have the dueling consultants thing going on. It is a complete time waste. I did advise early on we did not previously have quick positive outcomes using UX.

John

On Jun 9, 2025, at 11:13 PM, Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com> wrote:

Thank you John for the email. We are looking at those consultants and will get back to you tomorrow re: the same per your request below.

Re: 6-8 weeks, we do not have that long for Wilson (evacuation is different and could take longer if necessary). As the layout of Wilson is holding up the planning area designations, could we speed up the Wilson part to 2-3 weeks instead?

Best regards,
Matt

Matthew R. Fogt, Esq.

Partner, Land Use, Real Estate, and Energy
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
2010 Main Street, Suite 800, Irvine, CA 92614
949.851.5453 **direct** | 949.241.4043 **mobile**

Allen Matkins

<image001.jpg>

From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Thursday, June 5, 2025 5:06 PM
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Cc: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>;

AR 08162

Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>

Subject: RE: Etiwanda Traffic Study; Action Items

Importance: High

CAUTION: External Email

Matt

Seems like we are on a roll this week making progress on items.

We have identified these 4 individuals (resumes attached) as all qualified to perform the peer review from our on-call list of firms. None of them were involved in Etiwanda Heights previously but all have relevant private and public experience to understand the project.

Staff has requested a scope of services from all of them. We reiterated that 6-8 weeks is the maximum time for the peer review and they should charge appropriately to get it done in that time because extra time was not an option. The City also requested that they look at the new maximum number of 5780 when the review the traffic study so we have a better understanding if that potential density increase impacts the roads.

Could you please let us know your feedback on these 4 resumes by COB on Tuesday June 10th. Thank you.

John R. Gillison
City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga
2020 All American City

I value your work life boundaries.

Please do not feel pressure to respond to this message outside of working hours.

From: Gillison, John

Sent: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 8:59 AM

To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com

Cc: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>

Subject: RE: Etiwanda Traffic Study; Action Items

One last follow up. We asked our on-calls to submit resumes for TE's with the appropriate experience to peer review the UX study. Those resumes are rolling in now

AR 08163

and being reviewed. We are working to get you several names/firms that we can then get proposals from.

John R. Gillison
City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga
2020 All American City

I value your work life boundaries.

Please do not feel pressure to respond to this message outside of working hours.

From: Fogt, Matthew

Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2025 12:03 PM

To: Gillison, John <john.gillison@cityofrc.us>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <jennifer.nakamura@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com

Cc: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>

Subject: Etiwanda Traffic Study; Action Items

Thank you again for your time yesterday. Attached is the traffic study we mentioned.

Below are the action items I had from the meeting. Please advise as to any changes or additions.

Action Items:

1. City to look at park issues; see if it can count private parks over the Quimby thresholds. [Status?](#)
2. City to see what funding it has to buy parks or park improvements and/or trailheads. [Status?](#)
3. Previti to produce commercial market study and clean bio ASAP. [Bio is expected this week; market study possibly next week](#)
4. City to peer review bio, traffic and commercial analysis, once in. [Need list of traffic consultants for peer review](#)
5. Previti to send HCD letter today. [Sent last week, initial call with HCD today, call with City on 6/10 or 6/11](#)
6. Previti to nail down acreage and density this week. [See attached](#)
7. Previti to produce revised planning area boundaries; fixed for first three phases, dotted lines for others. [Forthcoming once Wilson issue resolved](#)
8. Previti to look at how much parks it is willing to build between the Quimby/nexus amount and the City's aspirational goal of 5 acres per 1,000 resident. [Only Quimby/nexus unless Previti can density transfer from SCE corridor, then willing to do passive parks in the SCE corridor](#)
9. Need commercial study to determine how much commercial and whether located near Rochester or Milliken; also how much commercial the market will support. [Forthcoming](#)

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2025 5:21 PM PDT
To: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
CC: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: RE: update on EHNCP

Thank you John for the detailed email. We are working on a detailed response to each issue and will have it to you tomorrow AM.

Thank you also for the significant time and effort everyone is making to keep this project moving; we acknowledge and appreciate the effort.

I think a quick call going into the holidays would be great if we could pull it off (even if everyone cannot make it).

We are free tomorrow from 10-10:30, 1-2:30 or after 4. Please advise if there is a time during those windows that would work for most for a quick call.

Thanks,
Matt

Matthew R. Fogt, Esq.

Partner, Land Use, Real Estate, and Energy
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
2010 Main Street, Suite 800, Irvine, CA 92614
949.851.5453 **direct** | 949.241.4043 **mobile**

Allen Matkins



From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2025 4:58 PM
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Cc: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Subject: update on EHNCP
Importance: High

CAUTION: External Email

Matt F and Team Previti:

AR 08199

1. We spoke with Gibson today. The traffic study peer review is not yet done. They are aiming for Wed this week at the earliest, or perhaps Thursday. If not then the holiday will catch us. We will turn it around to you once we have done a preliminary review to ensure there are no obvious gaps or mistakes or misconceptions.
2. Unless you sent it yesterday or today and I was not copied, we are still waiting for the bio study. It was promised the week of June 9th; we still don't have it or an updated ETA; we will need some time review and determine if further study or peer review is required.
3. Unless you sent it yesterday or today and I was not copied, we are also still waiting for the market study. It was promised the week of June 16th; we still don't have it or an updated ETA; we will need some time review and determine if further study or peer review is required.
4. Legal is finishing up their review of EHNCP Chapter 5 changes from the consultants. We are hoping to turn this around perhaps next week. Jennifer Nakamura is out part of this week, and it's the holiday.
5. We are continuing the TDR review. Legal and some staff have done an initial review with comments. We will be requesting some changes. Aiming to get this out next week as well.
6. Staff did an initial review of PA1 site plan and noticed some details that required further review. We are working to dig in and ensure the lot details work for the housing types without a problem, or if there is a problem, we know what it is and talk about it in advance.
7. Similarly on the Project description we just need to gather together everyone's comments. Trying to do that this week if possible.
8. Still waiting to hear back from Team Previti on parks. We all know the 5/1000 number. City added a lot of flexibility to count private and trails and open space. To date we have not heard back a proposal from your team. I am concerned at the delay as this should be a simple one. You were looking to do passive parks in the SCE corridor and we never heard anymore after that.
9. We have been working on an updated fire evacuation study. Still very preliminary but it does look like the at the 5,800 unit number there may be a delay that reaches a level fire has concerns with. Still working to finalize and develop recommendations.
10. We owe you an updated use table for commercial that is weeks overdue.
11. At this rate, with all the items on both sides outstanding I don't see how we hit our original timetable of finalizing everything in the next 2 weeks.

From: Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 5:41 PM PDT
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>; Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
CC: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Subject: RE: update on EHNCP
Attachments: Etiwanda Heights Plan Final - Text only (AM rev. 7.1) (4932-7060-9711.2).docx

You don't often get email from pgosney@allenmatkins.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Following up on Matt's email below, attached for the City's review is a redline of the Specific Plan with our proposed edits and revisions as well as incorporating Nick's comments on Chapter 1 and other revisions based upon our previous calls.

Of course, Chapter 5 is still pending Jean's comments and the proposed TDR program revisions in Chapter 7.4 are also pending the City's internal review.

We look forward to your thoughts and comments.

Thanks.

Paige

Paige H. Gosney | Partner | Allen Matkins
pgosney@allenmatkins.com | Direct (949) 851-5444

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 10:14 AM
To: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Cc: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: update on EHNCP

Thank you John for the detailed email. Below is our detailed response. We intend to get everything in our court to you by tomorrow (except the bio). We will send you a detailed summary re: the bio today so that the City understands that we are taking bio seriously so that it can be relied upon and is defensible; which unfortunately is taking longer than we initially anticipated. Please contact us with any questions.

Best regards,
Matt

Matthew R. Fogt, Esq.

Partner, Land Use, Real Estate, and Energy
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
2010 Main Street, Suite 800, Irvine, CA 92614
949.851.5453 **direct** | 949.241.4043 **mobile**

AR 08248

From: John.Gillison@cityofrc.us
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 9:53 PM PDT
To: Matthew Fogt <mfozt@allenmatkins.com>
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Paige Gosney <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
BCC: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Subject: Re: update on EHNCP

Matt

I am writing to share that the City has serious reservations about your new bio consultant. No one on our team, either consultant or staff, has any experience with or knowledge of their qualifications or experience. This is the second bio consultant as the first one apparently did not provide the desired conclusions or failed to support those conclusions. Not having been consulted or seen the study, I can only speculate.

In any event, we are still dealing with the poor, shallow and unsupported analysis that Urban Crossroads your traffic consultant prepared. It was internally inconsistent, riddled with errors, and utterly lacking in data. Those conclusions were just based on our internal review and the peer review seems likely to bear that out.

To that end, I want to express our concerns that if the bio consultant's work is similarly poor, it will only further delay moving forward. Hopefully your team vetted them well. A brief review of their references was unimpressive and it looks like most of their work is for the military.

John Gillison
City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga

On Jul 1, 2025, at 10:15 AM, Fogt, Matthew <mfozt@allenmatkins.com> wrote:

Thank you John for the detailed email. Below is our detailed response. We intend to get everything in our court to you by tomorrow (except the bio). We will send you a detailed summary re: the bio today so that the City understands that we are taking bio seriously so that it can be relied upon and is defensible; which unfortunately is taking longer than we initially anticipated. Please contact us with any questions.

Best regards,
Matt

Matthew R. Fogt, Esq.
Partner, Land Use, Real Estate, and Energy

AR 09010

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
2010 Main Street, Suite 800, Irvine, CA 92614
949.851.5453 **direct** | 949.241.4043 **mobile**

Allen Matkins

[<image001.jpg>](#)

From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2025 4:58 PM
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Cc: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Subject: update on EHNCP
Importance: High

CAUTION: External Email

Matt F and Team Previti:

1. We spoke with Gibson today. The traffic study peer review is not yet done. They are aiming for Wed this week at the earliest, or perhaps Thursday. If not then the holiday will catch us. We will turn it around to you once we have done a preliminary review to ensure there are no obvious gaps or mistakes or misconceptions. **Response:** Thank you John for agreeing to send us the report when you get it for concurrent review.
2. Unless you sent it yesterday or today and I was not copied, we are still waiting for the bio study. It was promised the week of June 9th; we still don't have it or an updated ETA; we will need some time review and determine if further study or peer review is required. **Response:** Will send a detailed response about this later today.
3. Unless you sent it yesterday or today and I was not copied, we are also still waiting for the market study. It was promised the week of June 16th; we still don't have it or an updated ETA; we will need some time review and determine if further study or peer review is required. **Response:** See attached (the first one is the more substantive one, the second one is for the retailers). We are willing to schedule a call with the consultant to discuss if helpful.
4. Legal is finishing up their review of EHNCP Chapter 5 changes from the consultants. We are hoping to turn this around perhaps next week. Jennifer

AR 09011

Nakamura is out part of this week, and it's the holiday. [Response](#): Thank you for the update; we look forward to the revised Chapter 5. We will have our revisions to the other chapters to you by tomorrow.

5. We are continuing the TDR review. Legal and some staff have done an initial review with comments. We will be requesting some changes. Aiming to get this out next week as well. [Response](#): I spoke with Nick about this last night and we understand the concerns re: banking trips well into the future and absurdly high density. We believe that the building types in Chapter 5 should address this concern, but are willing to explore other solutions. As previously noted, Previti does not intend to build anything more dense than a 3-story walkup.
6. Staff did an initial review of PA1 site plan and noticed some details that required further review. We are working to dig in and ensure the lot details work for the housing types without a problem, or if there is a problem, we know what it is and talk about it in advance. [Response](#): Thank you for the update; we look forward to the City's comments and getting PA1 going.
7. Similarly on the Project description we just need to gather together everyone's comments. Trying to do that this week if possible. [Response](#): Thank you for the update.
8. Still waiting to hear back from Team Previti on parks. We all know the 5/1000 number. City added a lot of flexibility to count private and trails and open space. To date we have not heard back a proposal from your team. I am concerned at the delay as this should be a simple one. You were looking to do passive parks in the SCE corridor and we never heard anymore after that. [Response](#): We will send you acreage for proposed parks by tomorrow.
9. We have been working on an updated fire evacuation study. Still very preliminary but it does look like the at the 5,800 unit number there may be a delay that reaches a level fire has concerns with. Still working to finalize and develop recommendations. [Response](#): We look forward look forward to the Gibson report and a cooperative solution with the City to handle traffic efficiency, access to the commercial component and fire evacuation.
10. We owe you an updated use table for commercial that is weeks overdue. [Response](#): Thank you for the update.
11. At this rate, with all the items on both sides outstanding I don't see how we hit our original timetable of finalizing everything in the next 2 weeks. [Response](#): We appreciate everyone's efforts and continued cooperation and look forward to getting PA1 (and hopefully PA2) going soon while solving for the rest of the Specific Plan area.

John R. Gillison

From: Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 10:13 AM PDT
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>; Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <SImhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>; Nichols, Matthew <mnichols@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: Park Acreage

Hello all,

Busy day of meetings yesterday so I just read the below now.

[@Fogt, Matthew](#) I'm assuming, but just want to make clear, your numbers counting half of the units as being multi-family attached were just for ease of calculation?

No one has ever said anything to you about 2,890 units of multi-family attached. I want to get that out there immediately. So the scenario was just a 'for instance' then, correct?

Thank you,



ANDREW WENNERSTROM

VP Planning

2151 E. Convention Center Way, Suite 114

Ontario, CA 91764

D:909-354-8010

AWennerstrom@ThePrevitiGroup.com



THEPREVITIGROUP.COM

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this electronic e-mail and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the intended recipient and may be confidential and/or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail, and delete the original message and all copies from your system. Thank you.

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 2:26 PM
To: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com
Cc: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <SImhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>; Nichols, Matthew <mnichols@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: Park Acreage

John/Nick:

Proposal: As detailed below, Previti will provide approximately **20 acres** (depending upon the mix of attached or detached) of **improved** parks within the Neighborhood Area to fully comply with the City's November 2024 Nexus Study. Additionally, Previti will dedicate the entire approximate **45-acre** SCE corridor as **passive unimproved** open space/parks. This will result in **approximately 65 acres of parks** within the Neighborhood Area, not to mention the

From: John.Gillison@cityofrc.us
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 12:19 PM PDT
To: Matthew Fogt <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Paige Gosney <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
BCC: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Subject: Re: update on EHNCP

Matt

I write to provide a week ending response and update on where things are at.

1. We are reviewing the park acreage memo you provided, however, inasmuch as your numbers in terms of SF and MF are hypothetical at best, if not simply random, it does not represent an actual proposal we could agree to. We will provide more detailed feedback in a week or so.
2. The team is reviewing the market study. It recommends grocery anchored center with inline and pad retail. They don't get into the form and design so it seems like it could be compatible with the EHNCP design standards. Our use table may only need a minimal change to allow the grocery use not a wholesale change as your team at one point suggested. Your own consultants says big box and other types of similar uses won't likely happen up there. Note the location is not really a recommendation. It is phrased as a preference not a mandate and no data is provided to support. Also, we disagree vehemently with the office / dental comment as the consultant clearly has no real world experience with Rancho Cucamonga where we have a huge demand for both in every possible retail location. Unless they can provide actual RC specific data that contradicts our actual experience, we will not accept or support that finding. Also, without data, it doesn't seem to contradict the existing location nearer to Rochester. More to come when we finish our review.
3. The Gibson memo didn't get in before everyone left so we will get it to you on Monday by COB once everyone returns to the office. We are closed today except for me. Verbally I was told late last night from our staff who spoke with Gibson before they finalized (2 degrees of hearsay) that due to the lack of data in the UX report the final recommendations will likely include that additional study and data is needed. I don't have context for the comment, however, so take it for what it is worth.
4. We are finalizing our PA1 comments which include review from our consultants. Will provide next week.
5. If the school site goes away, realigning Wilson to an alignment that is consistent with the GP but perhaps has not the sharp curves the present alignment shows and is "straighter" without being dead straight, seems feasible. Our team is working on some ideas and I hope your team is as well. I want to emphasize that we should work collaboratively on this and not at cross purposes.

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 3:08 PM PDT
To: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: update on EHNCP

Thank you John for the detailed update. I want to also want to express how grateful we are for everyone's efforts to keep moving this along.

We understand and appreciate the vacation aspect (I just flew home last night from vball in Orlando and Jimmy just got back last week). Hopefully we can find a time for an all-hands meeting/call soon with 4/5 or 3/4 of us in attendance (and we can catch up the 1/5 or 1/4 after the fact). I know everyone would be ideal, but we respectfully request to start with most if possible (and likely calendar a second all hands when everyone could attend).

If we could prioritize anything in the interim, it would be to move PA1 and PA2 forward using the housing laws and existing GP designation while we are processing the SPA for the other future planning areas and resolving the other open issues. PA2 obviously depends on keeping Milliken in its current as-built location as shown in the General Plan (while Wilson to the East is still open for discussion pending the Gibson report).

As such, the response to the draft PA1 site plan would be helpful in trying to move forward PA1 on a parallel track (then PA2 would follow also on a parallel track as well).

Thank you again for all of your help and we look forward to knocking out these open issues and moving us closer to a SPA approval later this year.

Best regards,
Matt

Matthew R. Fogt, Esq.

Partner, Land Use, Real Estate, and Energy
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
2010 Main Street, Suite 800, Irvine, CA 92614
949.851.5453 **direct** | 949.241.4043 **mobile**

Allen Matkins



From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 6:51 PM
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Cc: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer

AR 09089

From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2025 6:40 PM PDT
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
CC: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Welay, Jason <Jason.Welay@cityofrc.us>
Subject: EHNCP Update
Attachments: City_Edits EHNCP TDR Program (001).docx, FINAL_J2194 - Etiwanda Heights Traffic Assessment Review.pdf, EHNCP Land Use Table Edits 7.10.25.docx, PA1 Site Plan Comments.docx

Mr. Fogt

Attached please find a copy of the City edits to the TDR program. This is a clean copy but the changes are minimal and it should only take a few minutes to see where things were updated.

The City has not finished our review of the Market Study. Internally we have done one round of review, but our Econ Dev team is now doing a second round and comparing against the original studies we had done for EHNCP and the databases and sources we have access to.

Attached is the EHNCP modified land use table. We left it in strike out format so the changes were easy to see.

Attached is the completed Gibson memo. To address your concerns, the City is not charging the cost of the Gibson analysis to the Previti deposit. There were no additional instructions provided in writing. There was no correction/redirection. There were incomplete areas because the consultant felt rushed and pressured, particularly with calls from both yourself on multiple occasions and the City staff. I agree that openness is a good policy and perhaps going forward as your team gives directions to bio consultants, market consultants, and traffic engineers we will be included. It would avoid the back and forth of consultants and peer review and result in a work product both parties could accept. Further to your point, the Gibson scope (which you reviewed and had an opportunity to comment on before the report was done and had your own chance to speak with Gibson) was a peer review of UX. Had UX been properly given a scope, and had the City been involved, their report would hopefully have been supported by data and made its own recommendations on Wilson. The report did not, we were not involved, and the result was a largely general memo with no detail and little to no data. The Gibson peer review of UX reflects the product they had to work with and contains additional detail and understanding but no specific recommendations on the optimal Wilson Configuration. This is a problem best solved at the table, we believe, by both parties working together bringing their own ideas to the discussion. We respect that you may have other ideas, however, and remain committed to working with you if this is a topic you desire to pursue.

As a reminder, we have previously discussed, and are still waiting for (from your group) the following:

AR 09161

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 6:02 PM PDT
To: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
CC: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Welay, Jason <Jason.Welay@cityofrc.us>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: EHNCP Update

Thank you John for the detailed response. We remain 100% committed to the site plan and minor SPA for PA1/PA2 with building types to be able to achieve 8 du/ac. We likewise appreciate the City's focus and commitment to that goal.

As requested and discussed, however, we likely will not be able to hit 8 du/ac on PA1 and possibly even PA2 because we are proposing lower density near the existing neighbors. As such, we need a mechanism to transfer such unbuilt density to future planning areas within the Neighborhood Area of the Specific Plan. We are flexible on the mechanism, but propose the following for the City's consideration: (1) include the revised TDR program in the SPA for PA1/PA2 and address the TDR as part of the site plan approval or (2) address a future density transfer in the conditions of approval for the site plan.

Re: the 20% provision in our draft, we apologize as that got garbled. We instead propose that future receiving sites of the TDR would not be built more densely than the 3-story walkup that the City will approve as part of the building types.

Please contact us with any questions. Have a great weekend.

Best regards,
Matt

Matthew R. Fogt, Esq.

Partner, Land Use, Real Estate, and Energy
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
2010 Main Street, Suite 800, Irvine, CA 92614
949.851.5453 **direct** | 949.241.4043 **mobile**

Allen Matkins



From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2025 11:31 PM
To: Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Cc: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>; James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Welay, Jason <Jason.Welay@cityofrc.us>
Subject: RE: EHNCP Update

AR 09239

From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 5:54 PM PDT
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
CC: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Burris, Matthew <Matthew.Burris@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Welay, Jason <Jason.Welay@cityofrc.us>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: EHNCP Update

Matt

Let's do this. As I expressed to Mr. Previti recently, we are interested and eager to work with you, but there just isn't anymore to be done on PA2 without a site plan. We need final site plans for PA1 and PA2 and your team should identify on the plans the 8 DU/ACRE goal and where you actually wind up, and what the delta is. We will verify the calculations. I am not going to engage in 50-100 unit speculation. It may be correct but I recall how when we were discussing overall site numbers for the whole EH area we were dealing with numbers between 3000 and 6000+ before we finally settled on the current number of 8 DU/ACRE and 5,780 as a theoretical maximum.

We also need from your team:

- The bio study. That is now critical path. Do we have a delivery date?
 - FYI – Richland just got slapped by Fish and Game for grading outside their permits.....and Fish and Game was told by a third party monitoring the site.
- Park acreage. Have not seen any revised #'s from your team since we sent our comments back on the park acreage approximately 2 weeks ago and indicated the calculations were based on the old (and now superseded) DIF numbers.
 - We probably need to reach conceptual agreement on this (similar to TDR) so we all understand if it has impacts on later PA's or if these PA's stand on their own in terms of park acreage and improvements.
- Revised PA1 and PA2 site plans with info noted above to allow us to respond and continue TDR discussions
- Revised project description that incorporates the City's recent comments to keep the CEQA process moving

We will work on revising the SP for PA1 and PA2.

Thank your for the response.

John R. Gillison
City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2025 1:29 PM

AR 09252

From: Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Saturday, September 6, 2025 10:39 AM PDT
To: Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Stratos Georgopoulos <sgeorgopoulos@theprevitigroup.com>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Welday, Jason <Jason.Welday@cityofrc.us>; Steven Imhoof <Slimhoof@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: TDR
Attachments: City_Edits EHNCP TDR Program (002)_9_25.docx

Paige

We believe this revised TDR should address everyone's prior concerns. The remaining area of possible discussion is what happens when you have a PA that is at 6-8 DU for example, and either your team as the Master Developer or one of the Guest Builders, wants to transfer density out of the Density Bank and use it to increase the DU of the Planning Area immediately adjacent. Matt Fogt had previously stipulated that as long as you didn't exceed the DU of that multi-story walkup it should be fine with no restrictions. That particular building type can be as dense as 30-35 DU per acre and we believe it would be poor planning, create community outrage, and makes no sense to have 35 DU literally 10' away from 6 DU. Our proposal would require your team do more planning ahead work, but if you had a PA that was at 6 DU, then the adjacent one could be 9, the one next to that 13, the one next to that 19 and the one next to that 29. Basically increasing by 50% with each new adjacent PA.

We believe this is reasonable and prudent and do-able with some advance planning work which Andrew and Stratos and Mark and Steve are already working on as they look forward into the future. If your team has concerns, then let's get together a phone call rather than trade emails, and talk it thru. Maybe a 50% increase isn't enough. Maybe you have a different idea. But we aren't willing to concede to Matt's prior point as we know from experience that is a recipe for disaster (30+ DU next to 6-8 DU). No one in a 1-2 story home on 10,000 SF wants to look up at a 3 story building that completely blocks the sunlight and looms over their backyard and can look in their windows.

I left everything in redline format to make the changes easier to see.

John

John R. Gillison
City Manager
City of Rancho Cucamonga

From: Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 11:11 AM
To: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Fogt, Matthew

AR 09263

From: Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 12:04 PM PDT
To: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
CC: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Stratos Georgopoulos <sgeorgopoulos@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Welday, Jason <Jason.Welday@cityofrc.us>; Steven Imhoof <Slmhoof@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: RE: TDR
Attachments: AM Edits to City Revised EHNCPTDR Program (002)_9_25 (002) (4927-4481-9304.2).docx

Jenn / Nick:

Thanks again for your time yesterday on the call. Per our discussion, attached is a redline of the TDR section of the Specific Plan that incorporates some minor additional edits/revisions that are highlighted in yellow for ease of reference. As you'll see, rather than the proposed 50% gradual increase of density from the adjacent lot criteria we instead added a max density cap for the Receiving Site of 29 du's per acre. We also added some language clarifying that the "compatibility" criteria in Finding No. 5 (i) includes abrupt changes in building heights but (ii) only applies to properties that share a property line (e.g., it does not apply where the Receiving Site is located across a public roadway).

We look forward to your thoughts/comments and to getting the TDR program wrapped up and put to bed.

Paige

Paige H. Gosney | Partner | Allen Matkins
pgosney@allenmatkins.com | Direct (949) 851-5444

From: Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Monday, September 8, 2025 4:25 PM
To: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Cc: James Previti <JPreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Stratos Georgopoulos <sgeorgopoulos@theprevitigroup.com>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Welday, Jason <Jason.Welday@cityofrc.us>; Steven Imhoof <Slmhoof@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: RE: TDR

Hi Jen:

Wednesday at 2:00 pm will work great on our end. If that is good for the City Team please go ahead and send out a calendar invite and video link for the call (or let me know and I'm happy to do so as well). Thanks.

Paige

Paige H. Gosney | Partner | Allen Matkins
pgosney@allenmatkins.com | Direct (949) 851-5444

AR 09287

From: Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 5:10 PM
To: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com
Cc: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Stratos Georgopoulos <sgeorgopoulos@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>
Subject: RE: 8/27 EHNCP Meeting Follow Up

All:

Further to Matt's comment below regarding the 25% single story requirement for all new, detached residential development under Dev. Code section 17.122.010, we have prepared a footnote insert to Chapter 5 (Table 5.4A) that would specifically identify those specific allowed building types for which the 25% single-story requirement simply does not work (see attached redline). We can update the list once the final "universe" of allowed building types to be included in the SPA is confirmed but in the meantime we wanted to circulate this proposed footnote language and suggested approach to the collective teams (Previti and City) for their concurrent review and comment.

We appreciate and look forward to your thoughts.

Paige

Paige H. Gosney | Partner | Allen Matkins
pgosney@allenmatkins.com | Direct (949) 851-5444

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 11:01 AM
To: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com
Cc: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Mark Hicks <mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Stratos Georgopoulos <sgeorgopoulos@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven Imhoof <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: RE: 8/27 EHNCP Meeting Follow Up

Thank you Jennifer. I sent the attached SP comments from 7/1 to you and Nick this morning, but am attaching to this email so that everyone has it.

Mark and Andrew are working diligently on the site plan revisions with the goal of locking them down ASAP.

Paige and I are working on the project description and hope to get back to you soon.

We have the title company working on the legal parcel issue and hope to have an answer or proposed solution soon.

AR 09296

From: Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 9:41 AM PST
To: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
CC: nghirelli@rwglaw.com; Gillison, John <John.Gillison@cityofrc.us>; Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: SB 330 Application re: Etiwanda Heights Project
Attachments: SB 330 Letter - Etiwanda Heights 4933-9978-3292 v.1.pdf

CAUTION: This email is from outside our Corporate network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and can confirm the content is safe.

Hi Jennifer:

See the attached letter confirming that the previously-submitted applications for the Etiwanda Heights Project are/were submitted under Senate Bill 330. This was also uploaded directly to the City in ACELA.

We are very much looking forward to the Planning Commission meeting next week. Please do let us know if you have any questions or would like to discuss the attached.

Paige

Paige H. Gosney | Partner
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
2010 Main Street, 8th Floor, Irvine, CA 92614-7214
Direct (949) 851-5444 | Main (949) 553-1313
pgosney@allenmatkins.com | [Bio](#)

Allen Matkins

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this electronic e-mail and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the intended recipient and may be confidential and/or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited, and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail, and delete the original message and all copies from your system. Thank you.

AR 09329

From: Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>
Sent: Thursday, December 18, 2025 2:12 PM PST
To: [REDACTED]
CC: City Council <CityCouncil@cityofrc.us>
Subject: FW: Etiwanda Heights

Ms. [REDACTED]

Your email was routed to me to see if I could help answer your questions. My responses are below your question and underlined.

1. Was the Council aware that the developer had no intention of following the existing community development plan when you agreed to the sale?
The City was not involved in the sale of the property; the property transaction was between the County and the developer and was approved by the County Board of Supervisors.
2. If Council was aware of the developer's intention to radically change the plan, why did you not insist on a public meeting to review the change? Why was the developer given the option to decline a public meeting?
The developer approached staff in late 2024 to discuss amendments to the plan. We explained the background of the plan, how and why it was developed and the process for requesting an amendment to the plan. Developer initiated amendments have a different process than City led planning activities (like the original plan). The City has had an informal policy for over 20 years that developers should host a neighborhood meeting prior to the public hearing where the developer and residents can meet and learn about the project. I can't think of a project in the 20 years I have been here where they haven't done it when staff has suggested it. However, a neighborhood meeting not required by the Development Code and they opted not to do it, even after we recommended it.
3. What was the rationale for approving the developer's substantially revised plan?
The plan is not approved. The City Council is the approving authority for a specific plan amendment, and it will be considered at a future Council meeting in late January or February.
4. Given the significant change from the plan that had community input, what assurances does the City have that there will be no buildings that consist solely of rental units?
We cannot regulate whether units built in the City are offered for sale or for rent.
5. What assurances does the city have that the multiplex buildings will not be built by or sold to investment corporations only for the purpose of renting?
We cannot regulate who buys and sells property that is not owned by the City.
6. What assurances do you have that there will be no Air B&B type rentals in this development?
Our Development Code has regulations for short term rentals and any property owner wishing to use a portion or all their property as a short-term rental is required to get an annual permit from the City and follow our regulations.
7. Will HOAs be required in all the development phases? If not, why not?

From: Fogt, Matthew <mfogt@allenmatkins.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2026 11:42 AM PST
To: Cox, Elisa <Elisa.Cox@cityofrc.us>; Nakamura, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nakamura@cityofrc.us>; nghirelli@rwglaw.com
CC: James Previti <jpreviti@theprevitigroup.com>; Mark Hicks (Mhicks@theprevitigroup.com) <Mhicks@theprevitigroup.com>; Andrew Wennerstrom (awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com) <awennerstrom@theprevitigroup.com>; Steven B. Imhoof Esq. (simhoof@theprevitigroup.com) <simhoof@theprevitigroup.com>; Gosney, Paige <pgosney@allenmatkins.com>
Subject: 1/2 Story

CAUTION: This email is from outside our Corporate network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and can confirm the content is safe.

Elisa/Jennifer/Nick:

First, thank you for your time on this project to date. We are excited to present to the Council tomorrow night.

We are reviewing the staff report and noticed a reference to livable space for the 2.5 stories. Please note that the reference in the GP to 2.5 stories is very simple (see below) and does not prohibit livable space.

Below are several images showing a 2.5 story home. They are universally common all across the county and have livable and conditioned spaced tucked under the roof structure. As the GP does not prohibit livable space, the SP should not either.

We would like to remove or revise the following reference:

The additional half story is used to allow for varied architectural designs and roof angles [and a modest amount of livable space](#), ~~but livable space is limited to 2 stories~~. This standard must be maintained in the Plan to ensure consistency between the General Plan and EHNCP.

Built Form & Character

Neighborhoods are traditional in character. Buildings are set back from the sidewalk with moderately sized front yards and welcoming entries scaled and oriented to pedestrians. Commercial groundfloors may be set nearer to the sidewalk to support such activities as outdoor dining and provide clear views into shopfronts. Buildings are up to 2.5 stories in height with varied massing and a wide range of architectural styles compatible with the existing character of adjacent houses. Multifamily and mixed-use buildings are compatible in scale, form, and character with nearby houses.