
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