APN: 0332-211-02, 0332-212-02, 0332-211-04
APPLICANT: Skypark At Santa’s Village LLC
COMMUNITY: Sky Forest
LOCATION: State route (SR-18), both sides approximately one mile east of the intersection of SR-18 and Kuffel Canyon Road
PROJECT NO: P201500051
REP(S): William Johnson-Skypark Santa’s Village

PROPOSAL:
A) A General Plan Amendment to change the official land use district from Lake Arrowhead/Special Development-Residential (LA/SD-RES) & Lake Arrowhead/Single Residential-14,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size (LA/RS-14m) to Lake Arrowhead/Rural Commercial (LA/CR) on 152.92 acres. & an amendment to the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan, Policy LA/CI 1.14 and the Circulation Element of the General Plan.
B) A Conditional Use Permit to re-establish an outdoor commercial entertainment center which includes an amusement park, campground, restaurants, bar, wedding & reception facility, retail, trails, recreational activities and other accessory uses on 152.92 acres.

183 Hearing Notices Sent On: May 5, 2017
Report Prepared By: Kevin White

SITE INFORMATION
Parcel Size: 152.92
Terrain: Varies
Vegetation: Forest

SURROUNDING LAND DESCRIPTION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>EXISTING LAND USE</th>
<th>LAND USE ZONING DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Santa’s Village, undeveloped land/forest</td>
<td>LA/SD-RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Undeveloped land/ former camp/ forest</td>
<td>LA/RS-14m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Undeveloped land/ forest</td>
<td>Forest Service Lands-LA/RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Undeveloped land/forest</td>
<td>Forest Service Lands-LA/RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single-family residential/ forest</td>
<td>LA/RS-14m and LA/SD-RES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGENCY
City Sphere of Influence: N/A
Water Service: Onsite Wells/ Sky Forest Mutual Water
Sewer Service: Onsite Treatment

COMMENT
N/A
Presently Served
Presently Served

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: That the Planning Commission Recommend that the Board of Supervisors ADOPT the General Plan Amendments and APPROVE the Conditional Use Permit to establish the Outdoor Entertainment Center based on the recommended findings and subject to the conditions of approval.

Recommendations to the Board of Supervisors are not subject to appeal.
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PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project (Project) is a Conditional Use Permit to establish an Outdoor Commercial Entertainment Center which includes an amusement park, campground, meadow/wetland rehabilitation, restaurants, bar, wedding and reception facility, retail, trails, recreational activities and other accessory uses on 152.92 Acres. The Project also includes a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation from Lake Arrowhead/Special Development-Residential (LA/SD-RES) & Lake Arrowhead/Single Residential-14,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size (LA/RS-14M) to Lake Arrowhead/Rural Commercial (LA/CR) on 152.92 Acres. In addition, the Project includes an amendment to the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan, Policy-LA/CI 1.14 and the General Plan Circulation Element; both related to the planned extension of Cumberland Road.

The Project site is located approximately 1.5 miles southeast of Lake Arrowhead. In the vicinity of the Project site, land uses include residential and commercial development, and undeveloped forest land. The on-site elevation within the Project site ranges from approximately 5,660 to 5,730 feet above mean sea level, rising from State Route (SR) 18 generally to the northeast. The southern portion of the Project site, south of SR-18, abuts the steep south-facing slopes of the San Bernardino Mountains.

BACKGROUND/ HISTORY:

In the late 1800’s, the property was established as a family farm and sawmill operation. Portions of the present timber stand were cleared and agricultural crops were planted. The sawmill operation was in operation in 1885 at the present site of the pond. The Henck family gained ownership of the property in 1918 and opened Santa’s Village in 1955, which was in operation until its closure in 1998. The property was purchased by the Skyforest Company in 2000 and the parking lot on the north side of SR-18 (north western portion of the Project site) and the overflow parking lot south of SR-18 (proposed campsite area) were used primarily to store logs, and as a tree grinding site to support the dead tree removal effort caused by the bark beetle outbreak in 2002.

Unimproved fire access roads traverse the site. These existing dirt roads are proposed to be used for various mountain biking and hiking trail activities. The developed portions of the Project site include existing buildings and infrastructure associated with the original Santa’s Village Amusement Park. The various buildings associated with the amusement park have remained intact since the Park’s closure in 1998. The proposed new land use will utilize these existing buildings. Since the Project site was utilized as a staging/processing area for harvested timber from 2003 to 2014, the on-site soils and vegetation within the southern portion of the Project site have been heavily disturbed.

Temporary Use Permits: On September 14, 2016, the applicant submitted a Temporary Use Permit (TUP) application to allow limited operation of the Santa’s Village Amusement Park, utilizing the existing Santa’s Village buildings. The TUP did not authorize use of the trail system, the campground on the southern portion of the Project site, or any other activities outside the improved area of Santa’s Village. The original TUP was approved for operations
from November to April 2017. In March of 2017, the applicant applied for a subsequent TUP which was approved for continued operation with additional amusements in the same improved area of the historic Santa’s Village.

**PROJECT ANALYSIS:**

The goal for the SkyPark at Santa’s Village Project is to enhance the community through revitalization of the existing facilities and implementation of new active recreational amenities, wildlife and habitat education, community gathering areas, and a safe environment. The Project also intends to meet several objectives, including the following:

- Provide job opportunities to enhance economic stability in the surrounding mountain communities;
- Provide a balance between passive and active recreational uses that meet the demands of the community and surrounding area;
- Provide the opportunity to become a role model for future sustainable, conservation-based recreation parks in the State;
- Promote the importance of wildlife and habitat education through eco-tourism;
- Provide job training and placement in partnership with Rim of the World School district through a Regional Occupational Program and other outreach programs.
- Restore the existing meadow on site through a conservation plan prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service;
- Provide the opportunity for a healthier community through outdoor recreation activities such as hiking, biking, fishing, climbing and environmental studies;
- Restore the existing pond to improve hydrology and support recreational activities;
- Provide additional facilities where community gathering events can be held;
- Provide safe traffic access into and through the Project area;
- Provide camping opportunities to promote additional tourism in the Project area;

The Project site is divided into two distinct areas. The northern area is proposed for development of a mixed-use adventure park, including a variety of activities and services. Nineteen original buildings exist on the Project site totaling 23,389 square feet. It is intended that the exteriors of these original buildings not be significantly altered. Rather, the exterior of the buildings will be rehabilitated (re-painted and repaired). The rehabilitation of the property, which includes general maintenance and restoration of the existing buildings, has already commenced. All existing buildings are proposed to remain on-site, and no significant new construction is proposed. The southern portion of the site is currently undeveloped, and is proposed for use as a campground that would accommodate both recreational vehicles (RV’s) and tent camping.

Following are detailed descriptions of all amenities, improvements and activities proposed for the Project site. Some improvements are already in use under the TUP.
Amusement Park Zone: The Amusement Park Zone is the area on the Project site where concentrated amusement park uses are proposed. This zone is identified as the area of historic commercial use, previously impacted by the original development of Santa’s Village. In order for SkyPark at Santa’s Village to retain repeat visitors, to remain competitive in the adventure and amusement park Industry, and to continue to promote tourism in the mountain communities, occasional replacement of attractions and/or amenities will be required over time. Substitution of these improvements would be limited to the Amusement Park Zone.

The types of attraction and amenity updates predicted within the Amusement Park Zone could include, but not be limited to restoration of the original car ride, playground amenities, additional climbing wall and zip line activities, snow play, and small support structures such as storage sheds, concession stands or similar features that would support the entertainment function of the Amusement Park Zone. All proposed improvements of the Project site are concentrated in the existing disturbed areas of the site, to minimize grading, removal of vegetation, and intrusions of noise and light.

Mountain Bike Park (No motorized vehicles): This feature would include trails, obstacles, bridges, and creek crossings approximately 25 miles in length within the Project site. This feature would also include riding paths for persons of all ages and varied interests. This use would primarily utilize the existing dirt access roads on the site.

Wilderness Adventure/Zipline and Aerial Park: This feature would include zip lines, rope courses, adventure swings, climbing walls, balance features, log crossings, and exploration trails. The Forest Zipline and tree house is estimated to be an average of 30 feet in height and approximately 1,200 feet in length. Final designs will determine ultimate measurements. The tree house is proposed to have a zip line platform approximately 16 feet high. A small children’s zip line is also proposed that would be approximately 8 feet high and 30 feet long. The tree house would be an engineered structure, built among the trees. The final tree house platforms would be constructed using a stand-alone structure. The tree house is the only new structure proposed to be developed north of SR-18 at the existing SkyPark at Santa’s Village site.

Forest Playground: This feature would include bridges and swings. The playground would also provide seating, natural playscapes and sensory challenges such as log walks, stepping stones and exploration.

Skybike Monorail: The existing bumblebee ride would be converted to a pedal-operated bike monorail that would traverse the southern portion of the Amusement Park.

Fly Fishing Lake and Stream: Fly fishing clinics and fly fishing instruction would be offered at the site’s improved and existing reservoir/pond system. The on-site ponds and stream would be stocked with fish as permitted by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife. Historically, the pond has been stocked with trout. Trout fishing would be provided for catch and release, or to keep as the guest wishes.

Hiking and Tours: Eco-tours, wildlife and habitat education will be offered and promoted by the Project. Job skills will be introduced through “Pathways,” an ongoing ROP program through
local school districts. Ecotourism, involving bird-watching blinds, trails and assisted programs, will be implemented to educate the public and students on the importance of wildlife conservation.

**Santa’s Village/Winter Attractions:** Winter attractions at Santa’s Village would operate during the months of November and December. Winter attractions would include an outdoor ice rink, snow shoeing, sledding, and a snow play area. It is anticipated that these attractions would attract the largest number of visitors for the year.

**Retail:** A variety of related retail shops would be developed throughout the property. These uses would include gift shops, equipment rentals/purchases, and a variety of other retail uses which would be located within the existing buildings.

**Restaurants:** A full service restaurant, snack bar, pub, and bakery/candy store are proposed within the existing buildings.

**Wedding Services:** A wedding chapel, outdoor reception area, and full service wedding event center (including bridal room) would be developed within the existing buildings.

**Campground Site:** A campground is proposed to be located south of the Amusement Park Zone, on the south side of SR-18. The campground would provide accommodations for RV and 5th wheel support, and would provide partial hookups (electricity and water). Seventy (70) RV sites and approximately 35 tent campsites are proposed within the 20-acre campground.

**Restrooms:** Restrooms would be located throughout the park. The current Santa’s Village site has five existing septic systems with separating chambers and leach fields. In addition, a full service restroom (including showers) would be constructed onsite, south of SR-18 to service campers. The proposed campground would also provide laundry facilities. The facilities on the campground site would utilize a new septic system that would be designed with a tank and leach field system similar to the existing septic systems in the Santa’s Village site.

**Parking and Circulation:** The Project provides 575 car parking spaces: 275 in the primary parking lot and 300 in a secondary overflow lot proposed on the south side of SR-18. A pedestrian signal will aid in getting visitors from the overflow parking area across SR-18 to the Amusement Park Zone and other amenities on the Project site.

**Utilities:** The northern portion of the Project site would utilize existing utilities, already located on-site. Currently, there are no utilities located on the southern site. A wastewater treatment system would be developed to capture sewage from the proposed full service restroom (including showers) that would be constructed onsite to service campers.

**Offsite Improvements:** The Project proposes to consolidate driveways on SR-18 to one location, with two opposite driveways servicing the parking lots on the north and south sides of the highway. The driveways would provide 36 feet of width to accommodate two outbound lanes (one shared through/right turn lane, one left-turn lane) and one inbound lane. This width would also accommodate delivery trucks. There would be one eastbound left-turn lane and
one westbound left-turn lane constructed on SR-18 to accommodate the visitors of the Project turning into the driveways off the highway. This intersection would be signalized and striped. Crosswalks would be provided across one or both legs crossing SR-18 and across both driveways. Trees would be trimmed to provide improved sight distance if the trees surrounding the driveways conflict with vehicles safely exiting the Project driveways.

**Operating Hours:** Peak season for the proposed Project is anticipated to be November and December (approximately 2,000 visitors per day). Low season is anticipated to be during spring and early fall. Summer is anticipated to have an average of 1,000 visitors per day. Operating hours are proposed to be 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. The Project is proposed to be fully operational year round, with no planned closures.

**Meadow/Wetland Rehabilitation:** The Project also includes the removal of waste from the site and rehabilitation of Hencks Meadow. Previously, the Project site was used as a storage and processing site for wood material infested by the bark beetle. This use left a significant portion of the site covered with debris, woodchips, firewood, bark and trash. A Conservation Plan for the meadow was developed by the US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) which includes construction of water & sediment control basins and a streambank-protected waterway that conveys flows between them. The Conservation Plan also includes planting of native species, installation of structures for wildlife, and on-going herbaceous weed control.

In coordination with the NRCS, the applicant has already completed the majority of the restoration process as encouraged by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The sediment basins were constructed without required permits from the Land Use Services Department or input from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, the developer will be required to submit as-built plans for grading and construction of the sediment basins, and may be required to modify the improvements. Upon discovery of the un-permitted work, the rehabilitation work stopped, pending Project approval.

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS:**

**Land Use Designation:** The Project proposes to change the on-site General Plan designation/zoning district from LA/SD-RES & LA/RS-14m to LA/CR. The LA/CR district provides sites in rural areas where a range of commercial services, potentially mixed with residential uses, can be established to meet the needs of the rural population and the traveling public. The CR district generally provides for retail trade and personal services, repair services, lodging services, recreation and entertainment services. The Project applicant does not propose any residential uses.

**Lake Arrowhead Community Plan Policy LA/CI 1.14:** Policy LA/CI 1.14 currently states the following: *Complete Cumberland Road from Cedar Glen to State Highway 18 near Santa’s Village as a condition of development of the adjacent area and ensure protection of the character of the surrounding area by the following:*

A. *Require that Cumberland Road be designated as a County Scenic Route.*
B. *Require that Cumberland Road be used primarily for residential and emergency traffic.*
C. *Prohibit trucks that exceed 5 tons and vehicles pulling large trailers.*
The intent of the policy was to ensure that new residential development projects in the vicinity of the Project site would have adequate access to SR-18 by extension of Cumberland Road. This connection would also enhance options for evacuation routes. Since the Project would not add housing units in the area, and because the Project has direct access to the State Highway, the extension of Cumberland Road will not be required for the proposed Project. The following amendment to Policy LA/CI 1.14 is proposed (note underlining for new text and strikethrough for removed text):

Complete Cumberland Road from Cedar Glen to State Highway 18 near Santa’s Village as a condition of development of the adjacent area

Require the design and construction of the extension of Cumberland Drive from Cedar Glen to State Highway 18 as a condition of development of any new residential subdivision extending from Cumberland Drive, Blue Ridge Drive, or Greenbriar Drive and ensure protection of the character of the surrounding area by the following:

A. Require that Cumberland Road be designated as a County Scenic Route.
B. Require that Cumberland Road be used primarily for residential and emergency traffic.
C. Prohibit trucks that exceed 5 tons and vehicles pulling large trailers.

The extension of Cumberland Drive may be required if additional residential development is proposed at some time in the future.

Circulation Element: A change to the circulation element is proposed to downgrade the extension of Cumberland Road from a Mountain Secondary to Local Roadway. The change in classification from Mountain Secondary to Local Roadway will not adversely affect the existing segment of Cumberland Drive that functions as a local connector to SR-173. The existing segment of Cumberland Drive north of the Project between SR-173 and Bald Eagle Ridge Road is a two lane road with a painted center divider. The roadway will continue to provide one lane in each direction. A local roadway classification requires a two lane, 26-foot paved road with one lane in each direction, consistent with County Fire access requirements. Cumberland Drive, with a local roadway classification would not be depicted on the General Plan Circulation Element, and therefore, would not be eligible for designation as a scenic route. Also, local roadways with limited capacity should not be designated to attract regional tourism traffic, as might be the case if designated a scenic route.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

A Project-level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for the Project in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15000 et seq. (CEQA Guidelines). The EIR evaluated potentially significant effects for several environmental areas of concern. The conclusions of the EIR indicate that all of the potentially significant environmental impacts may be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation measures. The Final EIR (also EIR) includes the Draft EIR (DEIR), comments, responses to comments, errata and the Mitigation Monitoring
and Reporting Program (MMRP). The EIR is subject to certification by the Board of Supervisors.

The major steps leading to certification of the EIR included the following:

- Distribution of a Notice of Preparation (NOP). The NOP was distributed to state agencies, local organizations, and individuals on August 26, 2015, for a 30-day comment period.
- Conduct of a Scoping Meeting. The Scoping Meeting was held on September 8, 2015 to solicit comments on the scope of the EIR from the public.
- Circulation of the DEIR. The DEIR was circulated through the State Clearinghouse and to agencies and interested parties for a 45-day public review and comment period on June 7, 2016. The comment period ended on July 22, 2016. A total of 9 comment letters were received.
- Distribution of the Final EIR. The Final EIR was distributed to commenting parties on May 8, 2017.

The County of San Bernardino (County) is the lead agency on the proposed Project and has reviewed and revised all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable County technical personnel from other departments and review of all technical sub consultant reports. The following are details regarding a few of the key topics evaluated in the EIR.

**Biological Resources:** The Habitat Assessment determined a moderate to high potential to support two listed wildlife species and five special status wildlife species to occur on the Project site. Listed species that were identified to have a moderate to high potential to occur on the site include the Southern Rubber Boa and the Bald Eagle. The special status wildlife species that were identified to have a moderate to high potential to occur on the site are the California Spotted Owl, San Bernardino Flying Squirrel, Andrew’s Marble Butterfly, Lodgepole Chipmunk, and the White Eared Pocket Mouse.

Based on the assessment and focused surveys, there are no Federal or State listed plant species known or expected to occur on the Project site. All Federally or State listed plants are presumed absent or are expected to have a low potential to occur. Three special-status plant species were identified to have moderate to high potential to occur on the Project site: Silver-haired Ivesia, Parish’s Yampah, and Laguna Mountains Jewelflower. No sensitive plant species were found within the Project site during any of the field surveys. However, none of the general field surveys were conducted during the suitable blooming period for most sensitive plant species. Direct or indirect impacts could occur to special-status plant species, if present, as a result of Project implementation. If these species are present within areas that will be developed or otherwise used by the park, individual specimens would likely be lost. However, it is anticipated that if special-status plant species are located within a planned trail alignment that the trail alignment can be modified to avoid direct and indirect disturbance of the plants.
Transportation/Traffic: The Project proposes to consolidate driveways on SR-18 to one location with driveways servicing the parking lots located on the north and south sides of the highway. The driveways would provide 36 feet of street width to accommodate two outbound lanes (one shared through/right turn lane, one left-turn lane) and one inbound lane. This width would also accommodate delivery trucks. There would be one eastbound left-turn lane and one westbound left-turn lane constructed on SR-18 to accommodate the visitors of the Project turning into the driveways off the highway.

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared in 2015 by Gibson Transportation Consulting Inc., for the Project. All studied intersections are projected to operate at acceptable levels during both the morning and afternoon peak hours. A signal warrant analysis was conducted for the primary Project driveway. There are expected to be approximately 192 pedestrians during the morning peak hour and 234 pedestrians during the afternoon peak hour. Most of the recreational and retail facilities would be located on the north side of SR-18, with the campground located on the south side of the highway. As such, a traffic signal is warranted, based on the number of pedestrians expected to cross SR-18 once the Project is open and operational and will be installed as part of the Project. Pedestrian access would be provided by an at-grade crosswalk and the traffic signal equipment would include pedestrian push buttons with pedestrian “Walk/Don't Walk” indications on all crosswalks.

Hydrology: Estimates of the maximum perennial yield of the Hooks Creek groundwater subunit, in which the Project wells are located, ranged from 120 to 300 acre-feet/year with an average of 226 acre-feet/year. Under normal operating conditions, the Project will rely on the two existing Project wells with an expected total water demand of 5,800,000 gallons per year or 17.8 acre-feet/year, which is below the low end range of estimated perennial yield of 120 acre-feet/year. The majority of the Project site will remain natural and pervious, and would therefore continue to provide infiltration of stormwater during rain events. Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Mitigation Measures: A comprehensive list of mitigation measures has been compiled to eliminate or reduce potential Project impacts. The mitigation measures include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Installation of a traffic signal by the Project proponent at the intersection of State Route 18 and the Project access.
- Installation of advance signal ahead flashing beacons by Caltrans shall be required for both directions on State Route 18.
- Replanting of existing trees that are removed as a result of roadway improvements with native tree species in 36-inch box containers or larger in the vicinity of the area where they were removed.
- Placement of barriers along trails to control visitors from leaving the trails when the trail is within 500 feet of a special status plant species.
- Conducting of pre-construction clearance surveys.
- Establishment of a buffer zone if suitable nesting habitat is identified.
- Development of a Special-Status plant species planting plan.
- Installation of all exterior and permanent lighting shall at the minimum lumen (measure of the total quantity of visible light emitted by a source), shielded downward, and stationed at the minimum height in order to light the target area.

A complete list of the mitigation measures can be reviewed in the DEIR and the MMRP.

Section 15162(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to discuss the significant environmental effects of a proposed project that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented, including those which can be mitigated, but not reduced to a less than significant level. These impacts are referred to as "significant and unavoidable impacts" of a project. All impacts for this Project were found to be either less than significant without mitigation or reduced to less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures. Therefore, the proposed Project will not result in significant and unavoidable impacts.

**Project Alternatives:** CEQA requires that a lead agency identify and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project in the EIR to foster informed decision making and public participation. The alternatives identified should achieve most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project while substantially lessening or avoiding significant environmental damage of the proposed Project [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)]. The review must focus on feasible alternatives capable of either eliminating any significant adverse effects, or reducing them to a less than significant level. The following Project alternatives are evaluated in the EIR:

**Alternative 1: “No Project” Alternative:** The “No Project” Alternative assumes that the proposed Project improvements would not be completed, including the restoration and re-purposing of the existing Santa’s Village attraction buildings, the Wilderness Adventure/Zipline and Aerial Park, the Forest Playground and Skybike Monorail, restoration of Hencks Meadow and stocking of the pond for fly-fishing, improved trails for eco-tours, hiking and biking, and the campground. The “No Project” Alternative assumes that no development would occur on the Project site, and existing Santa’s Village attraction buildings and parking lot and disturbed Hencks Meadow and the area south of SR-18 would remain in their current states. The Santa’s Village attraction would continue to be closed to the public. This alternative does not meet the majority of the project objectives.

**Alternative 2: Residential Development Alternative:** A portion of the Project site is designated as LA/RS-14m. Areas to the north and west of the Project site are also designated as LA/RS-14m and include existing residential lots and homes. If the proposed Project were not to be implemented it is anticipated that the site may be developed as residential, consistent with the residential community to the north and west with a minimum lot sizes of 14,000 sq. ft. The total Project site, north and south of SR-18 is 152.92 acres. It is anticipated that even if the site was developed as residential that Hencks Meadow, the pond, Hooks Creek and associated riparian habitat (approximately 11.4 acres) would not be developed, and that the steep southern facing slopes on the southern portion of the property (approximately 27.8 acres) would not be developed. This would leave approximately 114 acres for a maximum of 354 residential lots and associated roadways. Alternative 2 would not meet the Project objectives, and it would have greater environmental impacts than the proposed Project.
Correspondence: A total of 11 written comment letters were received during the NOP comment period, including letters from agencies, organizations and individuals. In addition, nine letters were received in response to the DEIR. Comments received in response to the NOP and DEIR include comments related to:

- Aesthetics, operating hours, light use and light pattern impacts, noise impacts on nearby residences and adjacent forest, SR-18 scenic byway and viewshed;
- Air quality from additional auto and bus traffic;
- Wildlife migration and wildlife corridors;
- Threatened and endangered species, including southern rubber boa, flying squirrel and the spotted owl;
- Water requirements, water supply reliability and fire flow;
- Erosion and watershed protection from existing and proposed trails;
- Risk of wildfires and firefighting capacity;
- Potential growth inducement;
- Site access and evacuation safety;
- Water quality and hydrology of Hooks Creek, a headwaters stream of the Upper Mojave River; and
- Construction and post-construction storm water management practices.

The FEIR includes all written correspondence received and the County’s written responses to all comments. An errata sheet was also prepared as part of the FEIR to document changes to the DEIR. The changes to the DEIR do not affect the overall conclusions of the environmental document, and instead represent changes to the DEIR that provide clarification, amplification and/or insignificant modifications, as needed as a result of public comments on the DEIR, or due to additional information received during the public review period. These clarifications and corrections do not warrant recirculation of the DEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

One of the nine letters submitted during the public comment period on the DEIR, a letter from San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society (Audubon), was inadvertently omitted from the FEIR. Staff and the EIR consultant have reviewed the comment letter from Audubon, and have concluded that all of the comments will be addressed with reference to material already contained in the EIR, or with minor clarification that will not require recirculation of the DEIR. Audubon has since submitted another letter urging the Planning Commission to delay its review of the Project. The staff report on May 18 will include more detail on the Audubon comment letters.

Additional correspondence (over 200 letters and e-mails) from mountain community residents have been received since the Draft EIR was circulated by the County. The communications support and urge approval of the Project.
**RECOMMENDATION:** That the Planning Commission **RECOMMEND** the following actions to the Board of Supervisors:

1) **CERTIFY** the Environmental Impact Report.

2) **ADOPT** the Findings

3) **ADOPT** a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation from LA/SD-RES & LA/RS-14m to LA/CR on 152.92 Acres.

4) **ADOPT** an amendment to the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan, Policy-LA/CI 1.14

5) **ADOPT** an amendment to the General Plan Circulation Element to modify the designation of Cumberland Road.

6) **APPROVE** the Conditional Use Permit to establish an Outdoor Commercial Entertainment Center with an amusement park, campground, meadow/wetland rehabilitation, restaurants, bar, wedding & reception facility, retail sales, trails, recreational activities and related accessory uses on 152.92 acres.

7) **FILE** a Notice of Determination.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Exhibit A: Findings
Exhibit B: Conditions of Approval
Exhibit C: Correspondence
Exhibit D: EIR Posted at:
Exhibit E: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
EXHIBIT A

Findings
FINDINGS - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT. General Plan Amendment (GPA) to change the existing land use designation from Lake Arrowhead/ Special Development - Residential (LA/SD-RES) and Lake Arrowhead/ Single Residential-14,000 Square Foot Minimum lot size (LA/RS-14M) to Lake Arrowhead/ Rural Commercial (LA/CR) on 152.92 Acres, and an amendment to the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan and the Circulation Element of the County of San Bernardino General Plan.

1. The proposed GPA is internally consistent with all other provisions of the respective plan and the General Plan as it is consistent with the following goals and policies of the County General Plan:

   - **Policy M/LU 2** – Provide opportunities for commercial and industrial development within the region that is compatible with the forest and mountain character and meets the needs of local residential and visitors.

     **Implementation:** The amendments will allow commercial opportunities for mountain tourism that will create local jobs and interest in the local community. The addition of the Rural Commercial designation allows the previous commercial operation to be re-established in an area that is not adjacent to dense residential.

     Furthermore, it is consistent with the following Lake Arrowhead Community Plan policy:

   - **LA/LU 1.1** Require strict adherence to the land use policy map, unless proposed changes are clearly demonstrated to be consistent with the community character.

     **Goal Implementation:** The existing community contains mixed rural and commercial uses along State Highway 18. The proposed Rural Commercial Land Use is consistent with the community character because it includes commercial and recreational uses along SR-18.

2. The proposed GPA would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the County, because the amendment facilitates a Project that has incorporated appropriate conditions of approval and mitigation measures to protect and enhance public health and safety.

3. The proposed land use zoning district change is in the public interest, there will be a community benefit, and other existing and allowed uses will not be compromised, because the Project will provide the opportunity for economic
stability in the surrounding mountain communities, and rehabilitate and repurpose the Santa’s Village attraction and re-open for the public to enjoy. The amendment does not compromise existing or other planned uses, because the Project includes appropriate mitigation measures and conditions of approval to ensure performance standards are met.

4. **The proposed land use zoning district change will provide a reasonable and logical extension of the existing land use pattern in the surrounding area**, as the rural commercial district will allow the rehabilitation and re-use of a commercial use adjacent to the highway.

5. **The proposed land use zoning district change does not conflict with provisions of the Development Code**, because the Project site conforms to the size and location criteria specified for the Rural Commercial land use district.

6. **The proposed land use zoning district change will not have a substantial adverse effect on surrounding property**, because the Project includes appropriate mitigation measures and conditions of approval to ensure performance standards are met.

7. **The affected site is physically suitable in terms of design, location, shape, size, operating characteristics, and the provision of public and emergency vehicle (e.g., fire and medical) access and public services and utilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, potable water, schools, solid waste collection and disposal, storm drainage, wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal, etc.), to ensure that the proposed or anticipated uses and/or development will not endanger, jeopardize, or otherwise constitute a hazard to the property or improvements in the vicinity in which the property is located.** The site has been conditioned to ensure adequate water and wastewater needs of the Project have been met. Fire protection will also be provided by the County Fire Department which has reviewed the Project and provided appropriate conditions of approval. The Project will have sufficient permitted solid waste storage and landfill capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs. The County has evaluated drainage associated with the Project and determined that impacts will be less than significant with the implementation of specified conditions of approval.

**FINDINGS: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT.** Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish an Outdoor Commercial Entertainment Center which includes an Amusement Park, Campground, Meadow/Wetland Rehabilitation, Restaurants, Bar, Wedding & Reception Facility, Retail, Trails, Recreational Activities and other Accessory Uses on 152.92 Acres.
1. **The site for the proposed use is adequate in terms of shape and size to accommodate the proposed use and all landscaping, open space, setbacks, walls and fences, yards, and other required features pertaining to the application.** The 152.92-acre site will accommodate the existing and proposed building associated with the Project. All setbacks meet or exceed the requirements of the Development Code for the proposed land use and the existing zoning.

2. **The site for the proposed use has adequate access**, because State Highway 18 provides legal and physical access to the Project site, and the proposed conditions of approval required a traffic signal to allow safe pedestrian access across the highway.

3. **The proposed use will not have a substantial adverse effect on abutting properties or the allowed use of the abutting properties, which means that the use will not generate excessive noise, traffic, vibration, lighting, glare, or other disturbance**, because the proposed Project incorporates sufficient road improvements including a traffic signal. In addition, the conditions of approval ensure that the Project will conform to performance standards, including those for noise and vibration, to reduce any potential impacts to the nearby residences.

4. **The proposed use and manner of development are consistent with the goals, maps, policies, and standards of the County General Plan and any applicable Community or Specific Plan**, as demonstrated by the following goals and policies:

   **Policy M/CI 1.18.** On any commercial development that attracts daily traffic, require exclusive left turn lanes, and other improvements as necessary, to allow uninterrupted traffic movement.

   **Policy Implementation:** The Project improvements includes one eastbound left-turn lane and one westbound left-turn lane constructed on SR-18 to accommodate the visitors of the Project turning into the driveways off the highway. This intersection would be signalized and striped crosswalks would be provided across one or both legs crossing SR-18 and across both driveways.

   **Goal M/ED 1.** Promote economic development that is compatible with the character of the Mountain Region.

   **Goal Implementation:** The Project will provide the opportunity for economic stability in the surrounding mountain communities, while promoting the importance of wildlife and habitat education through eco-tourism.
5. **There is supporting infrastructure, existing or available, consistent with the intensity of the development, to accommodate the proposed Project without significantly lowering service levels.** The developer will be required to construct road improvements, as well as install a traffic signal at the Project’s primary access point.

6. **The lawful conditions stated in the approval are deemed reasonable and necessary to protect the overall public health, safety and general welfare because the conditions of approval include mitigation measures to reduce impacts to the environment, including biological resources, cultural resources and traffic. In addition, the conditions will ensure the Project meets the required performance standards.**

7. **The design of the site has considered the potential for the use of solar energy systems and passive or natural heating and cooling opportunities, however the Project site is located in a heavily forested area that makes solar heating less than desirable.**

8. **The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) adequately describes the environmental impacts that will result from the proposed Project and reflects the County’s independent judgment.** The EIR determined that all impacts will be less than significant with mitigation measures. Appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated for all other impacts into the Conditions of Approval and into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. This will ensure that all other impacts are reduced to a level of non-significance.
Conditions of Approval
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS
Conditions of Operation and Procedure
[Not subject to Condition Compliance Release Form (CCRF) signatures]

LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT– Planning Division (909) 387-8311

1. Project Description. The County conditionally approves the proposed Conditional Use Permit to establish an Outdoor Commercial Entertainment Center which includes an Amusement Park, Campground, Meadow/Wetland Rehabilitation, Restaurants, Bar, Wedding & Reception Facility, Retail, Trails, Recreational Activities and other Accessory Uses on 152.92 Acres. In accordance with the San Bernardino County Code (SBCC), California Building Codes (CBC), the California Fire Code (CFC), the following Conditions of Approval, the approved site plan, and all other required and approved reports and displays (e.g. elevations). APN: 0332-211-02*, Project Number P201500051.

2. Project Location. The Project site is located on State Route (SR-18), both sides, approximately one mile east of the intersection of SR-18 and Kuffel Canyon Road in the community of Sky Forrest.

3. Development Standards. The Project site is located in the Mountain Region, on a site proposed for development pursuant to the Rural Commercial (CR) land use zoning district standards, as specified in SBCC §82.05.060.

4. Revisions. Any proposed change to the approved use/activity on the site; or any increase in the developed area of the site or any expansion or modification to the approved facilities, including changes to structures, building locations, elevations, signs, parking allocation, landscaping, lighting, allowable number of occupants (clients and/or employees); or a proposed change in the Conditions of Approval, including operational restrictions from those shown either on the approved site plan and/or in the Conditions of Approval shall require that an additional land use application (e.g. Revision to an Approved Action) be approved by the County. The developer shall prepare, submit with fees, and obtain approval of the application prior to implementing any such revision or modification. (SBCC §86.06.070)

5. Continuous Effect/Revocation. All Conditions of Approval applied to this Project shall be effective continuously throughout the operative life of the Project for the approved use. Failure of the property owner, tenant, applicant, developer, or any operator to comply with any or all of the conditions at any time may result in a public hearing and revocation of the approved land use, provided adequate notice, time and opportunity is provided to the property owner or other party to correct the non-complying situation.

6. Indemnification. In compliance with SBCC §81.01.070, the developer shall agree to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County or its “indemnities” (herein collectively the County’s elected officials, appointed officials [including Planning Commissioners], Zoning Administrator, agents, officers, employees, volunteers, advisory agencies or committees, appeal boards or legislative body) from any claim, action or proceeding against the County or its indemnitees to attack, set aside, void or annul an approval of the County by an indemnitee concerning the map or permit or any other

Mitigation Measures in italics
Non-standard conditions are bolded.
action relating to or arising out of County approval, including the acts, errors or omissions of any person and for any costs or expenses incurred by the indemnitees on account of any claim, except where such indemnification is prohibited by law. In the alternative, the developer may agree to relinquish such approval.

Any Condition of Approval imposed in compliance with the County Development Code or County General Plan shall include a requirement that the County acts reasonably to promptly notify the developer of any claim, action, or proceeding and that the County cooperates fully in the defense. The developer shall reimburse the County and its indemnitees for all expenses resulting from such actions, including any court costs and attorney’s fees, which the County or its indemnitees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action.

The County may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action, but such participation shall not relieve the developer of their obligations under this condition to reimburse the County or its indemnitees for all such expenses. This indemnification provision shall apply regardless of the existence or degree of fault of indemnitees. The developer’s indemnification obligation applies to the indemnitee’s “passive” negligence but does not apply to the indemnitee’s “sole” or “active” negligence or “willful misconduct” within the meaning of Civil Code §2782.

7. **Expiration.** This Project permit approval shall expire and become void if it is not “exercised” within three years of the effective date of this approval, unless an extension of time is granted. The permit is deemed exercised when either:

- the permittee has commenced actual construction or alteration under a validly issued Building Permit, or
- the permittee has substantially commenced the approved land use or activity on the Project site, for those portions of the Project not requiring a Building Permit. [SBCC §86.06.060]

Occupancy of completed structures and operation of the approved exercised land use remains valid continuously for the life of the Project and the approval runs with the land unless one of the following occurs:

- Building and Safety does not issue construction permits for all or part of the Project or the construction permits expire before the completion of the structure and the final inspection approval.
- The County determines the land use to be abandoned or non-conforming.
- The County determines that the land use is not operating in compliance with these Conditions of Approval, the County Code, or other applicable laws, ordinances or regulations. In these cases, the land use may be subject to a revocation hearing and possible termination.

**PLEASE NOTE:** This will be the ONLY notice given of the expiration date. The developer is responsible for initiation of any Extension of Time application.

8. **Extension of Time.** County staff may grant extensions of time to the expiration date (listed above or as otherwise extended) in increments each not to exceed an additional three years beyond the current expiration date. The developer may file an application to request consideration of an extension of time with appropriate fees no less than 30 days before the expiration date. County staff
may grant extensions of time based on a review of the Extension application, which must include a justification of the delay in construction and a plan of action for completion. The granting of such an extension request is a discretionary action that may be subject to additional or revised Conditions of Approval or site plan modifications. (SBCC §86.06.060)

9. **Development Impact Fees.** Additional fees may be required prior to issuance of development permits. Fees shall be paid as specified in adopted fee ordinances.

10. **Project Account.** The Job Costing System (JCS) account number is P201500051. This is an actual cost Project with a deposit account to which hourly charges is assessed. The developer shall maintain a positive account balance at all times. A minimum balance of $1000 must be in the Project account at the time the Condition Compliance Review is initiated. Sufficient funds must remain in the account to cover the charges during each compliance review. All fees required for processing shall be paid in full prior to final inspection, occupancy and operation of the approved use. There shall be sufficient funds remaining in the account to properly fund file closure and any other required post-occupancy review and inspection (e.g. landscape performance).

11. **Condition Compliance.** In order to obtain construction permits for grading, building, final inspection and/or tenant occupancy for each approved building, the developer shall process a Condition Compliance Release Form (CCRF) for each respective building and/or phase of the development through the Planning Division in accordance with the directions stated in the Approval letter. The Planning Division shall release their holds on each phase of development by providing to County Building and Safety the following:
   - **Grading Permits:** a copy of the signed CCRF for grading/land disturbance and two “red” stamped and signed approved copies of the grading plans.
   - **Building Permits:** a copy of the signed CCRF for building permits and three “red” stamped and signed approved copies of the final approved site plan.
   - **Final Occupancy:** a copy of the signed CCRF for final inspection of each respective building or use of the land, after an on-site compliance inspection by the Planning Division.

12. **Additional Permits.** The property owner, developer, and land use operator are all responsible to ascertain and comply with all laws, ordinances, regulations and any other requirements of Federal, State, County and Local agencies as are applicable to the development and operation of the approved land use and Project site. These may include:
   a) **FEDERAL:** Fish & Wildlife Service.
   b) **STATE:** Fish & Wildlife, Lahontan RWQCB, Santa Ana RWQCB, South Coast AQMD
   c) **COUNTY:** Land Use Services - Planning, Building and Safety, Code Enforcement, Land Development; Public Health - Environmental Health Services; Public Works; County Fire; and Hazardous Materials
   d) **LOCAL:** N/A

13. **Performance Standards.** The approved land uses shall operate in compliance with the general performance standards listed in SBCC Chapter 83.01, regarding air quality, electrical disturbance, fire hazards (storage of flammable or other hazardous materials), heat, noise, vibration, and the disposal of liquid waste. In addition to these, none of the following shall be perceptible without instruments at any point outside the Project boundaries at adjoining property lines:

---

*Mitigation Measures in italics*
*Non-standard conditions are bolded.*
• **Odors:** No offensive or objectionable odor.

• **Emissions:** No emission of dirt, dust, fly ash and other forms of particulate matter.

• **Smoke:** No smoke of a greater density than that described in No. 2 on the Ringelmann Chart, as published currently by the United States Bureau of Mines, shall be emitted from any Project source.

• **Radiation:** No dangerous amount of radioactive emissions.

• **Toxic Gases:** No emission of toxic, noxious or corrosive fumes of gases.

• **Glare:** No intense glare that is not effectively screened from view at any point outside the Project boundary.

14. **Continuous Maintenance.** The Project property owner shall continually maintain the property so that it is visually attractive and not dangerous to the health, safety and general welfare of both on-site users (e.g. employees) and surrounding properties. The property owner shall ensure that all facets of the development are regularly inspected, maintained and that any defects are timely repaired. Among the elements to be maintained, include but are not limited to:

• **Annual maintenance and repair:** The developer shall conduct inspections for any structures, fencing/walls, driveways, and signs to assure proper structural, electrical, and mechanical safety.

• **Graffiti and debris:** The developer shall remove graffiti and debris immediately through weekly maintenance.

• **Landscaping:** The developer shall maintain landscaping in a continual healthy thriving manner at proper height for required screening. Drought-resistant, fire retardant vegetation shall be used where practicable. Where landscaped areas are irrigated it shall be done in a manner designed to conserve water, minimizing aerial spraying.

• **Dust control:** The developer shall maintain dust control measures on any undeveloped areas where landscaping has not been provided.

• **Erosion control:** The developer shall maintain erosion control measures to reduce water runoff, siltation, and promote slope stability.

• **External Storage:** The developer shall maintain external storage, loading, recycling and trash storage areas in a neat and orderly manner, and fully screened from public view. Outside storage shall not exceed the height of the screening walls.

• **Metal Storage Containers:** The developer shall NOT place metal storage containers in loading areas or other areas unless specifically approved by this or subsequent land use approvals.

• **Screening:** The developer shall maintain screening that is visually attractive. All trash areas, loading areas, mechanical equipment (including roof top) shall be screened from public view.

• **Signage:** The developer shall maintain all on-site signs, including posted area signs (e.g. “No Trespassing”) in a clean readable condition at all times. The developer shall remove all graffiti and repair vandalism on a regular basis. Signs on the site shall be of the size and general location as shown on the approved site plan or subsequently a County-approved sign plan.

• **Parking and on-site circulation:** The developer shall maintain all parking and on-site circulation requirements, including surfaces, all markings and traffic/directional signs in an un-faded condition as identified on the approved site plan. Any modification to parking and access layout requires the Planning Division review and approval. The markings and signs shall be clearly defined, un-faded and legible; these include parking spaces, disabled space and access path of travel, directional designations and signs, stop signs, pedestrian crossing, speed humps and “No Parking”, “Carpool”, and “Fire Lane” designations.

*Mitigation Measures in italics
Non-standard conditions are bolded.*
• **Fire Lanes:** The developer shall clearly define and maintain in good condition at all times all markings required by the Fire Department, including “No Parking” designations and “Fire Lane” designations.

15. **Construction Hours.** Construction will be limited to the hours between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Saturday in accordance with the SBCC standards. No construction activities are permitted outside of these hours or on Sundays and Federal holidays. **Mitigation measure may further limit construction times.**

16. **Lighting.** The glare from any luminous source, including on-site lighting shall not exceed one-half (0.5) foot-candle at property line. All lighting shall be limited to that necessary for maintenance activities and security purposes. This is to allow minimum obstruction of night sky remote area views. No light shall project onto adjacent roadways in a manner that interferes with on-coming traffic. All signs proposed by this project shall only be lit by steady, stationary, shielded light directed at the sign, by light inside the sign or by direct stationary neon lighting.

17. **Underground Utilities.** All new and existing local on-site utility distribution lines (less than 66 kv) located on or around the perimeter of the site, shall be placed underground. The developer will work cooperatively with the County and appropriate utility agencies to underground these facilities. Transmission lines with higher voltages (66 kv or greater) are not required to be placed underground.

18. **Clear Sight Triangle.** Adequate visibility for vehicular and pedestrian traffic shall be provided at clear sight triangles at all 90 degree angle intersections of public rights-of-way and private driveways. All signs, structures and landscaping located within any clear sight triangle shall comply with the height and location requirements specified by County Development Code (SBCC § 83.02.030) or as otherwise required by County Traffic.

19. **Improvement Plans.** Improvement plans should be submitted individually for the north and south side grading and construction, for review, approval, and sign-off.

20. **Park Capacity.** The maximum camp capacity is 1,100 guest. Upon satisfactory completion of all road improvements and traffic mitigation (traffic signal), and opening of the overflow parking area on the south side of State Highway 18, the park capacity may be expanded to 2,220 guest.

21. **GHG – Operational Standards.** The developer shall implement the following as greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction measures during the operation of the approved project:
   a) **Waste Stream Reduction.** The developer shall provide to all tenants and project employees County-approved informational materials about methods and need to reduce the solid waste stream and listing available recycling services.
   b) **Vehicle Trip Reduction.** The developer shall provide to all tenants County-approved informational materials about the need to reduce vehicle trips and the program elements this project is implementing. Such elements may include: participation in established ride-sharing programs, creating a new ride-share employee vanpool, and/or providing a web site or message board for coordinating rides.

---

*Mitigation Measures in italics
Non-standard conditions are bolded.*
c) Landscape Equipment. The developer shall require in the landscape maintenance contract and/or in onsite procedures that a minimum of 20% of the landscape maintenance equipment shall be electric-powered.

22. **Concerts.** The approval does not allow the use of the site for concerts that utilize amplified sound equipment

23. **Smoking.** No smoking is allowed on the property and will be strictly enforced, including but not limited to the campground site and Santa’s Village. **MM HAZ-1**

24. **Fire Rings.** There will be no wood burning fires that create windblown embers. The campground site will include a few community fire rings that are supplied by natural gas lines extended from Santa’s Village to the campground. The fire rings will be monitored during use. **MM HAZ-2**

25. **Trail Maintenance.** All trails shall be kept in a maintained state sufficient to clearly determine where the trail lies. Where trails are located within and adjacent to sensitive habitat areas, signs and physical barriers shall be strategically placed along the trail, under direction of a qualified biologist, discouraging to prevent guests from wandering outside of the trail boundaries and to inform them off-trail use of the park is strictly prohibited and enforced and will result in ejection from the park without a refund of any entry fees. **MM BIO-6**

**LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT – Code Enforcement Division (909) 387-8311**

26. **Enforcement.** If any County enforcement activities are required to enforce compliance with the Conditions of Approval, the County will charge the property owner for such enforcement activities in accordance with the SBCC Schedule of Fees.

27. **Weed Abatement.** The applicant shall comply with San Bernardino County weed abatement regulations [SBCC §23.031-23.043] and periodically clear the site of all non-complying vegetation. This includes removal of all Russian thistle (tumbleweeds).

**LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT – Land Development Division – Drainage (909) 387-8311**

28. **Tributary Drainage.** Adequate provisions should be made to intercept and conduct the tributary off site - on site drainage flows around and through the site in a manner, which will not adversely affect adjacent or downstream properties at the time the site is developed.

29. **Natural Drainage.** The natural drainage courses traversing the site shall not be occupied or obstructed.

30. **Additional Drainage Requirements.** In addition to drainage requirements stated herein, other "on-site" and/or "off-site" improvements may be required which cannot be determined from tentative plans at this time and would have to be reviewed after more complete improvement plans and profiles have been submitted to this office.
31. **Continuous BMP Maintenance.** The property owner/“developer” is required to provide periodic and continuous maintenance of all Best Management Practices (BMP) devices/facilities listed in the County approved Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for the project. This includes but is not limited to, filter material replacement and sediment removal, as required to assure peak performance of all BMPs. Furthermore, such maintenance activity will require compliance with all Local, State, or Federal laws and regulations, including those pertaining to confined space and waste disposal methods in effect at the time such maintenance occurs.

32. **BMP Enforcement.** In the event the property owner/“developer” (including any successors or assigns) fails to accomplish the necessary BMP maintenance within five (5) days of being given written notice by County Public Works, then the County shall cause any required maintenance to be done. The entire cost and expense of the required maintenance shall be charged to the property owner and/or “developer”, including administrative costs, attorney’s fees and interest thereon at the rate authorized by the County Code from the date of the original notice to the date the expense is paid in full.

### PUBLIC HEALTH – Environmental Health Services [DEHS] (800) 442-2283

33. **Noise Standards.** Noise level shall be maintained at or below County Development Code Standards, §83.01.080.

34. **Refuse Maintenance.** Refuse generated at the premises shall, at all times, be stored in approved containers and be placed in a manner so environmental public nuisances are minimized. Refuse NOT containing garbage shall be removed from the premises at least ONE (1) time per week, or as often as necessary, to minimize public health nuisances. Refuse containing garbage shall be removed from the premises at least TWO (2) times per week, or as often as necessary, to minimize public health nuisances. Refuse shall be removed by a permitted hauler to an approved solid waste facility pursuant with San Bernardino County Code, Chapter 8, §33.0801 et. seq.

35. **Septic System Maintenance.** The septic system (package treatment plant) shall be maintained so as not to create a public nuisance and shall be serviced by a DEHS permitted pumper.

### PUBLIC WORKS – Solid Waste Management (909) 386-8701

36. **Recycling Storage Capacity.** The developer shall provide adequate space and storage bins for both refuse and recycling materials. This requirement is to assist the County in compliance with the recycling requirements of AB 2176.

37. **Mandatory Commercial Recycling.** Beginning July 1, 2012, all businesses defined to include a commercial or public entity that generates four or more cubic yards of commercial solid waste a week must arrange for recycling services. The County is required to monitor business recycling and will require the business to provide recycling information. Requirement is to assist the County in compliance with the recycling requirements of AB 341.
38. Expiration. Construction permits, including Fire Condition Letters, shall automatically expire and become invalid unless the work authorized by such permit is commenced within 180 days after its issuance, or if the work authorized by such permit is suspended or abandoned for a period of 180 days after the time the work is commenced. Suspension or abandonment shall mean that no inspection by the Department has occurred within 180 days of any previous inspection. After a construction permit or Fire Condition Letter becomes invalid and before such previously approved work recommences, a new permit shall be first obtained and the fee to recommence work shall be one half the fee for the new permit for such work, provided no changes have been made or will be made in the original construction documents for such work, and provided further that such suspension or abandonment has not exceeded one year. A request to extend the Fire Condition Letter or Permit may be made in writing PRIOR TO the expiration date justifying the reason that the Fire Condition Letter should be extended.

39. Fire Jurisdiction. The above referenced Project is under the jurisdiction of the San Bernardino County Fire Department, herein “Fire Department”. Prior to any construction occurring on any parcel, the developer shall contact the Fire Department for verification of current fire protection requirements. All new construction shall comply with the current California Fire Code requirements and all applicable statutes, codes, ordinances, and standards of the Fire Department.

40. Additional Requirements. In addition to the Fire requirements stated herein, other on-site and off-site improvements may be required which cannot be determined from tentative plans at this time and would have to be reviewed after more complete improvement plans and profiles have been submitted to this office.

41. Fire Fee. The required fire fees shall be paid to the San Bernardino County Fire Department/Community Safety Division (909) 386-8400.

42. FS-1. The County General Plan designates this property as being within the Fire Safety Review Area 1 (One) and all future construction shall adhere to all applicable standards and requirements of this overlay district. [F04A]
PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS OR LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITY
The Following Shall Be Completed

LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT – Land Development Division – Drainage (909) 387-8311

43. **Drainage Improvements.** A Registered Civil Engineer shall investigate and design adequate drainage improvements to intercept and conduct the off-site and on-site drainage flows around and through the site in a manner, which will not adversely affect adjacent or downstream properties. Submit drainage study for review and obtain approval. A $550 deposit for drainage study review will be collected upon submittal to the Land Development Division. Deposit amounts are subject to change in accordance with the latest approved fee schedule.

44. **FEMA Flood Zone.** The Project is located within Flood Zone D according to FEMA Panel Number 7956H dated 08/28/2008. Flood Hazards are undetermined in this area but possible. The requirements may change based on the recommendations of a drainage study accepted by the Land Development Division and the most current Flood Map prior to issuance of grading permit.

45. **Topo Map.** A topographic map shall be provided to facilitate the design and review of necessary drainage facilities.

46. **Grading Plans.** Grading plans shall be submitted for review and approval obtained for area south of State Highway 18. An $806 deposit for grading plan review will be collected upon submittal to the Land Development Division. Deposit amounts are subject to change in accordance with the latest approved fee schedule.

47. **WQMP.** A completed Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted for review and approval obtained for the parking and camp site area located at south of State Highway 18. A $2,650 deposit for WQMP review will be collected upon submittal to the Land Development Division. Deposit amounts are subject to change in accordance with the latest approved fee schedule. The report shall adhere to the current requirements established by the Santa Ana/Mojave Watershed Region. Copies of the WQMP guidance and template can be found at: [http://www.sbcounty.gov/dpw/land/npdes.asp](http://www.sbcounty.gov/dpw/land/npdes.asp)

48. **WQMP Inspection Fee.** The developer shall provide $3,600 deposit to Land Development Division for inspection of the approved WQMP.

49. **CDFW.** California Department of Fish and Wildlife must be notified if the drainage course of any streambed on this property is to be altered or encroached. A streambed alteration agreement shall be provided prior to grading.
50. **Mitigation Monitoring.** The developer shall submit a Mitigation Monitoring Application for review and approval to verify compliance and effectiveness of the Mitigation Measures.

51. **Special Status Plants Mitigation.** A qualified biologist or botanist shall conduct a pre-construction clearance survey for special-status plant species on the project site during the appropriate blooming period prior to trail creation or construction in new areas. If present, any special-status plants shall be clearly flagged for avoidance with a suitable buffer zone of a minimum of 50 feet, during construction by the qualified biologist/botanist. Physical barriers (e.g., logs, boulders, segments of split rail fence) shall be strategically placed along one side or both sides of the trail as directed by the biologist/botanist where the trail occurs within 500 feet of any identified special-status plant species, to control hiking and mountain biking trail users from leaving the trail. A letter report summarizing the results of the preconstruction plant survey and any placement of physical barriers to protect special-status plants shall be prepared by the biologist/botanist and be submitted to the San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department. **MM BIO-1**

52. **Trail work/construction.** Prior to any new work (e.g. clearing for trail construction or maintenance) that are conducted in suitable habitat for southern rubber boa, all duff, debris, and downed logs in proposed work areas shall be examined for southern rubber boa by a biologist no more than 5 days prior to disturbance; the biologist conducting this survey must hold a Memorandum of Understanding from the CDFW allowing take of southern rubber boa. During construction or maintenance, a qualified biologist familiar with southern rubber boa ecology and identification shall be on-site at all times to monitor for southern rubber boa in the work area(s). Any incidences of injuring or killing an individual southern rubber boa shall be reported immediately to SkyPark Management who shall notify CDFW within 24 hours.

The qualified biologist shall be responsible for submitting daily construction or maintenance monitoring reports, noting specifically if any southern rubber boa refugia (e.g., downed logs, boulders) were disturbed during construction or maintenance and/or if any southern rubber boa were found, and if so, the quantity of each and its condition at the time that the construction or maintenance site was left for the day. In addition, a final monitoring summary will be written upon completion of the monitored work and submitted to CDFW within 30 calendar days of construction or maintenance completion. The report shall include start and end dates of the monitored work, known project effects on southern rubber boa, occurrences of incidental take of southern rubber boa, and other pertinent information regarding the success or failure of the monitoring in protecting southern rubber boa. **MM BIO-25**

53. **Southern Rubber Boa Mitigation.** Approximately twenty acres (20.2 acres) of high quality southern rubber boa habitat in the northernmost extent of the project site will be set aside as mitigation lands for the project. A restrictive covenant will be placed over these 20.2 acres and will provide for conservation of that property in perpetuity (refer to Exhibit 4.4-5, Conservation Area).

The conservation area will not undergo any new development of any kind. Some maintenance of the existing road and biking trail segments located in the conservation area may be necessary after
severe weather events. Any new, illegal trails into this area will be immediately closed off with a berm, rocks, or a similar method to discourage guests from using them and will be restored to original conditions.

To protect the mitigation area, SkyPark Management shall place appropriate fencing and/or natural barriers and signage around the perimeter of conservation area. Except for existing trails in the conservation area (portions of existing single track bike trail and existing access road), the public shall not have access to the mitigation area, and no activities shall be permitted within the site, except maintenance of habitat, including the removal of nonnative plant species, trash, and debris, and the installation of native plant materials. **MM BIO 26**

54. **Drainage Mitigation.** Permanent and temporary impacts to drainage feature D-2 (as identified in the Jurisdictional Delineation Report) from the widening of SR-18 shall be mitigated to less than significant levels through off-site compensatory mitigation at a minimum of 1:1 ratio for impacts, as deemed appropriate by USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW through the permitting process, which may include enhancement and restoration of Hooks Creek and Hencks Meadow. **MM-BIO-27**

55. **Construction Zones.** All work areas shall be visibly flagged or staked prior to construction. Construction activities shall be limited to these approved work areas except with prior authorization from regulatory agencies. **MM BIO-2**

56. **Worker Environmental Awareness Program.** A Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) shall be implemented to educate all construction personnel of the area’s environmental concerns and conditions, including special-status species, and relevant environmental protection measures. The WEAP will constitute the conveyance of environmental concerns and appropriate work practices, including spill prevention, emergency response measures, protection of sensitive resources, and proper implementation of BMPs, to all construction and maintenance personnel. All new workers that arrive after construction has started shall be trained under the WEAP within two days’ time. **MM BIO-3**

57. **Brush removal.** All brush, debris, and cleared vegetation shall be removed from the project site and disposed of properly or reused elsewhere on-site in an approved location where it will not wash into any riparian areas. **MM BIO-4**

58. **Streams.** For Class II streams, defined as those supporting aquatic life other than fish, a buffer of 75 feet (23 meters) on either side of the stream (measured from the high water mark) will be flagged and avoided. For Class III streams, defined as those not supporting aquatic life, a buffer of 25 feet (8 meters) on either side of the stream (measured from the high water mark) will be flagged and avoided. On-site streams are expected to be classified as a combination of Class II and Class III streams. **MM BIO-5**

59. **Trail Construction.** A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction clearance survey for special-status wildlife species (including California spotted owl, San Bernardino flying squirrel, and southern rubber boa) on the project site immediately prior to trail creation or construction in new areas. Special-status wildlife shall be avoided by waiting for them to leave an area before working in it. A letter report summarizing the results of the pre-construction clearance survey for special-
status wildlife species shall be prepared by the biologist and be submitted to the San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department. A biologist shall be on-site when work (e.g. trail clearing) is conducted in suitable habitat for SRB. All duff, debris, and downed logs in proposed work areas shall be examined for SBR by a qualified biologist no more than 5 days prior to disturbance. **MM BIO-7,8**

60. **Log Retention.** Retain 9 logs per acre of all age and decay classes greater than or equal to 12 inches (31 centimeters) in diameter and 20 feet (6 meters) long. At least 3 of the logs should be Class 1 logs with a minimum diameter of 12 inches (31 centimeters). Half of the logs should be 20-36 inches (51-96 centimeters) in diameter. A biologist shall coordinate where the logs should be placed for maximum wildlife usability. Exceptions will be made in fuel break areas. **MM BIO-9**

61. **Rock Outcrops.** All rocky outcrops shall be avoided. In addition, brush piles for burning or chipping will not be created within 300 feet (92 meters) of rock outcrops and existing logs in rubber boa habitat. If this is not possible, exclusionary fencing will be placed around brush piles to prevent usage by boas prior to burning or chipping. **MM BIO-10,11**

62. **Bald Eagle Mitigation.** Brush piles for burning or chipping will not be created within bald eagle roosts during occupancy. **MM BIO-12**

63. **Bird Clearance Survey.** All construction shall occur outside of January 1-September 15 (this time frame includes both the passerine and raptor nesting season). If construction occurs during this time period, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird clearance survey in all work areas and all areas within 500 feet of the general construction zone. This shall occur no more than one week prior to construction. Active nests shall be given an avoidance buffer, typically 300 feet for non-listed, non-raptor species, and 500 feet for listed and raptor species. This buffer shall remain in place until the young fledge or the nest otherwise becomes inactive, and may be reduced with approval from CDFW and/or USFWS. The nest(s) shall be monitored at least once each week during active construction to determine status. If an established buffer is still causing animal stress or potential abandonment of nest, work will stop until a biologist can establish a new buffer to ensure no take is incurred. A letter report summarizing the results of the pre-construction nesting bird clearance survey and any active nests and buffer areas shall be prepared by the biologist/botanist and be submitted to the San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department. **MM BIO-13**

64. **Trees.** The applicant will retain 10-15 hard snags per 5 acres (minimum of 16 inches/41 centimeters diameter at breast height and 40 feet/12 meters tall). Live and dead oaks that are at least 14 inches (35 centimeters) diameter at breast height will be retained unless they pose falling hazards. **MM BIO-14:**

65. **California Spotted Owl Mitigation.** If owl surveys have not been conducted, all suitable habitat shall be avoided during the LOP (period during which spotted owls are actively breeding). No work will be allowed during the LOP in the entire project area. In addition, no work will be allowed within 400 meters of known California spotted owl during the Limited Operating Period # 2 between February 1 and August 15. **MM BIO-15,16,17.**
66. **Nesting Sites.** In known or suitable nesting areas, percent canopy cover shall not be reduced below 70%. In areas of known or suitable foraging, percent canopy cover shall not be reduced below 50%. Known nest sites will be buffered by 400 meters (as identified by a qualified biologist) and avoided in perpetuity. Wildlife trees will be marked by a qualified biologist and avoided. All snags in nesting or foraging areas shall be left intact. **MM BIO-18,19,20**

67. **Woody Debris.** Downed woody debris shall be left at 10-15 tons per acre in nesting and foraging habitat. **MM BIO-21**

68. **Woodrat nest.** All woodrat nests shall be avoided and buffered by 10 feet. Approximately 10 percent or more of stumps, targeting those showing some level of decomposition, should be left at two to three feet. **MM BIO-22,23**

69. **Slash piles.** Slash piles should be left in approved areas. Slash piles should be three to four feet high and four to six feet in diameter. There should be two to three slash piles per acre. They should not be burned. Slash piles should be placed approximately 50 feet from roads and houses. **MM BIO-24**

70. **Trail Erosion.** Development and use of new hiking and mountain biking trails as well as use of existing trails shall implement the following avoidance, design, and maintenance measures:
   * Discourage or prohibit off-trail travel through education (information given to guest before they use trails, include in park rules), signage on trails, and strategic placement of boulders, downed timber, split rail fence segments;
   * Design trails with sustainable grades and avoid fall-line alignments;
   * When possible, build trails in dry, cohesive soils that easily compact and contain a larger percentage of coarse material. These soils better resist erosion by water, wind, or displacement by feet and tires;
   * Minimize trail muddiness by avoiding flat terrain, wet soils, and drainage bottom locations;
   * Use grade reversals to remove water from trail treads. Grade reversals are permanent and sustainable. When they are designed into a trail’s alignment they remain 100 percent effective and require minimal maintenance;
   * If it is not possible to install proper drainage on a trail, consider rerouting trail sections that are most problematic, or possibly hardening the trail;
   * In flatter areas, elevate and crown trails to prevent muddiness, or add gravel/soil mixture in low spots;
   * Integrating ramps where turns or change in direction are likely to occur on trails. The trails would be more vulnerable to erosion during turns because of decrease in speed and possible skidding, thus adding ramps would decrease erosion; and
   * Temporarily close trails that are prone to muddiness during rainy or snowmelt seasons. **MM GEO-1**

71. **Noise Mitigation.** Prior to Grading Permit issuance, the Project applicant shall prepare a construction noise management plan that identifies measures to be taken to minimize construction noise on surrounding sensitive receptors (e.g., residential uses) and includes specific noise management measures to be included into Project plans and specifications subject to review and approval by the
San Bernardino Planning Department. The Project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the San Bernardino County Planning Director that the Project complies with the following:

- Construction contracts specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state required noise attenuation devices.
- The County shall require that the contractor maintain and tune-up all construction equipment to minimize noise emissions.
- Construction haul routes shall be designed to avoid noise sensitive uses (e.g., residences, convalescent homes, etc.), to the extent feasible.
- Stationary equipment shall be placed so as to maintain the greatest possible distance to the sensitive receptors.
- A qualified “Noise Disturbance Coordinator” will be retained amongst the construction crew who shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the Disturbance Coordinator shall notify the County within 24 hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, malfunctioning muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the compliant, as deemed acceptable by the San Bernardino County Planning Department.
- Construction activities shall take place during weekdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., and are prohibited on Sundays and Federal holidays. MM NOI-1

72. GHG – Construction Standards. The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning of a signed letter agreeing to include as a condition of all construction contracts/subcontracts requirements to reduce impacts to GHG and submitting documentation of compliance. The developer/construction contractors shall do the following:

- Implement the approved Coating Restriction Plans.
- Select construction equipment based on low-emissions factors and high-energy efficiency. All diesel/gasoline-powered construction equipment shall be replaced, where possible, with equivalent electric or CNG equipment.
- Grading plans shall include the following statements:
  - “All construction equipment engines shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturers specifications prior to arriving on site and throughout construction duration.”
  - “All construction equipment (including electric generators) shall be shut off by work crews when not in use and shall not idle for more than 5 minutes.”
- Schedule construction traffic ingress/egress to not interfere with peak-hour traffic and to minimize traffic obstructions. Queuing of trucks on and off site shall be firmly discouraged and not scheduled. A flag person shall be retained to maintain efficient traffic flow and safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- Recycle and reuse construction and demolition waste (e.g. soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard) per County Solid Waste procedures.
- The construction contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew and educate all construction workers about the required waste reduction and the availability of recycling services.

Mitigation Measures in italics
Non-standard conditions are bolded.
73. **Changes to Historical Resource.** Project activities should be consistent with “plans for rehabilitation to ensure that the undertaking maintains consistency with the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties” (36 CFR part 68; see http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehab/stand.htm). The Standards are intended to pertain to rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.
   - Project design should be prepared and applied in consultation with a professional that meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior Professional Qualification Standards for Historic Architecture (see http://www.nps.gov/history/locallaw/arch_stnds_9.htm). **MM CR-1**

74. **Changes to an Archaeological Resource.** An archaeological monitor shall be present during any earthmoving activities proposed within the project site boundaries. The monitor shall work under the direct supervision of a cultural resource professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction work in the vicinity of any find until the project archaeologist can evaluate it.
   - In the event of a new find, salvage excavation and reporting shall be required. **MMCR-2**

75. **Encountering Human Remains.** If human remains are encountered during the project activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately.
   - If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. **MMCR-3**

76. **Dust Control.** Prior to issuance of any Grading Permit, San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans, and specifications stipulate that, in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust prevention measures, as specified in the SCAQMD’s Rules and Regulations. The “developer” shall prepare, submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning of both a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a signed letter agreeing to include in any construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that project contractors adhere to the requirements of the DCP. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off-site. Implementation of the following measures would reduce short-term fugitive dust impacts on nearby sensitive receptors:
   - Apply soil stabilizers or moisten inactive areas.
   - Water exposed surfaces as needed to avoid visible dust leaving the construction site (typically 2-3 times/day).
   - Minimize in-out traffic from construction zone.
   - Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose material and require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
   - Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site. **MM AQ-1**
LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT– Building and Safety Division (909) 387-8311

77. Retaining Wall Plans. Submit plans and obtain separate building permits for any required walls or retaining walls.

78. Geology Report. A geology report shall be submitted to the Building and Safety Division for review and approval by the County Geologist and fees paid for the review prior to final project approval.

79. Geotechnical (Soil) Report. A geotechnical (soil) report shall be submitted to the Building and Safety Division for review and approval prior to issuance of grading permits.

80. Grading Plans. Grading plans shall be submitted to Building and Safety for review and approval prior to grading/land disturbance.

81. Demolition Permit. Obtain a demolition permit for any building/s or structures to be demolished. Underground structures must be broken in, back-filled and inspected before covering.

82. Erosion & Sediment Control Plan. An erosion and sediment control plan and permit shall be submitted to and approved by the Building Official prior to any land disturbance.

83. Erosion Control Installation. Erosion control devices must be installed at all perimeter openings and slopes. No sediment is to leave the job site.

84. NPDES Permit. An NPDES permit - Notice of Intent (NOI) - is required on all grading of one (1) acre or more prior to issuance of a grading/construction permit. Contact your Regional Water Quality Control Board for specifics. www.swrcb.ca.gov

85. Regional Board Permit Letter. CONSTRUCTION projects involving one or more acres must be accompanied by a copy of the Regional Board permit letter with the WDID #. Construction activity includes clearing, grading, or excavation that results in the disturbance of at least one (1) acre of land total.

COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT – Community Safety Division (909) 386-8465

86. Water System Commercial. A water system approved and inspected by the Fire Department is required. The system shall be operational, prior to any combustibles being stored on the site. All fire hydrants shall be spaced no more than three hundred (300) feet apart (as measured along vehicular travel-ways) and no more than three hundred [300] feet from any portion of a structure.

87. Primary Access Paved. Prior to building permits being issued to any new structure, the primary access road shall be paved or an all-weather surface and shall be installed as specified in the General Requirement conditions (Fire # F-9), including width, vertical clearance and turnouts, if required.

Mitigation Measures in italics
Non-standard conditions are bolded.
88. **Record of Survey.** Pursuant to Sections 8762(b) and/or 8773 of the Business and Professions Code, a Record of Survey or Corner Record shall be filed under any of the following circumstances:
   a. Monuments set to mark property lines or corners;
   b. Performance of a field survey to establish property boundary lines for the purposes of construction staking, establishing setback lines, writing legal descriptions, or for boundary establishment/mapping of the subject parcel;
   c. Any other applicable circumstances pursuant to the Business and Professions Code that would necessitate filing of a Record of Survey.

89. **Monumentation.** If any activity on this Project will disturb any land survey monumentation, including but not limited to vertical control points (benchmarks), said monumentation shall be located and referenced by or under the direction of a licensed land surveyor or registered civil engineer authorized to practice land surveying prior to commencement of any activity with the potential to disturb said monumentation, and a corner record or record of survey of the references shall be filed with the County Surveyor (§8771(b) Business and Professions Code).
PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS
The Following Shall Be Completed

LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT– Building and Safety Division (909) 387-8311

90. Construction Plans. Any building, sign, or structure to be constructed or located on site, will require professionally prepared plans based on the most current County and California Building Codes, submitted for review and approval by the Building and Safety Division.

91. Permits: Obtain permits for all structures located on site and all work done without a permit.

PUBLIC WORKS – Solid Waste Management (909) 386-8701

92. Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan (CDWMP) Part 1 – The developer shall prepare, submit, and obtain approval from SWMD of a CDWMP Part 1 for each phase of the project. The CWMP shall list the types and weights or volumes of solid waste materials expected to be generated from construction. The CDWMP shall include options to divert from landfill disposal, materials for reuse or recycling by a minimum of 50% of total weight or volume. Forms can be found on our website at www.sbcounty.gov/dpw/solidwaste. An approved CDWMP Part 1 is required before a demolition permit can be issued.

LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT – Planning Division (909) 387-8311

93. Elevations. Elevations shall be provided for all proposed structures for review and approval. All proposed structures shall be designed to blend with the alpine environment.

94. Tree Replacement. Trees that are removed as a result of roadway improvements shall be replaced by replanting of native species at a minimum height of 8 feet at a 2:1 ratio of new trees to removed trees in the vicinity of the area they were removed. A landscape plan in conformance with Chapter 83.10, Landscaping Standards, of the County Development Code which includes the species, size, and location of trees to be planted shall be submitted to and approved by San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department and Caltrans. MM AES-1

95. Groundwater. Hydrogeological testing shall be conducted by a qualified hydrogeologist to confirm the assumption used in this EIR analysis that the groundwater at SkyPark is directly connected to the surface water of Hooks Creek. The results of this testing shall be submitted to the San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.

If the results of the hydrogeological testing confirms the assumption used in this EIR analysis, that there is connectivity between the groundwater source for SkyPark’s wells and the surface water flow in Hooks Creek, a groundwater and surface water monitoring plan shall be developed and implemented and shall include:

Mitigation Measures in italics
Non-standard conditions are bolded.
- Installation of a stream gage on Hooks Creek, or other monitoring mechanism if Hooks Creek is ephemeral and only flows during storm events, at a location downstream of the Project boundary.
- Installation of an inline flowmeter on all Project pumping wells in order to record instantaneous and cumulative groundwater production.
- Baseline monitoring of groundwater levels at a minimum of three months prior to opening day. Groundwater monitoring shall be conducted on a monthly basis.
- On-going monitoring of groundwater levels and Hooks Creek streamflow rates to provide the data necessary to assess the role of Project pumping on changes in stream flow rates (if any).
- Baseline and on-going monitoring of groundwater levels and Hooks Creek streamflow rates will be submitted to the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board on an annual basis.
- Within one year of opening day the threshold for change (reduction) in the streamflow rate that warrants implementation of adaptive management steps shall be established by a qualified hydrogeologist in coordination with Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- The adaptive management steps that shall be implemented if the threshold for change in Hooks Creek is exceeded include one or more of the following until such time that monitoring data shows the threshold is no longer exceeded for two consecutive months:
  i. Reduce or eliminate use of on-site groundwater for irrigation;
  ii. Reduce or eliminate use of on-site groundwater for potable/operational uses;
  iii. Increase delivery and use of water from Skyforest Mutual Water Company for potable/operational uses. **MM HYDRO-1**

96. **Lighting.** The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning of a lighting (photometric) plan. Exterior lighting shall be kept to the minimum required for safety and shall support the preservation of night sky views. All exterior and permanent lighting shall be the minimum lumen (measure of the total quantity of visible light emitted by a source), shielded downward, and stationed at the minimum height in order to light the target area. The County of San Bernardino Building and Safety Department will review construction plans for compliance with applicable codes, including the Night Sky Protection Ordinance, and will conduct final inspection approval for issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. This lighting plan shall do the following:
   a) Show the type, height, and location of all outdoor lights.
   b) Lighting shall be hooded, shielded, or directional in nature so that it does not extend beyond the property boundary and is directed downward.
   c) All lighting shall not exceed one-half (0.5) foot-candle at the property line.
   d) Utilize dimmers, photocells and motion detectors to reduce interior and exterior lighting, save energy and reduce night sky-light pollution
   e) On-site lighting shall be designed in a manner to confine the area illumination to the site boundaries and in a manner to avoid glare to adjacent properties or motorists on adjacent roadways
   f) No onsite lighting or glare from such lighting shall create any safety hazards for traffic on roadways. **MM-AES-2**
97. **Fantasy Forest Trail Lighting.** All lighting to be installed for the Fantasy Forest Trail shall be at the minimum lumen, shielded downward, and stationed at the minimum height in order to light the target area. All Fantasy Forest Trail lighting shall not extend beyond and illuminate more than 50 feet into the forest from the edge of either side of the trail. Upon completion of the Fantasy Forest Trail a report shall be completed by the contractor that verifies the lighting does not extend more than 50 feet into the adjacent forest. This report shall be submitted to the Land Use Services Department for review and approval. **MM AES-3**

98. **GHG – Design Standards.** The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning evidence that the following measures have been incorporated into the design of the project. These are intended to reduce potential project greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions. Proper installation of the approved design features and equipment shall be confirmed by County Building and Safety prior to final inspection of each structure.

a) **Meet Title 24 Energy Efficiency requirements.** The Developer shall document that the design of the proposed structures meets the current Title 24 energy-efficiency requirements. County Planning shall coordinate this review with the County Building and Safety. Any combination of the following design features may be used to fulfill this requirement, provided that the total increase in efficiency meets or exceeds the cumulative goal (100%+ of Title 24) for the entire project (Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations; Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non Residential Buildings, as amended):

- Incorporate dual pane or other energy efficient windows,
- Incorporate energy efficient space heating and cooling equipment,
- Incorporate energy efficient light fixtures, photocells, and motion detectors,
- Incorporate energy efficient appliances,
- Incorporate energy efficient domestic hot water systems,
- Incorporate solar panels into the electrical system,
- Incorporate cool roofs/light colored roofing,
- Incorporate other measures that will increase energy efficiency.
- Increase insulation to reduce heat transfer and thermal bridging.
- Limit air leakage throughout the structure and within the heating and cooling distribution system to minimize energy consumption.

**Department of Public Works-Traffic Division (909) 387-8186**

99. **Street Improvement Plans.** As part of the street improvement plans, the applicant shall design a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 18 and the project access. It shall include the following:

- The north and south legs shall be designed with 36-foot roadways to accommodate two outbound lanes(one shared through/right turn lane and one left turn lane) and one inbound lane.
- Provide for pedestrian indications and crosswalks at the intersection.
- Provide 432.5 foot westbound and eastbound left turn lanes on State Route 18.
- Advance signal ahead beacons are required by Caltrans for both directions on State Route 18. **MM TRA-1**

*Mitigation Measures in italics
Non-standard conditions are bolded.*
LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT – Land Development Division – Roads (909) 387-8311

100. **Road Dedication.** The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from the Land Use Services Department the following dedications. These shall be submitted to the Land Use Services Department, located at 385 N. Arrowhead Ave, San Bernardino CA 92415-0187. Phone: (909) 387-8178.

State Highway 18 (Major Highway – 104’)

- **Road Dedication.** A 2 foot grant of easement is required to provide a half-width right-of-way of 52’ on both sides of the project.
- **Curb Return Dedication.** A 35 foot radius return grant of easement is required at the intersection of State Highway 18 and Blue Ridge Dr./Cumberland Dr.

Westerly Property Line (Portion of Blue Ridge Dr./Cumberland Dr)

- **Road Dedication.** A 20 foot grant of easement is required along the westerly property line from State Highway 18 northerly to the northerly boundary of Assessor’s Parcel Number 0332-211-02.

101. **Caltrans Review.** Obtain written verification from Caltrans regarding access requirements and permit requirements (if any) for work within Caltrans right-of-way.

PUBLIC HEALTH – Environmental Health Services [DEHS] (800) 442-2283

102. **Acoustical Checklist.** Submit preliminary acoustical information demonstrating that the proposed project maintains noise levels at or below San Bernardino County Noise Standard(s), San Bernardino Development Code Section 83.01.080. The purpose is to evaluate potential future on-site and/or adjacent off-site noise sources. If the preliminary information cannot demonstrate compliance to noise standards, a project specific acoustical analysis shall be required. Submit information/analysis to the DEHS for review and approval. For information and acoustical checklist, contact DEHS at 1-800-442-2283.

103. **Refuse.** All refuse generated at the premises shall at all times be stored in approved containers and shall be placed in a manner so that visual or other impacts, and environmental public health nuisances are minimized and complies with San Bernardino County Code Chapter 8, Section 33.081 et. seq. For information, please call DEHS/Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) at: 1-800-442-2283. The recycling center must maintain an amount of less than 10% residual amount of solid waste from the separated waste for reuse; a less than 1% putrescible wastes from the separated waste for reuse material received by weight. As long as the above conditions are met, the facility will not be subject to the Transfer/Processing Regulatory Requirements, pursuant to 14 CCR §17402.5. If the facility exceeds the above stated limitations, a Full Solid Waste Facility Permit will be required.
104. **Food Facilities.** Plans for food establishment(s) shall be reviewed and approved by DEHS. For more information, contact DEHS Plan Check. 26B012 CUP.

105. **Water Purveyor.** Water purveyor shall be Sky Forest Mutual Water Company or EHS approved. Applicant shall procure a verification letter from the water agency with jurisdiction. This letter shall state whether or not water connection and service shall be made available to the project by the water agency. This letter shall reference the Assessor’s Parcel Number. For projects with current active water connections, a copy of water bill with project address may suffice. For information, contact the Water Section at 1-800-442-2283. If an approved water company cannot serve the project, individual wells are authorized for each daughter parcel providing that County Development Code infrastructure requirements can be met. Conceptual plans, showing that wells and septic system locations meet setback requirements, may be required (§ 83.09.060).

106. **Regional Board Clearance.** Written clearance shall be obtained from the designated California Regional Water Quality Control Board and a copy forwarded to DEHS:

- (a) Santa Ana Region, 3737 Main Street, Suite 500, Riverside, CA 92501 (909) 782-4130
- (b) Lahontan Region, 14440 Civic Drive, Suite 200, Victorville, CA 92392 (760) 241-6583.

107. **Onsite Water Treatment System.** Method of sewage disposal shall be EHS approved onsite wastewater treatment system. If sewer connection and/or service are unavailable, Onsite Wastewater Treatment System(s) (OWTS) may then be allowed under the following conditions: A percolation report shall be submitted to DEHS for review and approval. If the percolation report cannot be approved, the project may require an alternative OWTS. For more information, contact DEHS Wastewater Section.

108. **Onsite Water Treatment System Certification.** An existing septic system (package treatment plant) can be used if applicant provides certification from a qualified professional (i.e., Professional Engineer (P.E.), Registered Environmental Health Specialist (REHS), C42 contractor, Certified Engineering Geologist (C.E.G.), etc.) that the system functions properly, meets code, and has the capacity required for the proposed project. Applicant shall provide documentation outlining methods used in determining function.

109. **Vectors.** All demolition of structures shall have a vector inspection prior to the issuance of any permits pertaining to demolition or destruction of any such premises.

**COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT – Community Safety Division (909) 386-8465**

110. **Fire Flow Test.** The submittal did not include a flow test report to establish whether the public water supply is capable of meeting the project fire flow demand. The applicant shall either produce a current flow test report from the water purveyor demonstrating that the fire flow demand is satisfied or the applicant shall install an approved fire sprinkler system. This requirement shall be completed prior to combination inspection by Building and Safety.

111. **Building Plans.** No less than three (3) complete sets of Building Plans shall be submitted to the Fire Department for review and approval.
112. **Access.** The development shall have a minimum of __2__ points of vehicular access. These are for fire/emergency equipment access and for evacuation routes. Standard 902.2.1

- **Single Story Road Access Width:**
  All buildings shall have access provided by approved roads, alleys and private drives with a minimum twenty six (26) foot unobstructed width and vertically to fourteen (14) feet six (6) inches in height. Other recognized standards may be more restrictive by requiring wider access provisions.

- **Multi-Story Road Access Width:**
  Buildings three (3) stories in height or more shall have a minimum access of thirty (30) feet unobstructed width and vertically to fourteen (14) feet six (6) inches in height. [F41]
PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION OR OCCUPANCY
The Following Shall Be Completed

LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT – Land Development Division – Drainage (909) 387-8311

113. Drainage Improvements. All required drainage improvements shall be completed by the applicant. The private registered engineer shall inspect improvements outside the County right-of-way and certify that these improvements have been completed according to the approved plans. Certification letter shall be submitted to Land Development.

114. WQMP Improvements. All required WQMP improvements shall be completed by the applicant, inspected and approved by County Public Works. An electronic file of the final and approved WQMP shall be submitted to Land Development Division, Drainage Section.

PUBLIC WORKS – Solid Waste Management (909) 386-8701

115. Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan (CDWMP) Part 2 – The developer shall complete SWMD’s CDWMP Part 2 for construction and demolition. This summary shall provide documentation of actual diversion of materials including but not limited to receipts, invoices or letters from diversion facilities or certification of reuse of materials on site. The CDWMP Part 2 shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of SWMD that demonstrates that the project has diverted from landfill disposal, material for reuse or recycling by a minimum of 50% of total weight or volume of all construction waste.

LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT – Building and Safety Division (909) 387-8311

116. Condition Compliance Release Sign-off. Prior to occupancy all Department/Division requirements and sign-offs shall be completed.

COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT – Community Safety Division (909) 386-8465

117. Commercial Addressing. Commercial and industrial developments of 100,000 sq. ft or less shall have the street address installed on the building with numbers that are a minimum six (6) inches in height and with a three quarter (3/4) inch stroke. The street address shall be visible from the street. During the hours of darkness, the numbers shall be electrically illuminated (internal or external). Where the building is two hundred (200) feet or more from the roadway, additional non-illuminated contrasting six (6) inch numbers shall be displayed at the property access entrances. Std. 901.4.4

118. Fire Extinguishers. Hand portable fire extinguishers are required. The location, type, and cabinet design shall be approved by the Fire Department.

119. Fire Lanes. The applicant shall submit a fire lane plan to the Fire Department for review and approval. Fire lane curbs shall be painted red. The "No Parking, Fire Lane" signs shall be installed on public/private roads in accordance with the approved plan. Standard 901.4 [F93]
120. **Fire Sprinkler-NFPA #13.** An automatic fire sprinkler system complying with NFPA Pamphlet #13 and the Fire Department standards is required. The applicant shall hire a Fire Department approved fire sprinkler contractor. The fire sprinkler contractor shall submit three (3) sets of detailed plans to the Fire Department for review and approval. The plans (minimum 1/8" scale) shall include hydraulic calculations and manufacture’s specification sheets. The contractor shall submit plans showing type of storage and use with the applicable protection system. The required fees shall be paid at the time of plan submittal. Standard 101.1 [F59] All areas over 5000 sq ft.

121. **Fire Alarm.** An automatic monitoring fire alarm system complying with the California Fire Code, NFPA and all applicable codes is required for 100 heads or more. The applicant shall hire a Fire Department approved fire alarm contractor. The fire alarm contractor shall submit three (3) sets of detailed plans to the Fire Department for review and approval. The required fees shall be paid at the time of plan submittal. Standard 1007.1.1FA. [F62] All areas over 5000 sq ft.

122. **Hood And Duct Suppression.** An automatic hood and duct fire extinguishing system is required. A Fire Department approved designer/installer shall submit three (3) sets of detailed plans (minimum 1/8" scale) with manufactures’ specification sheets to the Fire Department for review and approval. The required fees shall be paid at the time of plan submittal. [F65]

123. **Key Box.** An approved Fire Department key box is required. The key box shall be provided with a tamper switch and shall be monitored by a Fire Department approved central monitoring service. In commercial, industrial and multi-family complexes, all swing gates shall have an approved fire department Knox Lock. Standard 902.4 [F85]

124. **Override Switch.** Where an automatic electric security gate is used, an approved Fire Department override switch (Knox ®) is required. Standard 902.4 [F86]

125. **Additional Requirements.** In addition to the Fire requirements stated herein, other on-site and off-site improvements may be required which cannot be determined from tentative plans at this time and would have to be reviewed after more complete improvement plans and profiles have been submitted to this office. [F01A]

126. **Turnaround.** An approved turnaround shall be provided at the end of each roadway one hundred and fifty (150) feet or more in length. Cul-de-sac length shall not exceed six hundred (600) feet; all roadways shall not exceed a 12 % grade and have a minimum of forty five (45) foot radius for all turns. In the FS1, FS2 or FS-3 Fire Safety Overlay District areas, there are additional requirements. Standard 902.2.1

127. **Spill Prevention.** A comprehensive Spill Prevention and Response Plan shall be prepared that outlines the site-specific monitoring requirements and lists the BMPs necessary to prevent hazardous material spill and to contain and clean up a hazardous material spill, should one occur.
128. **CCRF/Occupancy.** Prior to occupancy/use, all Condition Compliance Release Forms (CCRF) shall be completed to the satisfaction of County Planning with appropriate authorizing signatures from each affected agency.

129. **Landscaping Installed.** All proposed landscaping, hardscape, exterior features (benches, walkways, bike racks etc), walls and fencing shall be installed as shown on the approved plans.

130. **Fees Paid.** Prior to final inspection by the Building and Safety Division and/or issuance of a Certificate of Conditional Use by the Planning Division, all fees required under actual cost job number P201500051 shall be paid in full.

131. **GHG – Installation/Implementation Standards.** The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning of evidence that all applicable GHG performance standards have been installed, implemented properly and that specified performance objectives are being met.

132. **Parking Lot Installed:** On-site parking and circulation requirements shall be installed, inspected and approved as being in compliance with SBCC Chapter 83.11. The appropriate parking plan shall be implemented based on the identified tenant, and stalls painted accordingly. The following shall be completed:
   a) **Surface.** All access drives shall be surfaced with all-weather paving as determined necessary by County Building and Safety to be adequate to accommodate long-term and extensive use by heavy hauling trucks.
   b) **Markings.** All circulation markings shall be clearly painted and permanently maintained, including arrows painted to indicate direction of traffic flow.
   c) **Crosswalks.** All on-site internal pedestrian crosswalks shall be delineated with a minimum 3” white or yellow painted line stripe. All pedestrian crossings in public right-of-way shall be per County Standards.
   d) **Stops.** All internal parking lot driveway intersections shall be installed with a painted stop limit line and shall have either a breakaway pole “STOP” sign and/or painted “STOP” lettering on the paving in front of the limit line.
   e) **Parking Space Striping.** All paved parking stalls shall be clearly striped and permanently maintained.
      - All paved non-truck parking stalls shall be striped with double/hairpin lines with the two lines being located an equal nine inches on either side of the stall sidelines. Each use shall have a minimum of four standard parking stalls (9’x19’), one loading zone (10’ x 20’ with 14’ clearance) and one van accessible space for the disabled (9’+ 8’ x 19’), plus one additional space for each company vehicle.
      - All paved truck parking stalls and docks shall have at a minimum a single six-inch wide line per each side of the stall.
   f) **Multi-modal.** All required multi-modal amenities (e.g. bike stands, motorcycle parking, mass transit access, carpool preferred parking, vanpool passenger pickup etc.) shall be installed per approved plans.
133. **Screening Installed.** All required screening and buffering measures shall be installed. All rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened from ground vistas. All trash enclosures shall be screened from public view and shall be double-bin capacity with a rainproof roof.

134. **Building Elevations.** The building construction shall be completed in conformance with the approved architectural elevations to the satisfaction of County Planning.

**LAND USE SERVICES DEPARTMENT – Land Development Division – Roads (909) 387-8311**

135. **LDD Requirements.** All LDD requirements shall be completed by the applicant prior to occupancy.

136. **Caltrans Approval.** Obtain approval as required from Caltrans for access requirements and improvements within Caltrans right-of-way.

**Department of Public Works-Traffic Division (909) 387-8186**

137. **Traffic Signal.** The applicant shall construct the traffic signal at State Route 18 and the project access at 100% cost to the applicant per the approved street improvement plans.

END OF CONDITIONS
Correspondence
May 12, 2017

Paul Smith, Chairman
Planning Commission
County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Dept -Planning Division
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Subject: SkyPark at Santa’s Village; Project No. P201500051

Dear Chairman Smith and Planning Commissioners,

A detailed letter that the San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society (Audubon) submitted as our critique of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the SkyPark Project was not included in the Final EIR released to the public on May 8. Therefore, per CEQA section 15088, Evaluation of and Response to Comments, and other portions of the law the FEIR is not complete and should not have been issued. On this basis Audubon objects to the undue rushing of the review process that is scheduled for a Planning Commission hearing May 18, just 10 days after the incomplete document was inappropriately released.

In a brief email explanation by the project planner sent to Audubon, the following unsatisfactory method for dealing with the mistake was indicated as the County’s way of resolving the matter:

The Audubon comment letter will be provided to the Planning Commission and posted for public review with the Planning Commission staff report. Please note that the Planning Commission role in the review of this project will be to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors is the review authority for certification of the EIR and for a decision on the project. In advance of the public hearing by the Board of Supervisors, the FEIR will be amended to include the Audubon letter with a comprehensive response. (Note: the full text of Audubon’s email communication is appended at the end.)

We find this solution to be unsatisfactory, and we believe the Planning Commission should also. It suggests that neither the public nor the Planning Commission have a right to have a properly completed and fully completed FEIR prior to the start of the official review process. Because the Planning Department failed to include the public comments submitted by Audubon into the DEIR prior to releasing the document, the only legitimate remedy is a full and complete correction of the mistake before any formal review process commences. After the mistake is rectified, the corrected document ought to be re-released with a new period for public review (hopefully longer than 10 days) prior to commencing any official review process with the Planning Commission. Because Audubon has conscientiously and diligently participated in the public review process of County Projects for over 25 years, we believe we deserve the right to have our comments treated seriously. It is not sufficient to simply tack them on to the Staff Report.

The Planning Commission also should warrant greater respect than having its review process casually dismissed as irrelevant. The implication of the Planning Department’s intent to delay the correction of the FEIR until after the Planning Commission Hearing strongly suggests that either 1) the Planning Commission is expected to automatically rubberstamp whatever the Planning Department recommends, or 2) the Planning Commission’s input is altogether insignificant and doesn’t warrant
the respect or effort to provide a complete and fully-vetted documentation relevant to the matter at hand. Either conclusion greatly undercuts the County’s credibility.

Also, because the Audubon letter is simply being included directly into the Staff Report without the benefit of thorough and thoughtful analysis by planning staff and the EIR consultants, the commissioners are deprived of the advantage of the more professional review. In the short timeframe allowed they cannot be expected to adequately read and fully evaluate it themselves.

Audubon has a track record of submitting important comments on critical issues that are factually-based, legally sound, and generally held up in court. We regard the public comment process to be the earliest opportunity to provide serious and constructive input to both the project applicant and the county decision makers. We like to think our comments are taken seriously.

In the most significant prior court case filed by Audubon (in concert with other reputable organizations), i.e. the Hawarden case, where substantive comments were ignored by County decision makers, the court sternly chided the County for its negligent and irresponsible disregard of both its own policies and CEQA procedure. Had Audubon’s comments been taken seriously, the County would have saved itself and the applicant both considerable time and enormous expense by actually correcting the flaws that were pointed out rather than ignoring them.

For these reasons, it’s an especially disturbing oversight in the case of the SkyPark FEIR that Audubon’s comments have been excluded altogether. Omission of these comments from the FEIR means that the Planning Commission does not have an accurate, complete or valid document to base its decision upon. It also denies the public from having all the relevant facts prior to the May 18 hearing.

Since the official Audubon letter is some 21 pages long, we will provide a short executive summary here, emphasizing again that in the similar Hawarden case on property adjacent to Santa’s Village, Audubon’s analysis proved to be more accurate than either the EIR consultants/Planning Department or the County Counsel. What concerns us most is:

1). For reasons unknown, a zoning change is being proposed for the SkyPark Project. Unknown, because no reason was disclosed in the DEIR. Relevant information, factors and details about why a zone change is deemed necessary ought to have been provided. That information constitutes a highly critical component of the project, one that ought to be made available in advance for public review and comment. The fact that this information was not provided means that the DEIR has not fulfilled one of its primary obligations.

2). The DEIR failed to do an Alternatives Analysis. The Alternatives Analysis is a cornerstone of CEQA whereby the applicant and consultants look at ways to avoid or minimize significant impacts that have been identified in the DEIR, while at the same time still meeting many of its underlying purposes of the project. It is meant to be a good faith exercise in self restraint and curtailing potential overreach that results in excessive adverse impacts.

The SkyPark DEIR largely ignores this fundamental part of CEQA. There is only a perfunctory discussion in speculating about what a hypothetically different developer might do at the site, a discussion that’s completely extraneous to the purpose of this section. Other than the baseline “No Project” alternative, there is no viable alternative provided. It is standard procedure to introduce at least one or two “reduced” project alternatives that would avoid certain significant impacts revealed in the DEIR. This omission stands out as a major flaw in the document, if it is not corrected.

3). The DEIR contains a fraudulent analysis of the Cumberland Road policy in the County General Plan, asserting a false and unsubstantiated claim that the policy pertains only to residential
development. There is no evidence to back up that claim, and it contradicts the 2008 court ruling made in the Hawarden case.

Based on this deceptive claim in the DEIR, planning staff is proposing that the County legislate around the existing policy to explicitly and financially benefit the project applicant at the detriment of two other adjacent property owners. The Cumberland Road policy has been in effect for over for over 25 years and is one that the court recognized to be of paramount public safety concern. A General Plan Amendment to change the Cumberland Road policy to exclusively favor the current applicant is being inappropriately tied into an altogether separate General Plan Amendment for changing the zoning of the project (an action for which the underlying reason has not been disclosed or properly explained in the DEIR for the public review). The ethical ramifications of overt legislative favoritism solely to the benefit of the project proponent is highly disturbing in a county with a tarnished reputation and a less than honorable record of prior malpractice of this kind. This misguided amendment effectively renders the completion of Cumberland Road null and void, an action that cannot be seen as advancing the public interest. An action as questionable and irresponsible as the proposed amendment would likely warrant examination by the court system.

4). Vital landscape linkages for wildlife movement and habitat protection for critical species are not given adequate focus in the DEIR for sufficient avoidance of significant impacts. The San Bernardino flying squirrel, the California spotted owl and the southern rubber boa all require fewer trails and less intensive encroachment into their critical habitat areas than the DEIR has acknowledged or provided for. Otherwise the project will need to consider the purchase of offsite replacement habitat to balance this problem.

The fact is that some 2,000 acres of private forestlands around Lake Arrowhead were converted into high density subdivisions in the 1960s and built-out during the subsequent 30 years without an iota of deference to National Forest, wildlife, scenic or ecological values has resulted in the Santa’s Village property becoming all the more critical for wildlife. Past disregard, negligence and maximized urbanization of the once pristine natural resources in the Arrowhead area has thereby increased the ecological and wildlife significance of Henck’s Meadow and the remaining forest open space at the Santa’s Village property, especially the County-designated Wildlife Corridor #22 that runs through the heart of the SkyPark project and somehow need to allow animals to safely cross the proposed highway expansion. These are all significant natural resources that state guidelines and county policies require to be protected to a much greater extent than the proposed SkyPark Project has adequately acknowledged thus far.

The County’s track record of downplaying environmental concerns supported by its own policies has proven to be a discouraging disappointment in the past, especially inside a National Forest, where one might expect these values to merit greater precedence.

5). The severe wildfire danger of the Mountain Region seems to have fallen off the radar at the Planning Department now that it’s been about 10 years since we last had a major outbreak. However, the actual fact remains that the Mountain Region is already dangerously overbuilt, and another large-scale out-of-control fire will inevitably occur again sometime in the future whenever extreme winds converge with an ignition source at the driest time of year. Substandard roads and insufficient evacuation routes will intensify the hazard.

In 2003 the three primary roads out of Lake Arrowhead became gridlocked bottlenecks as evacuees tried to creep up to Highway 18 to escape a major wildfire. Highway 18 was also gridlocked. In a worst case scenario, SkyPark would compound the problem with hundreds of cars of projected visiting tourists also crowding onto Highway 18 plus up to 74 RVs from the RV park. Also SkyPark will guarantee that Cumberland Road will never get built as a necessary additional evacuation route.
It is highly troubling to Audubon that County decision makers will be advised on this matter solely by the County Fire Department, an agency whose mission does not include wildland fire defense but only urban-style structure protection. Without Forest Service or CalFire input, the County will be making a decision to approve the RV park and the excessive parking capacity without a realistic concept of the mountain-wide fire danger. Previously it was shocking that Supervisors ignored citizen concerns on the Hawarden Project back in 2005, when frightening memories of the harrowing evacuation experience were still fresh in the minds of all those who were stuck in the gridlock. Now that fire is a distant memory, it is less surprising that the DEIR does not give this issue the serious credence it warrants, but it is still an issue that deserves much greater attention in the context of curtailing excessive development than it is getting.

In conclusion, we hope that these comments will be taken by the Planning Commission as evidence that the formal review of the SkyPark project is being unduly rushed and that there are still many considerations that make it premature to approve the project. The FEIR should be formally re-issued with Audubon’s comments correctly included and given the thorough and reasonable assessment and response by the preparers of the FEIR that the comments warrant. We also believe that, given the reasons stated above and in more detail in Audubon’s original letter, that the Draft EIR needs to be further corrected to include the essential information that was left out and then be recirculated to the public in order to satisfy its true function. The information that has been left out, such as the Alternatives Analysis for example, is of critical significance to the public’s and decision-makers understanding of the project. It should not be cavalierly dismissed or disregarded. Once these corrections are made, the Project Proposal and the Final EIR will be in a much more appropriate position for a proper and formal review by the County.

Thank you for your attention to these comments.

Respectfully,

Drew Feldman  
Conservation Chair

cc. Lewis Murray, Field Representative for Supervisor Janice Rutherford  
Dave Barrie, Chair of Mountains Group of Sierra Club  
Ilene Anderson, Center for Biological Diversity

ADDENDUM

Email Correspondence between Audubon Conservation Chair, Drew Feldmann, and County Senior Planner for the SkyPark Project, Kevin White
Mr. White,

Please see the attached comments. The document is password-protected, but only for modifications. You should be able to open it as read-only.

Please confirm that you received this email and were able to open the attachment.

Thank you.

Drew Feldmann
Conservation Chair
San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society

Please see the Link to the Final EIR for SkyPark which includes the responses to comments.

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-3067
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Hello Kevin,

Thanks for the email note and link to the Final EIR for the SkyPark Project. However, it appears that Audubon's comments are not included in the Final EIR. This is a serious matter, since Audubon raised several significant issues about the adequacy of key sections of the DEIR. The absence of our comments means that the Final EIR cannot be considered complete.
Please let us know as soon as possible how the County plans to correct this oversight.

Thank you for your attention.

From: White, Kevin - LUS <Kevin.White@lus.sbcounty.gov>
To: 'Drew Feldmann' <drewf3@verizon.net>
Cc: davegoodward <davegoodward@earthlink.net>; Rahhal, Terri <Terri.Rahhal@lus.sbcounty.gov>
Sent: Tue, May 9, 2017 5:02 pm
Subject: RE: Audubon Comments on SkyPark Project

Mr. Feldmann,

Thank you for your email bringing this matter to our attention. We apologize for the inadvertent omission of the San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society (Audubon) letter in the FEIR. County Staff along with our consultant team has reviewed the correspondence and we are in the process of preparing a response to the letter. As you know, the project is scheduled to be heard by the County Planning Commission on May 18, 2017. At that time staff will present an overview of the project, the environmental analysis and the associated comments and responses. The Audubon comment letter will be provided to the Planning Commission and posted for public review with the Planning Commission staff report. Please note that the Planning Commission role in the review of this project will be to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors is the review authority for certification of the EIR and for a decision on the project. In advance of the public hearing by the Board of Supervisors, the FEIR will be amended to include the Audubon letter with a comprehensive response.

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-3067
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.
July 22, 2016

Kevin White, Project Planner
Planning Division
County of San Bernardino Land Use Services
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

By e-mail to: Kevin.White@lus.sbcounty.gov

SUBJECT: SkyPark Santa’s Village LLC, Project No. P201500051/CF; Draft Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 3015091001 for a Conditional Use Permit to re-establish an Outdoor Commercial Entertainment Center which includes an Amusement Park, Campground, Meadow/Wetland Rehabilitation, Restaurants, Bar, Wedding & Reception Facility, Retail, Trails, Recreational Activities and other Accessory Uses on 152.92 Acres.

1) The Project includes a General Plan Amendment to change the official Land Use District from Lake Arrowhead/Special Development-Residential (LA/SD-Res) and Lake Arrowhead/Single Residential-14,000 square foot minimum lot size (LA/RS-14M) to Lake Arrowhead/ Rural Commercial (LACR) on 152.92 acres.

2) The Project also includes a 2nd amendment to the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan (Policy LA/Cl 1.14) and the Circulation Element of the County of San Bernardino General Plan to alter the text from a reference to land use development in general to a more limited reference solely to “residential subdivision,” thereby exempting SkyPark from compliance with the policy.

Dear Mr. White,

The San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society (“Audubon”) presents the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) referenced above for the SkyPark development project proposed at the former site of Santa’s Village.

San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society is the local chapter of the National Audubon Society and represents about 2000 members in the greater Inland Empire area. A key element of our mission is protecting habitat for birds and other wildlife. We regard the San Bernardino National Forest and adjacent mountain areas as one of the region’s most outstanding public assets. It is a premier mountain environment that offers excellent habitat for a remarkable range of wildlife as well as a place to enjoy beauty, serenity and recreation in a natural forest setting. Whenever County actions are proposed that have a potential to diminish these unique values, our members count upon Audubon’s leadership to speak out on their behalf and in the best interest of the natural environment. The following comments outline our observations and concerns regarding the SkyPark DEIR. The particular topics addressed below focus on:

1. The failure of the DEIR to disclose a tangible and specific reason why the proposed General Plan Amendment to change the project’s land use designation is deemed necessary;
2. An assessment of the mistaken basis for proposing a second General Plan Amendment to nullify the existing Lake Arrowhead Community Plan policy to complete a half mile of the Cumberland Drive evacuation route from Cedar Ridge to State Highway 18 at SkyPark;
3. The DEIR’s unwarranted disregard of County-designated Wildlife Corridor #22
4. Inadequate measures to protect the threatened southern rubber boa and the California spotted owl
5. Concerns about evacuation routes and extreme fire hazard in the San Bernardino Mountains as related to SkyPark; and
6. The failure to provide an adequate Alternative Projects analysis.
1. No Explanation Provided for a Change in SkyPark’s Land Use Zoning

The proposed Zoning Change might quite likely not be in the public interest or compatible with surrounding land use, where over 50 percent of adjacent land use is USFS & Boy Scout large acreage open space. On no side of the SkyPark property is there any commercial zoning designation. However, the proposed zoning change cannot be adequately evaluated because the DEIR fails to state why it is even considered necessary.

On page 4.10-13 (Land Use) the DEIR states: “The LA/SD-RES Land Use District allows for the combination of residential, commercial, and/or manufacturing activities that maximizes the utilization of natural as well as man-made resources.” Commercial activity is clearly allowed within the existing zoning designation, which acknowledges the historical use of the site for the Santa’s Village commercial activity.

The DEIR’s cursory explanation for the zone change (also on page 4.10-13) does not cite any particular reason why the zone change is necessary. The explanation given states:

The (LA/CR) Land Use District provides sites in rural areas where a range of commercial services intermixed with residential uses can be established which are limited in scope and intensity and meet the need of the remote population and the traveling public. The LA/CR designation more accurately reflects the existing development of the site as well as the proposed amenities and activities for the site. The LA/CR designation is compatible with the surrounding community as the surrounding community is largely rural residential with low intensity commercial along SR-18 in Sky Forest and a mix of residential and commercial in Lake Arrowhead.

The above explanation begs the question of HOW is “a range of commercial services intermixed with residential uses” (i.e. the LA/CR zone) any different from allowing for a combination of residential and commercial activities in the existing LA/SD-RES zone?

It appears that some key relevant fact related to the zone change has been left out of the DEIR. What does it mean for the DEIR to say the zone change “more accurately reflects the existing development of the site as well as the proposed amenities and activities”? The statement is vague, obscure, and offers no clarification as to why a zone change has been proposed. If there is some relevant reason why a zone change is needed which has not been revealed in the DEIR, then the DEIR needs to be re-circulated in order to disclose the actual reason for the change so that the public can review and provide input on whatever that particular reason might be.

Below are the criteria for a General Plan Amendment that changes an existing land use zoning designation:

86.12.060 Findings and Decision

An amendment to the General Plan, this Development Code, a Community Plan, or an Area Plan may be approved only if all of the following findings are made, as applicable to the type of amendment.

(a) Findings for General Plan, Community Plan, or Area Plan amendments.

(2) If the General Plan amendment proposes to change a land use zoning designation from one zone to another, the Board shall first make the two findings above plus all of the following additional findings:

(A) The proposed land use zoning district change is in the public interest, there will be a community benefit, and other existing and allowed uses will not be compromised;

(B) The proposed land use zoning district change will provide a reasonable and logical extension of the existing land use pattern in the surrounding area;
(C) The proposed land use zoning district change does not conflict with provisions of this Development Code;

(D) The proposed land use zoning district change will not have a substantial adverse effect on surrounding property; and

(E) The affected site is physically suitable in terms of design, location, shape, size, operating characteristics, and the provision of public and emergency vehicle (e.g., fire and medical) access and public services and utilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, potable water, schools, solid waste collection and disposal, storm drainage, wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal, etc.), to ensure that the proposed or anticipated uses and/or development would not endanger, jeopardize, or otherwise constitute a hazard to the property or improvements in the vicinity in which the property is located.

Audubon cannot determine from the inadequate information provided so far whether the proposed General Plan Amendment is appropriate or not. A supplement to the DEIR is needed in order to provide the full disclosure as to why the change is being applied to the site.

2. General Plan Amendment to Exempt Applicant from Cumberland Drive Completion

The proposed SkyPark Project includes a General Plan Amendment to re-write and thus effectively nullify the policy to complete Cumberland Drive. The proposed amendment to the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan Policy LA/CI 1.14 and the Circulation Element of the County of San Bernardino General Plan misleadingly claims to provide additional clarification and specificity for implementation while ostensibly retaining the initial intent of the policy. The text of the existing policy and the proposed change are quoted below:

Policy LA/CI 1.14 is currently in the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan as:

Complete Cumberland Road from Cedar Glen to State Highway 18 near Santa’s Village as a condition of development of the adjacent area and ensure protection of the character of the surrounding area by the following:

A. Require that Cumberland Road be designated as a County Scenic Route.

B. Require that Cumberland Road be used primarily for residential and emergency traffic.

C. Prohibit trucks that exceed 5 tons and vehicles pulling large trailers.

The proposed amendment to this policy is identified using underline for new text and strikethrough for removed text as follows:

Complete Cumberland Road from Cedar Glen to State Highway 18 near Santa’s Village as a condition of development of the adjacent area Require the design and construction of the extension of Cumberland Drive from Cedar Glen to State Highway 18 as a condition of development of any new residential subdivision extending from Cumberland Drive, Blue Ridge Drive, or Greenbriar Drive and ensure protection of the character of the surrounding area by the following:

A. Require that Cumberland Road be designated as a County Scenic Route.

B. Require that Cumberland Road be used primarily for residential and emergency traffic.

C. Prohibit trucks that exceed 5 tons and vehicles pulling large trailers.

The proposed amendment to the Circulation Element is to change the designation of Cumberland Drive from Mountain Secondary to Local Road (40-foot right-of-way). Cumberland Drive, as currently identified as a Secondary Street in Figure CI-2, Major Roads and Freeways – Mountain
Region of the Circulation Element, would be removed from this figure as local streets are not shown on it.

Section 3.4 (Proposed Project) of the DEIR claims on Pg 3.0-24: "An amendment to the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan Policy LA/CI 1.14 is proposed to provide additional clarification and specificity for implementation while retaining the initial intent of the policy." On page 4.10-15 (Land Use) the DEIR further states: "The intent of the existing Lake Arrowhead Community Plan Policy LA/CI 1.14 is to ensure that any new development projects that will increase the number of residents in the Cedar Glen/Sky Forest area, will have adequate access to evacuation routes, including SR-173 and SR-18, in the event of a fire or other emergency."

Although the authoritative-seeming assertions made above are written to sound legitimate, they completely lack any supportive evidence to back them up. The DEIR has no basis to know the underlying "intent" of the existing Cumberland Drive Policy or to assert that the policy specifically refers to "any new development projects that will increase the number of residents." Instead the claim of knowing the intent of the policy and clarifying its meaning is nothing more than a subjective expression of what clearly is the preferred interpretation by the applicant and the SkyPark Project itself. The DEIR provides nothing substantial to support this claim besides some faintly plausible speculation (masquerading as a statement fact) as to why the policy might potentially pertain to only residential development, but the explanation remains only speculation and definitely is not valid evidence by any measure.

This same tactic of re-interpreting the Cumberland Drive policy in favor of the developer was employed on the adjacent property by the Hawarden Development Company for its proposed housing project in 2005. That tactic was rejected by both San Bernardino County Superior Court and three appellate court judges. There is no evidence that the policy pertains only to residential development. It states unambiguously that any "development" in the area (un-restricted by any particular type of development) must result in the completion of the road. Cumberland Drive is a vital evacuation route for the overdeveloped community of Lake Arrowhead. (Why wait for more residents, when it is obvious that Lake Arrowhead already has a critical need for Cumberland Drive as an evacuation route).

At the Board of Supervisors’ Hearing in 2005, when a similar tactic was used to evade the Cumberland Drive Policy, a score of Sky Forest residents loudly objected and cited their own harrowing experience in trying to evacuate on gridlocked Kuffle Canyon Road during the major “Old Fire” of October 2003. These residents were shamefully ignored by chairman Bill Postmus and colleagues Paul Biane and Gary Ovitt, while Dennis Hansberger chided them by saying they should move off the mountain if they’re so afraid of fire. To further ignore the inadequacy of mountain-wide evacuation in a potential worst case scenario of wildfire would be utterly irresponsible negligence. This critical evacuation route is only a half mile short of completion. It should be completed per the true intent of the County Plan.

The applicant and the DEIR consultants are being sly and disingenuous in an effort to disguise a deliberate effort to evade their share of the financial responsibility for guaranteeing the future public safety of the area. The county would be jeopardizing an already dangerous situation by adopting an amendment that is clearly not in the public interest, but is expressly designed to provide direct financial relief and a special favor to the commercial interests of the project proponents. To sneak this amendment past the public on false pretenses would be a serious miscarriage of the county’s basic common welfare responsibility. As noted above a previous effort to do so was resoundingly rejected at both the County Superior Court level and at appellate court.

It is clear from the guidelines cited below that a General Plan Amendment must “not be detrimental to the public interest” as often happens when it is prompted by the private interests of a particular developer.
Criteria for a General Plan Amendment

86.12.060 Findings and Decision

An amendment to the General Plan, this Development Code, a Community Plan, or an Area Plan may be approved only if all of the following findings are made, as applicable to the type of amendment.

(a) Findings for General Plan, Community Plan, or Area Plan amendments.

(1) If the amendment pertains only to changing a portion of the text of the plan, the Board shall first make both of the following findings:

(A) The proposed amendment is internally consistent with all other provisions of the respective plan, the General Plan or an applicable specific plan; and

(B) The proposed amendment would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the County.

Unfairly shifting the burden of completing the evacuation route onto the two remaining neighbor parcels (also affected by the Cumberland Drive policy) simply delays and diminishes the likelihood of the road ever being completed.

3. Lack of Regard for a Major Wildlife Corridor

Santa’s Village is no longer a small part of a much larger forest as it was in the days of its establishment. Instead it is now one of the only remaining significant natural forest habitats left in the greater Lake Arrowhead area. It features one of the most viable landscape linkages in a highly critical and major wildlife dispersal corridor. However, the DEIR appears to be generally dismissive of wildlife corridor and dispersal issues by concluding that wildlife can simply go around project. It further fails to address the potential impediments of perimeter fencing.

The addition of left turn lanes on Highway 18 will substantially widen part of the roadway along SkyPark making it more difficult for wildlife to cross. This is a significant factor that has not been addressed in any meaningful way. For nearly twenty years deer and bear have used Santa’s Village frontage on Highway 18 as a favored crossing area. This fact is attested by the many sightings along this route and also unfortunately by the numerous casualties, when the animals are struck by vehicles.

The two most frequented crossings appear to be at the hairpin curve on Highway 18 at the east end of Santa’s Village, where CalTrans has already posted Deer Crossing signs, and at the west end of the park, where the original entrance is located. The diagonally trending west boundary of Santa’s Village intersects the highway at this point. This west boundary along Hooks Creek is a prime corridor for bear and deer and smaller animals. The speed limit along the highway at this juncture should be reduced to 35 mph to conform to the recent reduction directly to the west of Santa’s Village in Sky Forest. It would also be beneficial to have Wildlife Crossing signs at this spot on the highway similar to the ones at the hairpin curve. Basic measures such as these, acknowledging these points, can be beneficial in a meaningful way.

The conservation measure below from the General Plan indicates that the accommodation and protection of wildlife is a definite objective and concern in the county’s overall policies.

CO 2.4. All discretionary approvals requiring mitigation measures for impacts to biological resources will include the condition that the mitigation measures be monitored and modified, if necessary, unless a finding is made that such monitoring is not feasible.
Programs

4. The County shall require all new roadways, roadway expansion, and utility installation within the wildlife corridors identified in the Open Space and Biological Resource Overlays to provide suitable wildlife crossings for affected wildlife. Design will include measures to reduce or prevent habitat fragmentation and provide wildlife a means of safe egress through respective foraging and breeding habitats. A qualified biologist will assist with the design and implementation of wildlife crossing including culverts, overcrossings, undercrossings, and fencing.

Hooks Creek is a wildlife magnet. With the intended restoration and stream bank protection outlined in the Meadow Conservation Plan and the stream's source at the parking lot, there should be provision for wildlife to readily proceed southward across the highway to access the front country of the National Forest. Also ponds (both the existing one and the three newly-planned ponds) will draw wildlife.

The DEIR acknowledges only the fact that the project site “is located within an area designated simply as ‘Dispersion Corridor’” in the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan. No reference is made to it being one of the Major Wildlife Corridors identified in the San Bernardino County General Plan Overlay Maps, specifically Wildlife Corridor 22. Thus the DEIR tends to undervalue the significance of the Santa’s Village site in facilitating wildlife movement and dispersal through this corridor.

To better emphasize the value the county has placed on the ability of wildlife to disperse freely across its range, it is helpful to look back at the 1989 County General Plan, which provides more detail on the origin of the county’s policies. The concept of the numbered zones, which originated with the 1989 plan, is quoted below from that document.

Wildlife Corridor Zones: These indicate the general locations of areas within which major wildlife corridors should be provided. The actual size and location of these corridors will need to be determined based on future detailed study. The Resources Overlay identifies only MAJOR wildlife corridors. It is expected that application of policies in this Open Space Element will result in the establishment of major and minor wildlife corridors throughout the County.

The county clearly intended that additional wildlife corridors be identified and added to the Resources Overlay, refining and enhancing what is meant to be a starting point. Insofar as only “major” corridors have thus far been designated, these certainly should not be impaired or characterized as “less than significant,” as has been the tendency of most environmental impact reports for the mountain area in the past 20 years, including the SkyPark DEIR.

As far back as 1989 the General Plan notes that “wildlife has been placed in increasing conflict” with urban encroachment in the mountain region. The fact that the Wildhaven Center for rescue of injured wildlife needed to be established in the Lake Arrowhead area and continually treats large numbers of animals attests to the adverse impact that local development inflict on a wide range of forest species. The SkyPark project should not be downplaying an existing major wildlife corridor without any mitigation and thus further limiting wildlife movement in an area long deemed as significant by the county. It should not be dismissed as “less than significant.”

The 1989 County General Plan in its Policies and Actions for Biological Resources clearly addressed common species as well as rare and listed species, stating in Policy/Action B-4:

Because the quality of life is related to the variety and abundance of all species, commonly occurring species shall be conserved. The following policies shall be incorporated into the conditions of approval for all proposed discretionary land use proposals....
The current 2007 General Plan carried over these basic policies in various ongoing objectives quoted below:

**CO-2** The county will maintain and enhance biological diversity and healthy ecosystems throughout the county.

**CO-2.1** The county will coordinate with state and federal agencies and departments to ensure that their programs to preserve rare and endangered species and protect areas of special habitat value, as well as conserve populations and habitats of commonly occurring species, are reflected in reviews and approvals of development programs.

**M/OS-1** Ensure the preservation and proper management of National Forest lands within the Mountain Region to maintain the alpine character of the region.

**M/OS-2** Improve and preserve open space corridors throughout the Mountain Region.

**M/OS-2.2** Use open space corridors to link natural areas.

Major Wildlife Corridors, such as Wildlife Corridor 22, which links the City Creek watershed in the south front country with the Deep Creek watershed in the north, are critical to “maintain and enhance biological diversity and healthy ecosystems.” They are essential for the proper management of National Forest lands within the mountain region. In order to follow the General Plan and “improve and preserve” Wildlife Corridor 22, the dismissive analysis in the DEIR that undervalues the true significance should be reassessed.

In view of the emphasis given to wildlife values in county policies, Audubon believes it is inappropriate for the DEIR to unduly downplay the importance of a major Wildlife Corridor.

On page 4.4-25 the DEIR cites certain goals and policies from the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan, of which the following relate to wildlife protection:

**Goal LA/CO 1** Preserve the unique environmental features of Lake Arrowhead including native wildlife, vegetation, and scenic vistas.

**Policies:**

**LA/CO 1.1** The following areas are recognized as important open space areas that provide for wildlife movement and other important linkage values. Projects shall be designed to minimize impacts to these corridors.

a. Grass Valley Creek Wildlife Corridor

b. Strawberry Creek Wildlife Corridor

c. Dispersion Corridor- between Lake Arrowhead and Running Springs and south of Highway 18.

**LA/CO 1.4** Work with Federal, State and local agencies to protect significant wildlife corridors.

We note that the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan specifies “minimizing impacts,” while the broader General Plan guidelines prescribe “enhancing biological diversity” and “improving” open space corridors, which we assert should be prevailing approach inside a National Forest.

The Lake Arrowhead Community policies are somehow translated into “Thresholds of Significance” by the DEIR, which are then analyzed on page 4.4-49 as to whether they would have a significant adverse impact on biological resources. The assessment below concludes that no significant impact results:
Threshold: Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Impact 4.4-4 Implementation of the Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. There would be less than significant impacts.

The proposed improvements will largely be confined to existing developed/disturbed areas. The undeveloped forest surrounding the existing buildings and infrastructure has the potential to support the movement of mule deer, bobcat, coyote, and black bear through and around the site. Wildlife movement through these areas will be impeded by project-related disturbance, particularly use of hiking and riding trails. However, the northern half of the project site will remain generally undisturbed and should continue to provide relatively unimpeded movement opportunities for wildlife. As a result, the project site and the surrounding open spaces will continue to provide opportunities for local wildlife movement, and has the potential to function as a corridor for highly mobile wildlife species.

This conclusion notably does not address how wildlife gets across the highway or offer any actions that might "improve" the wildlife corridor. Neither does it address the Lake Arrowhead Community Plan Police CO 1.4: “Work with Federal, State and local agencies to protect significant wildlife corridors.”

This DEIR’s less than significant conclusion is based on narrowing the definition of a wildlife corridor, ignoring key policies in the General Plan for both enhancing biological diversity and improving wildlife movement, while neglecting to conduct any actual studies of wildlife movement.

A viewing of aerial photographs and topographic maps plus a familiarity of the project site and its immediate surroundings indicate that Santa’s Village is the most natural and assessable route in the westerly portion of Wildlife Corridor 22 for wildlife to travel from the Deep Creek watershed to the front country, which includes crossing Highway 18. Directly east of the site are various obstacles like steep drop-offs south of Highway 18 and the Robinson cement plant and the Heaps Peak Transfer Station on the north side of the highway. Additionally, the single safest path for animals crossing Highway 18 is directly in line with the SkyPark project site.

Audubon would like to see SkyPark put more focus on improving the ability of wildlife to move through the site, to avoid fencing that would obstruct such movement and to look for ways that would make the crossing of Highway 18 more accessible and safer. The casual downplaying of the value of a major wildlife corridor is disappointing when so much of the rest of Lake Arrowhead has already incorporated so many impediments to wildlife movement that their lives are continually in jeopardy.

4. Inadequate Protections for Southern Rubber Boa and California Spotted Owl

Audubon biologist David Goodward has reviewed the SkyPark project’s Habitat Assessment and has prepared more extensive comments on the biological aspects of the project in a separate letter that is attached as an addendum at the end of this set of comments.

His conclusions indicate that the delineation of suitable habitat for SRB (shown in Exhibit 9), for San Bernardino flying squirrel (shown in Exhibit 10) and California spotted owl (shown in Exhibit 11) have each underestimated the scope of suitable habitat. There also appears to be a conflict between Mitigation
Measure—Bio 18, which places a 400-meter protective zone around the spotted owl nest adjacent to the project and the siting of several trails within that range. 400 meters is roughly equivalent to a quarter of a mile. It appears that an existing access road, a proposed trail and two existing tracks (a single and double) encroach within that range, which the mitigation measure places off-limits for all activity. However, Audubon wishes to underscore the fact that the full range of suitable habitat appears to have been underestimated.

The DEIR identifies the following threshold of project impact on critical species on page 4.4-28 of the Biological Resources section followed by the conclusion that all impacts are relieved by mitigation:

**Threshold: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Impact 4.4-1 Implementation of the Project may have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This impact would be potentially significant impact without mitigation incorporated.

Audubon believe that it is premature to make the conclusion that impacts are resolved by the current mitigation. In David Goodward’s comments it is pointed that there are various gaps and flaws in the analysis. He is recommending that key adjustments to habitat assessments be made, that further data is necessary to substantiate certain conclusions and that this section of the DEIR be re-circulated for final public input.

There is also a question as to whether the impacts of so-called “existing” roads, tracks and trails were included in the overall analysis. If not, they should be, insofar as the new uses proposed will greatly increase the level of activity. When an Audubon member walked the Santa’s Village site prior to its purchase by the current owner, there was no evidence of such extensive trail routes as are indicated as already existing on Exhibit 5. Were these possibly improved and upgraded prior to the biological studies and Habitat Assessment?

5. Extreme Fire Danger and Inadequate Evacuation Routes

The DEIR accurately characterizes the extreme wildfire hazard of the San Bernardino Mountains, an environment designed by nature to burn on an annually basis. The prospect of forceful Santa Ana winds occurring in the driest time of year in conjunction with fire greatly increases the overall danger. The steep and rugged terrain make fire fighting difficult, and the wildland-urban mix of lots of residences and businesses inside the forest further compounds the challenge. In the last 20 years there have been several large destructive fires that destroyed hundreds of structures. The overdevelopment of the mountain environment makes it virtually impossible to avoid loss of structures and sometimes lives in the worst case incidents of wind and wildfire, a fact acknowledged in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report for the County’s 2007 General Plan.

The Programmatic EIR for the county’s 2007 General Plan states that: “Development in high fire hazard areas will be subject to periodic wildland fires that occur in these areas.” It is further recognized that “structures may be damaged or destroyed during major wildland fire conflagrations” and that “People occupying these structures during a wildland fire will also be subject to injury or death.” It is noted that: “The majority of catastrophic wildland fires occur in the mountain region and impact both mountain and foothill communities.”
In regard to these facts, the county’s Programmatic EIR for the General Plan concludes that: “Despite the imposition of certain mitigation measures presented in Section 4 below, the impact cannot be fully mitigated to a level below significance.” In other words the county itself has previously concluded that wildland fire hazard in the mountain area is an unavoidable significant impact.

However, what is not quite so readily admitted is that the evacuation routes off the mountain are quite likely to be severely inadequate in a worst case scenario. The Board of Supervisors commissioned a study in 2012, but the results appear to have been suppressed. The assumption is that there was fear that the findings might fall into the hands of vandals, saboteurs or terrorists, who could then affect great mischief. Anyone who had to evacuate in the extreme conditions of 2003 vividly know the potential for a critical breakdown of the system.

The DEIR cites the following policies of the County General Plan:

**Goals:**

M/S 1 The County’s emergency evacuation routes will quickly and efficiently evacuate all residents in the event of wildland fires and other natural disasters, and will ensure adequate access of emergency vehicles to all communities.

**Policies:**

M/S 1.1 Designate the following roads and highways as evacuation routes in the in the Mountain Region: State Highways 2, 18, 38, 138, 189 and 330, and Mount Baldy Road.

**Goals:**

LA/S 2 Ensure that emergency evacuation routes will adequately evacuate all residents and visitors in the event of a natural disaster.

**Policies:**

LA/S 2.1 Work with the Public Works Department and Caltrans to ensure that an adequate road system and proper access are provided to ensure safe and efficient evacuation for residents and visitors of the mountain communities.

LA/S 2.3 Work with the U.S. Forest Service to explore opportunities to develop access routes for evacuation purposes only through the National Forest. Evacuation routes through the National Forest would only be used in the event that primary evacuation routes are found to be inadequate.

The DEIR’s “Threshold of Significance” on page 4.8-19:

Threshold: Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas and where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

The following conclusion is belied by the fact that the Programmatic EIR for the General Plan has already acknowledged that loss, injury or death cannot be avoided.

Impact 4.8-8 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires with Mitigation incorporated.

Based off the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire), the project is not located within a Very High Hazard Severity Zone. The list of areas in San Bernardino County with a Very High Hazard Severity Zone does not include Lake Arrowhead or the SkyForest community. The California Cooperative Forest Management Plan (CCFMP) includes fire protection objectives to increase the property’s defense against fire, as well as maintain a healthy forest for recreational purposes. Some of the objectives include managing areas overgrown with chaparral and shade tolerant trees by clearing and trimming. Doing so creates horizontal and vertical defense space between the ground and the lower branches of larger trees during a fire. In addition, sheltered fuel
breaks would be implemented along roads and near structures for future fire prevention or spread. The CCFMP also includes forest health objectives in order to return the forest to a more fire resilient state and to potentially reduce the threat of insect and disease introduced by stress caused from droughts and fire events. Removing chaparral and diseased tree species will accomplish the desired objectives. A routine schedule for maintenance would be important to sustain the changes of the property. Thus, yearly assessments to determine the timing to reduce competition of weeds and brush by mechanical or chemical treatment and an entry to thin trees would be necessary steps in restoration efforts. Several community camp fire rings are proposed at the campground. These camp fire rings would be supplied by natural gas and burning of wood or other materials at the campground would not be allowed. In addition to management plan objectives, mitigation measures below would further reduce the potential of exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

**MM HAZ-1:** No smoking will be strictly enforced on the property, including but not limited to the campground site and Santa's Village.

**MM HAZ-2:** There will be no wood burning fires that create windblown embers. The campground site will include a few community fire rings that are supplied by natural gas lines extended from Santa's Village to the campground. The fire rings will be monitored during use. Use of camp fire rings at the campground must be operated in accordance with the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District Fire Code. A permit must be obtained by the fire code official prior to use of the camp fire rings at the campground. In case of a wildfire, the proposed Project would have adequate readily available water and pressure to meet fire flow standards. The existing 20,000-gallon water tank on the campground site will supply campground users/restrooms/showers but can also be used for fighting wildfires if needed. Additionally, the SkyForest Mutual Water Company (SFMWC) has adequate ground water sources, storage, and distribution line capacities to provide water to the Project in sufficient quantities to satisfy domestic water services and fire flow protection requirements for the proposed land use. Furthermore, the Crestline-Lake Arrowhead Water Agency (CLAWA), a water wholesaler delivering imported California State Water Project water to Crestline/Lake Arrowhead area has a waterline within an easement across the site, and there are multiple fire hydrants along this pipeline that could be accessed and used during emergencies. A less than Significant impact would occur with implementation of mitigation measures.

The SkyPark DEIR does not adequately realize that the defense of every new project is linked to the wildfire danger of the entire mountain region, a situation where the county’s jurisdiction, responsibility and accountability are largely subordinate to other authorities. Yet these other authorities, such as the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) and the federal Forest Service, are not given any veto power over the proposed actions by the county, which significantly and negatively impact the safety, management policies, and financial resources of the state and federal jurisdictions. The county has disproportionate project approval authority without comparable accountability or responsibility for adverse consequences.

Often multiple fires occur in California or nearby states causing local firefighting agencies to be scattered and deployed away from the mountain region. In 1999 the Willow Fire expanded to a then record-breaking magnitude, partly because local forces were deployed elsewhere at the outset. Altogether the long-range capability to fight future major wildfires in the mountain region is uncertain at best, and availability of adequate services and infrastructure cannot be reliably counted on in either near- or long-term projections.

The county fire agency is one small component in the overall defense against wildfire in the mountain region.
Traffic Circulation and Evacuation:

The most important component of traffic circulation in the mountain region is the highly limited capacity for emergency evacuation in the event of a major earthquake or the recurring incidents of severe wildfire. The analysis of this contingency is inadequate, primarily because the critical overall inadequacy of mountain evacuation routes is nowhere directly acknowledged in any county planning documents. As a result the potential breakdown of an evacuation effort is not given the significance it warrants.

In the first place, no comprehensive assessment exists by the county that evaluates or sets criteria for the vehicle capacity of specific routes and intersections in the case of a large scale evacuation emergency. There are scores of substandard and circuitous roads throughout the mountain communities where various alternative scenarios must be considered in case there are blockages at one or more key intersections or primary escape routes. This is critical, given that there are only three highways providing minimal evacuation opportunity off the mountain.

For this reason the existing transportation infrastructure is not adequate to accommodate the proposed project or any equivalent project. Emergency impacts on the local road infrastructure are already overextended. For example during the 2007 Grass Valley Fire, State Highway 189 was gridlocked and bottlenecked for over two hours. It is a small substandard two-lane road with steep grades and blind sharp curves. It is apparent from the 2007 experience that the highway cannot handle present emergency evacuations. Already rated at Level of Service “D,” it is unrealistic to expect costly improvements in the foreseeable future, especially with current long-term financial crisis facing the California state government. The same scenario applies to most other mountain routes.

There are only three main routes off the mountain for Sky Forest residents. Two were blocked in 2003, when 80,000 residents had to be evacuated. In a worst case scenario, there is uncertainty whether existing numbers of people can safely evacuate. This should have been pointed out in the DEIR. Adding more people without adequate analysis does not support a conclusion of less than significant.

Although the project has an individual evacuation plan, the problem lies not so much with any given site as rather a chronic problem mountain-wide.

6. Inadequate Alternatives Analysis

On page 8.0-1 the DEIR states: “Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or a range of reasonable alternatives to the location of the Project, that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project. An EIR does not need to consider every conceivable alternative project, but it does have to consider a range of potentially feasible alternatives that will facilitate informed decision making and public participation” [emphasis added]. Thus “a range of potentially feasible alternatives” is a legal requirement for the DEIR. CEQA further states that: “The range of alternatives required is governed by a ‘rule of reason.’ Therefore, the EIR must only evaluate those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives must be limited to only ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project.”

Despite these guidelines only one alternative other than the no project alternative is considered. In the discussion of the Environmentally Superior Alternative on page 8.0-18, it is noted that “If the ‘No Project’ Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (e)(2) require that another alternative that could feasibly attain most of the basic Project’s basic objectives be chosen as the environmentally superior alternative.” But no other alternative is evaluated in the DEIR that “could feasibly attain most of the basic Project’s basic objectives.” It is difficult to understand in this case why a reduced project alternative was not evaluated as a viable option.
Alternative #2 is not a proper or realistic alternative. The DEIR notes that the existing zoning of the Santa’s Village parcels allows for residential land use, and then states on page 8.0-12 that if the project itself is not developed, then “it is anticipated that the site may be developed as residential...” However, the abstract possibility that another developer might propose residential development on the property is not an appropriate alternative, since the concept of a residential development does not match any of the project objectives. As the CEQA Guidelines section quoted above points out, the purpose of the alternatives analysis is to consider viable alternative versions of the project that meet most of the applicant’s objectives, but that potentially would be less harmful to the environment. Instead of properly addressing the purpose of the CEQA Guidelines, the DEIR offers up an artificial “straw man” that is easily kicked over, i.e. a scenario chosen solely to produce a readymade conclusion, which the applicant uses to avoid analyzing any other more realistic or potentially feasible alternatives.

The Project Objective, as stated on pg 3.0-34, is: “The goal for the SkyPark at Santa’s Village Project is to enhance the community through revitalization of the existing facilities and implementation of new active recreational amenities, wildlife and habitat education, community gathering areas, and a safe environment.” On pages 3.0-34 and 8.0-2 a detailed enumeration of 15 idealistic objectives offers a series of noble-sounding community benefits, as if the applicant were a nonprofit public recreational service rather than a business venture. No mention is made of actually running a business or whether there are any limits to the cost of the project. The possibility that the business model might not make a profit does not seem to be a consideration.

However, apart from the failure to analyze the alternative correctly, there remains the question, Why did the EIR include an alternative that did not contain any of the basic project objectives for SkyPark? It’s as if the DEIR chose a random alternate that it believed could quickly be dismissed simply to give the appearance of fulfilling the CEQA requirement. Instead there should be included a reduced project alternative that could feasibly meet the basic project objectives but would avoid more of the adverse impacts, one that would not require a zoning change but could still incorporate the Santa’s Village commercial sector into the project—one that would eliminate some of the excessive trails in sensitive wildlife habitat and perhaps not require a crosswalk by potentially forgoing the RV park, the dual left turn lanes and traffic signal.

It is apparent that the Alternatives Analysis provides no useful information and fails to meet the CEQA requirement. The cursory and inaccurate analysis of Alternative #2 raises concerns that other parts of the DEIR might also be subject to similar deficiency of detail and proper scrutiny.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Drew Feldmann
Conservation Chair

Cc: Jeff Brandt, CA Dept of Fish & Wildlife
    Steve Farrell, Sierra Club
    Hugh Bialecki, Save Our Forest Association
    Steve Loc, USFS Wildlife Biologist (ret.)
    Ileen Anderson, Center for Biological Diversity
    Lewis Murray, Field Representative 2nd District Supervisor, Janice Rutherford
ADDENDUM
Additional Comments by David Goodward, Biologist for San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society
July 21, 2016

Kevin White, Senior Planner
County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Dept -Planning Division
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Subject: SkyPark at Santa’s Village; Project No. P201500051; APNs 0332-211-02-04 & 0332-212-02;
Draft Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse Number: 3015091001

Dear Mr. White,

The San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society (SBVAS) is the local chapter of the National Audubon Society for almost all of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. SBVAS has about two thousand members in that area, including many in the San Bernardino Mountain communities. Its missions are the protection of natural habitat for birds and other wildlife, and public education about the environment. It is a 501(c)(3) organization.

The San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society is pleased to take the opportunity to comment on the Habitat Assessment for the proposed SkyPark at Santa’s Village. Many of our members recall visiting Santa’s Village in the past and are hopeful that its revival will be a positive development for the mountains. We are pleased that SkyPark is planning a strong nature appreciation component to their project. It is very important to foster a deep appreciation of the forest and its wild inhabitants, and we encourage the venture, if it is approved, to incorporate as much environmental awareness into the planned amenities and activities as possible.

Even a forest-friendly establishment will have impacts to the very plants and animals they want to showcase. The San Bernardino National Forest (SBNF) is particularly sensitive to environmental impacts, given the extremely high visitation rates, the ecological effects of drought and climate change, and the presence of so many rare and declining species. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has at least three of these rare and declining species, namely the San Bernardino Flying Squirrel (SBFS), the California Spotted Owl (CASO) and the Southern Rubber Boa (SRB). Other sensitive species may occur on site, but for the purposes of this letter, I will focus on these three species. A fourth, the Mountain Yellow-legged Frog, was analyzed in the Habitat Assessment. We agree with the assessment that this species is very unlikely to occur on site because Hooks Creek does not have the flows or deep pool characteristics required by this species.

For the remaining three species, maps of habitat suitability were produced. These maps will be used to help determine habitat impacts and the level of mitigation that is appropriate for those impacts. For two species, the California Spotted Owl and the San Bernardino Flying Squirrel, those maps are not valid and need to be reworked. Incorrect or inconsistent assumptions are made, and justifications are lacking. Underestimating project impacts can lead to marginal and insufficient mitigation measures, something that the San Bernardino National Forest cannot afford and does not deserve.
San Bernardino Flying Squirrel (SBFS)

For this species, only 14.4 acres are deemed highly suitable. The reasons for the lower suitability of approximately 66 additional forested acres are as follows:

1) The canopy is too open (trees too widely spaced).
2) Lack of woody debris, which fosters truffle growth, which are purported to be an essential food item for SBFS.
3) SBFS remains found in owl pellets only in the northeast corner, the area of high suitability.
4) An abundance of very young trees covering the forest floor, precluding access by SBFS.

We believe there is some validity to some of these postulates, but support is generally lacking. For the open canopy, numbers are listed for the type of spacing that allows SBFS to fly between trees, but it is not clear from the amp of the text which areas are too open. The area south of the pond (about 40 acres) is mapped as low suitability despite large areas of relatively large trees and closed canopy.

The close dependence on truffles was first proposed for the Pacific Northwest, a much wetter area than the San Bernardino National Forest. I am not aware of data that confirms dependence on or preference for truffles for this forest. Even the dependence on truffles in the Northwest has been challenged, with data suggesting other food sources are more nutritious and essential than the relatively indigestible truffles (Duncan, Sally. 2004. Science Findings, Pacific Northwest Research Station 60:p.3. Online at http://www.fs.us/pnw/science/sci660.pdf.) Nonetheless, truffles are indeed sought out by flying squirrels in the Pacific Northwest and the Sierra Nevada when available (Meyer, M. D., M. P. North, and D. A. Kelt. 2005b. Fungi in the diets of northern flying squirrels and lodgepole chipmunks in the Sierra Nevada. Canadian Journal Of Zoology 83:1581-1589. 2005; Carey, A. B. 2000. Effects of new forest management strategies on squirrel populations. Ecological Applications 10:248-257.). Downed logs and debris that can foster truffle growth were deliberately cleared out from these 40+ acres. “For recreational and management purposes it has been almost denuded of woody debris” (caption, photo 6). The forest will eventually generate new fallen logs and branches. To speed up this process, we recommend that logs and woody debris be deliberately replaced to enhance the forest floor, in keeping with the goal of SkyPark at Santa’s Village to foster an appreciation of forest ecology. It is disingenuous to clear the forest floor and then claim it has low habitat suitability because it has been cleared, just in time for a proposed development.

As for factor 3) the presence of flying squirrel remains found in California Spotted Owl pellets in the northeast section, I would point out that this is in the vicinity of the CASO nest. Owl pellets elsewhere on the Project site would be hard to find, as most pellets are regurgitated in the close vicinity of the nests, often accumulating under the nest tree itself. This evidence cannot be used to suggest the remaining acreage away from the owl nest sites are NOT frequented by flying squirrels.

The argument that an abundance of young trees obscures the forest floor and makes it hard for the SBFS to forage is not supported. Indeed there is evidence to the contrary. Understory cover can provide protective cover for flying squirrels when they are foraging on the ground (Pyare, S., and W. S. Longland. 2002. Interrelationships among northern flying squirrels, truffles, and microhabitat structure in Sierra Nevada old-growth habitat. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 32:1016-1024). Given the agility and ingenuity of squirrels in general, I doubt if small trees or shrubs would deter them from finding food on the forest floor.

For the reasons stated above, it is biologically sound to assume SBFS has moderately to highly suitable habitat throughout the forested portions of the project site except in areas where the trees are too widely spaced.
California Spotted Owl (CASO)

A known CASO nest and adult were found at the northeast edge of the Project site and a habitat suitability map was generated with very similar areas of high, moderate and low suitability as that for SBFS. The highly suitable 14.4 acres includes the nest and consists of large trees towering over a forest floor with abundant downed logs and other woody debris. 56.4 acres of moderately suitable habitat consists of the southern section and lands west of the best habitat. The northern 11.3 acres are listed as low suitability.

The major mistake made in this Habitat Assessment is that it bases suitability on nesting habitat only, not on home range habitat, which includes foraging areas. On page 37, the Habitat Assessment points out that foraging habitat is often much more open than nesting habitat, with canopy cover as low as 40%.

A little basic math confirms that all of the forsted portions of the Project site should be considered essential, with nesting in the NE section and foraging throughout. The Habitat Assessment lists the home range of CASO in the San Bernardino National Forest as 800-2,200 acres. Using the average of 1,500 acres, this converts to 2.34 square miles. If depicted as a circle, it would have a diameter of 1.73 miles. If this circle were overlain on the Project nest site depicted on Exhibit 5, the theoretical home range of that pair of owls would encompass the entire project site and more. So, while the northeast 14.4 acres has the nest, these birds would starve if they were confined to this fraction of their home range.

This is consistent with the Protected Activity Center (PAC) areas of Exhibit 5, which is based on direct habitat observation rather than theoretical circles. PACs provide the needs of a pair of owls to nest, forage and roost. The nest sites on Exhibit 5 are marked with ¼ mile radius circles, but the significance of these circles is not explained, and they are clearly not home range estimates due to their small size.

The Habitat Assessment uses dubious logic to downplay the importance of the land labeled as moderate or low suitability for CASO. The reasoning is based on those lands supposed dearth of flying squirrels for prey, even though evidence for poor flying squirrel habitat is lacking, as described above. In addition, CASO depends much less on flying squirrels for prey than wood rats (page 152), and there was no attempt to document the numbers of wood rats on the different portions of the Project site.

To conclude, we firmly disagree with the statement on p. 156 of the Habitat Assessment that habitat designations for CASO are "generally consistent with the mapping of habitat use by NRCS" (i.e. Exhibit 5). To the contrary, the NRCS data clearly shows the importance of the entire site to CASO. All forest acres on the project site are essential and therefore highly suitable for Spotted Owls.

Southern Rubber Boa (SRB)

The assessment for this secretive species follows to a degree the same pattern as the two preceding species. Its range is known to encompass the Project site and is expected to occur in suitable habitat. The north end is singled out as particularly suitable due to the presence of rock outcrops used as refugia by SRB. Part of the northeastern section, however, is scored as moderate potential for SRB, rather than the high potential for CASO and SBFS. This is based on the lack of rock outcrops, though the other forest characteristics are similar. As with the other species in question, forest in the southern half of the Project site is deemed low suitability due to the lack of downed logs and woody debris resulting from the recent forest clearing operations, and a lack of rock outcrops. The second to the last photo in the Biological Assessment for Southern Rubber Boa at the SkyPark at Santa's Village Project Site in the San Bernardino Mountains the Habitat Assessment illustrates this section of the project site. The report acknowledges the forest structure and composition are similar to that of the northern half. It is highly possible that SRB is
found in this area, but without appropriately timed surveys in optimal weather, it remains a matter of probabilities.

It is frustrating to deal with a short term assessment of the forest when we know that in time, the duff and woody debris that was cleared by forestry crews will once again build up, rendering the habitat fully suitable for SRB. Rotten logs could be replaced to the site without increasing the fire danger, and would provide biological and educational benefits to the site.

Mountain Yellow-leged Frog (MYLF)

This species is to date known only from the East Fork of City Creek, following its precipitous decline in the San Bernardino Mountains. We agree with the Habitat Assessment that Hooks Creek does not provide suitable habitat for this species, and that the onsite reservoir with its introduced predatory fish would also not be suitable.

Meadow Restoration

We have some concerns over the plans for meadow restoration. It is not explained why the reconfigured creek bottom is to be lined. This will cut off water from the creek edges and will not allow natural revegetation or watering of the meadow. The Habitat Assessment states that the upper end of the meadow is fed by sheet flows off the paved areas adjacent to the highway. We wonder if this condition will be allowed to persist if the Project proceeds, or if it will be channelized to prevent erosion and inconvenience to visitors. We urge that the meadow restoration be undertaken by professionals who are familiar with this uncommon habitat in the San Bernardino Mountains. This will ensure that the meadow can be restored to full biological function. To that end, we request that biologists from the San Bernardino National Forest be consulted over the meadow design, and be charged with granting approval to the choice for the restoration firm charged with restoring the meadow.

Lastly, we reluctantly point out that the Habitat Assessment illustrates a general lack of understanding of local reptile and amphibian species. While we are not referring to listed species, it is important for any document to be free from factual errors. It should not have to be the role of a nonprofit organization such as SBVAS to point out these factual errors.

Specifically, the Garden Slender Salamander does not occur anywhere near this elevation in the San Bernardino Mountains. The Monterey Ensatina is the common high elevation salamander, and I personally have found it on site at Santa’s Village. The California King snake is not expected on site except perhaps in the chaparral south of the freeway, along with a few other low elevation snakes that could reach this high in open habitats. Rather, the California Mountain King snake (potentially threatened, State of California) would be expected. The San Bernardino Ring-necked Snake (Forest Service Sensitive) has a high probability of occurrence on site. The Two-striped Garter snake is found in some of the drainages on both sides of the San Bernardino Mountains. A database search for this California Species of Special Concern (and Forest Service Sensitive Species) might turn up records in the vicinity of the Project site. If in the area, it would be expected along Hook’s Creek and the reservoir.

Comments on Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-7:

A preconstruction survey for SRB is not feasible. The chance of encountering a boa on the surface is miniscule, particularly when the timing of the survey will be determined by the construction schedule, not the exacting weather and season conditions that might bring SRBs to the surface. Relocation of listed species is a last resort form of mitigation. Avoidance or onsite protection and habitat enhancement is
much preferred by the wildlife agencies. It those are not feasible, off-site acquisition of occupied habitat is the next option.

Likewise, a preconstruction survey for SBFS is not feasible. They are nocturnal and well hidden during the day. Avoidance by waiting for them to leave is not feasible, as nobody will know if they have left. As with SRB, there is no protocol in place for capture and relocation for SBFS.

As pointed out earlier, the entire project site is foraging territory for California Spotted Owl. As with the SBFS, the owls could be anywhere on the property during the night. During the day, they would likely be in the roosting/nest groves. There is no mitigation offered for the disturbance caused by trail building and most importantly the vastly increased presence of people on and off trail once SkyPark has been constructed. There is no analysis in the HA of how Spotted Owls respond to high levels of human activity near their nest area or in their foraging areas. This includes lighting and noise from SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

MM BIO-8:

Having a biologist closely attend to the trail work should be useful to rescue any SRB exposed/disturbed during trail building. However, paying a biologist to rake all duff and examine all fallen wood prior to construction does not sound realistic, especially when SRB could move into the previously examined areas after the search. There is a possibility that SRB will be injured or killed in the trail building activities, even if hand tools are used. A take permit from CDFW should be in place prior to construction, even with the mitigation measures proposed in the HA.

MM BIO-9:

The key word here is “retain”. If the size and number of logs are not available, as they won’t be in much of the southern portion of the project, then this mitigation measure is futile. If it is changed to “place” or “import” said logs, then it becomes meaningful for areas that were recently denuded by forestry crews. This needs to be spelled out clearly. The fuel break areas referred to in MM BIO-9 need to be delineated to CDFW to ensure effective mitigation will not be circumvented.

MM BIO-10:

This is very important, and will help the survival of SRB on site.

MMBIO-11:

We agree that this is sensible.

The measures to be taken to avoid disturbance to the other 5 species are not mitigation. Everything described is simply what must be done to construct a trail. Of course trails will be left in a rough state, with brush cleared and overhanging vegetation trimmed back. We agree that direct construction-related impacts will be minor. MM BIO-8 should help reduce the chance that SRB are injured or disturbed, but we still think a take permit should be in place prior to trail construction.

Daytime construction should not disturb or dislodge SBFS unless a roosting tree is cut down. We do not think preconstruction surveys would help with this, as locating a roost cavity would be very difficult. An effective mitigation measure could be the avoidance of all snags during trail construction.

Potential destruction of Andrew’s Marble host plants could be mitigated by planting the host plants on the Project site. This would be in keeping with the stated goal of fostering an appreciation of local wildlife.
CASO mitigation measures:

MM BIO-17: This is redundant with MM BIO-16, but also potentially problematic. If owl surveys are conducted, and foraging areas are deemed owl-free, then does this mean construction could take place during the LOP? As pointed out earlier, all forested areas of the Project site should be considered occupied and essential. There needs to be an analysis of whether the trail construction would constitute a disturbance to CASO. The literature and experts might well say that if trail construction is a particular distance from roosting and nesting sites, that it would not constitute disturbance. These data however are lacking.

MM BIO-18:

It is not clear whether the 400-meter buffer from the nest site is sufficient. It might be, but no data is presented on the effects of trail construction and usage on nesting Spotted Owls. We therefore cannot judge whether this is an effective mitigation measure. However, it should be noted that the 400-meter buffer will preclude both existing road, tracks and proposed trail that are designed for the northern portion of the site.

MM BIO-19:

Given that the entire site is foraging territory for CASO, this means all snags in all forested portions of the site will be left intact. Does this also apply to trees that die in the future? While this sounds very environmentally friendly, we wonder if this is actually the intent of MM BIO-19.

MM BIO-20-24:

These both sound like measures for ongoing forestry operations, not simply trail construction. While they sound good for wildlife, the full intent of the measures should be made clear.

The mitigation measures for CASO clearly show intent to avoid driving away the owls that nest and forage on and near the Project site. We commend the Project for this wildlife friendly approach. We want to restate the importance of gathering information on whether this is indeed feasible. Given the amount of research that has been devoted to Spotted Owls, both Northern and California, there should be information out there on whether an operation like SkyPark at Santa's Village with large numbers of visitors can actually coexist with the owls. This information is lacking in the Habitat Assessment. If it turns out the projected level of activity and the forestry practices and mitigation measures proposed are not sufficient to avoid driving away or otherwise impacting the local owls, then the feasibility of offsite mitigation needs to be analyzed as well. The habitat suitability map for CASO needs to be changed to recognize the importance (high suitability) of all the forested areas on site.

In anecdotal experience, we suspect SBFS will be able to coexist with SkyPark. This impression is based on observations of SBFS visiting bird feeders and nesting in abandoned buildings. The Habitat Assessment map needs to be changed to recognize the suitability of much of the forested habitat on site.

We have concerns that there may be some take of SRB during trail construction. We also are concerned that visitors who chance upon SRB may take them as pets. On-site mitigation for impacts to SRB might be feasible at SkyPark at Santa's Village because the opportunity exists for habitat enhancement of the southern forest, i.e. replacement of downed logs and woody debris that was removed during the last bark beetle outbreak. This would have to be shown to be compatible with any required forestry practices for fire prevention.
To summarize, this Habitat Assessment is heading in the right direction for protecting wildlife, but it needs work. Recirculation of the DEIR with additional information about wildlife impacts would be the appropriate course of action.

David Goodward, MSc
Conservation Committee
San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society
davegoodward@earthlink.net
March 19, 2015

Kevin White, Senior Planner
San Bernardino County Land Use Services
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Re: SkyPark at Santa’s Village

Dear Mr. White:

At the February meeting of the Lake Arrowhead Communities Chamber of Commerce, the Board of Directors unanimously voted to accept the recommendation of the Government Affairs Committee to support owner Bill Johnson and the opening of Sky Park at Santa’s Village.

We want to thank you for your support in this effort. As you know, the Mountain Communities are firmly behind this project knowing that it will present opportunities for economic growth, local employment and increased tourism for our area and beyond. While the economic benefits are more than obvious, it has social and historical significance as well.

We look to the continued support from you and the entire Board of Supervisors as this project moves through the county planning process. The entire community is anticipating the opening of Sky Park at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

Ginny Durand

Ginny Durand, Chairperson
Lake Arrowhead Communities Chamber of Commerce
March 7, 2017

Terri Rahhal, Planning Director
Land Use Services Department
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

RE: SkyPark at Santa’s Village – Support Approval of EIR, Schedule for Board approval in May

Dear Mr. Rahhal,

Please ensure the Planning Commission and all procedures are performed in a timely manner, so that the rezoning hearing for the SkyPark project can be heard by the Board of Supervisors in May.

Waiting for the next window for approval of the rezoning (which would revert to the original zoning – before someone wanted to build houses on the property, and had the property re-zoned in 2007,) would cause great harm to our community and economy, as SkyPark / Santa’s Village would miss the summer vacation period, as the Board of Supervisors only meets on re-zoning once a quarter.

The County as a whole benefits from this extremely low environment impact project, including increasing sales tax and employment.

We support this project!

Please ensure the timely scheduling of the approval hearings.

Sincerely yours,

Diane R. Gladwell, MMC
President, Gladwell Governmental Services, Inc.
March 7, 2017

Terri Rahhal, Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

RE: SkyPark at Santa's Village – Support Approval of EIR, Schedule for Board approval in May

Dear Mr. Rahhal,

Please ensure the Planning Commission and all procedures are performed in a timely manner, so that the rezoning hearing for the SkyPark project can be heard by the Board of Supervisors in May.

Waiting for the next window for approval of the rezoning (which would revert to the original zoning - before someone wanted to build luxury estates, and had the property re-zoned in 2003) would cause great harm to our community and economy, as SkyPark / Santa's Village would miss the critical summer vacation period, as the Board of Supervisors only meets on re-zoning once a quarter.

The County as a whole benefits from this extremely low environmental impact project, including increasing tourism throughout the state, sales tax and employment for local residents.

We support this project!

Please do what you can to do ensure the timely scheduling of the approval hearings, and vote to approve the project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Robert C. Gladwell
President, RC Gladwell Advertising & Graphic Design, Inc.
March 27, 2017

Mr. Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415
Kevin.white@ius.sbcouny.gov

RE: SKYPARK ZONE CHANGE SUPPORT

Copies to: Distribution List page 3

Dear Mr. White,

On behalf of the Lake Arrowhead Communities Chamber of Commerce and our Board of Directors, this letter expresses our support for the ZONING CHANGE for Skypark at Santa’s Village in Skyforest, from Single Family Residential to COMMERCIAL for continued development for the amusement park.

Skypark represents the largest commercial development our business community has seen in decades, and its success will attract more development and investments in our community.

Skypark is a big tourism draw for our communities which helps our local businesses thrive and attracts new families to settle in our region so our declining School district can once again flourish in the future. Since the park closed in 1998, Rim of the World school district has lost 50% of its enrollment.

Skypark employs over 250 people, a necessary economic center of our community.

Our cultural resources are preserved by the hard work and creative vision of development at Skypark. The park has great historical significance in our mountain communities and the hard work of the developers preserves our cultural resources for generations to come.

Skypark improves our environment in part by enriching our way of life in the mountain communities through recreation, education, amusement and commerce.

The Lake Arrowhead Communities Chamber of Commerce represents over 350 members who are businesses, charitable organizations and community members. Our mission is to promote a positive, vital economy and strengthen our business environment while preserving the natural resources of our community.
Sincerely yours,

Robin Bull, Executive Director of LACCC
Bullworx Fitness and Tommy’s Pet Studio

Lake Arrowhead Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors

CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Nolan Calkins, Sweeps Luck Chimney Service

HONORARY LIFETIME BOARD MEMBER
Carol Banner, Coldwell Banker Sky Ridge Realty

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:
John Connor, Tudor House and Brackenfern Manor
Grant Dunning, Arrowhead Retreats
Tricia Dufour, Pine Rose Cabins
Terry Ebert, K&E Promotions
Charlie Farrell, Herbalife
Mauricio Granados, R&B Steakhouse
Keith Harriott, Lake Arrowhead Sports Grille
Sondra Hughes, Sondra’s and Tattle Tales
Linda Miller, Bill’s Villager
Sarah Muecke, Community Member
Shelli Wimmer, Farmer’s Insurance
Mike Zweber, Z Painting
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Supervisor Robert A. Lovingood, Vice Chairman, 1st District
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 5th Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0110
Email: SupervisorLovingood@sbcounty.gov

Supervisor Janice Rutherford, 2nd District
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 5th Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0110
Email: SupervisorRutherford@sbcounty.gov

Supervisor James C. Ramos, Chairman, 3rd District
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 6th Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0110
Email: SupervisorRamos@sbcounty.gov

Supervisor Curt Hagman, 4th District
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 5th Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0110
Email: SupervisorHagman@sbcounty.gov

Supervisor Josie Gonzales, 5th District
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 5th Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0110
Email: SupervisorGonzales@sbcounty.gov

Terri Rahhal
Planning Director
Land Use Services Department
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187
Terri.rahhal@lus.sbcounty.gov
March 28, 2017

Mr. Kevin White, Sr. Planner
Land Use Services, San Bernardino County
385 North Arrowhead Ave.
San Bernardino, Ca. 92315

Re: Sky Park/Santa’s Village Zone Change

The Rim of the World Association of Realtors, representing 277 Realtors and Real Estate practitioners conducting business in the Lake Arrowhead Mountain Communities, urges the Planning Commission to recommend approval of the Zone Change needed for the Sky Park Project to continue. Further, please do not delay the zone change hearing beyond the May, 2017.

As business owners, home owners and active members of our Mountain Communities, we recognize the benefits the completed project will bring to our Community and to the San Bernardino Region, as well. I know you are aware of the economic benefits and the employment opportunities. Park owners have created a beautiful and environmentally sensitive plan with every consideration given to make Sky Park the eco-sensitive family destination, nature study opportunity and outdoor showplace for the enjoyment of generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tonja Graff, President
Rim of the World Association of Realtors

Cc: Terri Rehhal, Planning Director, Land Use Services Dept.
From: Ginny Durand <ginny@theteaexchange.com>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 12:03 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: SkyPark-Santa's Village
Attachments: Durands letter 2 on SkyPark.docx; Kevin White, Sky Park at Santa's Village Letter.doc

Dear Mr. White,

I hope you can find time to read these attached letters regarding SkyPark-Santa's Village issue.

I would really appreciate it. I am dropping off the original today.

Thank you,

Ginny Durand
Chairperson
Lake Arrowhead Communities Chamber of Commerce
March 23, 2015

Kevin White, Senior Planner
San Bernardino County Land Use Services
385 North Arrowhead Ave. First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92315

Subject: SkyPark at Santa’s Village

Dear Mr. White:

Over this past year our community has been anxiously awaiting the opening of the SkyPark at Santa’s Village to personally enjoy, along with all of the visitors that will be drawn to the San Bernardino Mountain Communities, while visiting the park.

It is no secret that those of us that live up here and own businesses have been greatly disappointed in the decline of businesses in Blue Jay Village and Lake Arrowhead Village. For whatever reasons Pacific Capitol has not been successful in drawing retailers into their properties, which definitely has had an impact on the businesses that are there and the communities as a whole by having less job opportunities, which means people have been moving off the mountain to find employment.

The Tea and Coffee Exchange has been fortunate to show a significant increase in our business over this past year, but we know part of our growth is because of no competition in the village. All of the businesses up here need more people to increase their business, but that can only be done by having an increase of stores and other activities to attract them.

Almost every day we have high school kids coming in asking for a job. We have been very fortunate with the kids we hired when we opened. In 2007 they were juniors in high school and all have continued to work for us and have graduated from college and gotten jobs in their field. Our current employees tell us all the time how thankful they are for their jobs. The kids on this mountain are eager to work and it gives them the opportunity to earn money toward college. It also keeps them out of trouble. SkyPark can do just that. There will be almost 300 people employed at SkyPark at Santa’s Village. That alone is a major boost to our community. People on this mountain need jobs and it means they can continue to live on this mountain. SkyPark at Santa’s Village is an opportunity to have growth for all our businesses, because of the increase in visitors that would be coming up to this area. That means those of us already owning businesses would need to hire more employees because of the increase in our business. It could be a win, win situation for all of us.
For years the location of Santa’s Village has never had the attention it needs. It was used as a logging operation since the fires and destroyed all the wonderful things that were there. Bill and Michelle Johnson had the vision needed to restore not only Santa’s Village, but the wonderful natural part of that land, with replanting the Apple Orchard and putting the Meadow and Lady Bug Pond back to their original state. No one else was even remotely interested in what was happening to this property until the Johnsons started this project. Now in the 11th hour most of the environmental organizations are trying to kill this project. Bill has done his environmental studies and is trying to restore what was there.

Please support his efforts, by supporting this project and helping to deflect the naysayers trying to prevent this great opportunity for our community.

Sincerely,

Harvey Durand       Ginny Durand

Harvey Durand       Ginny Durand
March 18, 2015

San Bernardino Planning Department
Attention: Kevin White

Dear Sirs, Ms.
The following is my personal comments as a 30 year Mountain Resident.

Entertainment and tourism attractions are sorely needed in the mountain communities.

It appears the Sky Park Santa’s Village project is well thought out to benefit the local and visitor alike. It will also provide many opportunities for local worker employment.

Environmental and traffic concerns of the development should be met but should not be so financially burdensome as to make the project infeasible; it is too important to the area and far less invasive that alternative development.

Sincerely,

Larry Brown
30 year resident, Lake Arrowhead, California.
I am excited about the development and opening of Sky Park - it will be a wonderful asset to the mountain communities. We spent many happy hours here with my children when they were young and now I look forward to sharing this special place with my grandchildren.

Thank you,

Barbara Lazar
1296 Arctic Drive
Lake Arrowhead CA
92352
Dear Ms. Rahhal and Team,

I am a resident of our county and have lived in Lake Arrowhead for over a decade. Let us know what we can do to show our support for SKYPARK to open. It truly will be the best thing to happen to our county, our residents, our children, our businesses, and the greater outdoors for a long time. I have watched the issues that have come up and been addressed. Our county needs this on so many levels. It’s the right thing to do.

All the necessary work has been done to understand the value of this project as well as the impact. It’s time to move forward without any delay. Thank you so much for all you do and your time. Let’s get this done!

Tristan Miller
+310.989.0856

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain CONFIDENTIAL material. If you receive this material/information in error, please contact the sender and delete or destroy the material/information.
Hello Ms. Rahhal,

My name is CJ, I work for Five Ten shoes and am an avid mountain biker living in Running Springs. I have been patiently awaiting the opening of the Skypark at Santa's Village both because the family-oriented environment will be spectacular for biking and because my company has invested in this business offering to both sell and rent mountain biking and rock climbing shoes.

It has been brought to my attention that directing an email to you may help encourage a more timely opening for Skypark. I do believe that this business will be a wonderful opportunity for our community and everything possible should be done to get their doors open as quickly as possible.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
CJ Selig
Hello Mountain Community Leaders and other Action folks:

Once again our over regulating local bureaucracy is challenging to end the dreams & future visions of locals Bill and Michelle Johnson aka "SkyPark at Santa's Village". The Temporary Use Permit (TUP) and December 2016 Opening that the Community United Front fought so hard together helping Bill & Michelle comes to an end soon. After a huge and successful SkyPark debut, the TUP expires at the end of March 2017. For you that have read the book The San Bernardino's by John Robinson, we are living Chapter 25. The Johnson's have the visions for the future in our community and we can help it go the right direction. This is just the beginning & we will read about our decision to act in 25 years. SEE JIM'S LETTER BELOW for more detail about SkyPark current status and let's unite as a community to achieve excellence.

Chris Ehe, Owner
Environmental HighTech Engineering
Cell (909)534-0823
Office (909)886-1811
EheChris@hotmail.com

On Mar 12, 2017, at 11:18 AM, "JLNewcomb@aol.com" <JLNewcomb@aol.com> wrote:

I know this might be long, but please read it through, as it is extremely important for our community. I try to keep politics out of our wine club, but this is crucial.

Thanks to all of you who showed up at last weeks' wine tasting at Skypark at Santa's Village. If you stuck around for our announcements, you know that I invited Bill Johnson (the head Elf for Santa's Village) to speak to the group, and bring us up to speed on progress. If you were like me, you were shocked to hear the reality that SkyPark could be forced to shut down as early as this May, if the county does not act. As a group of concerned citizens, we can make our voices heard. Two things Bill brought up: 1) his temporary use permit expires at the end of March; 2) he needs the county to re-zone his property back to amusement park, so he can move forward with his vision for the property (this will happen in May). Without the re-zoning, there is no way for the park to survive.

My personal thoughts:
1) If SkyPark at Santa's Village does not succeed, we will probably not see any new development on this mountain.
2) We need new development to draw people to our community, or else the current businesses will fail; the School district will continue to decline; real estate values will decline; and future investment will move to other growing communities (take a look at what is going on in Big Bear, since Mammoth Mountain bought the ski resorts).
3) We need jobs on the mountain, and SkyPark has employed 243 people.

I know it is a long shot to get people to do something, but we really need all of you to write letters. The petitions that have been circulating are good, but now we need to flood the county with personal letters.
Below is a recap of what Bill Johnson told the group:

SkyPark at Santa’s Village is a new idea, based on a historic land use with today’s innovation. The Park replaces electric rides with self powered features, and promotes the natural ecology. It uses existing trails to re-establish recreation, education and tourism all with NO ADVERSE EFFECTS.

SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark) is based upon an existing land use that is already built. The property once produced local foods as a small farm and ranch, before becoming the first franchised amusement park 1955. The Architecture is unmatched in the world as all of the original buildings were produced by the timber on the property. It has brought our community together with generations of hard work to preserve a CULTURAL RESOURCE.

At the time Santa’s Village closed in ’98, the mountain community was hit hard by an infestation of bark beetles; a very small black insect that destroyed over 1 million trees in the region. The mountain community was declared a natural disaster area and the “Santa’s Village property” was the solution for harboring and processing timber, leaving an environmental mess. The property also contains a dense forest that requires continued forest management to provide FIRE PROTECTION for the surrounding community. SkyPark in partnership with NRCS has rehabilitated the land and continues to promote the natural habitat. The historic park has always contained horse back riding, hay rides, amusement rides and utility easements. It’s proven over a half century of experience to be able to balance nature with human interaction. SkyPark has proven to be a SUSTAINABLE SOLUTION for the environment.

Santa’s Village brings families to the community. The park promotes and attracts tourism from around the world. Since the closing of the Park in 1998, Rim of the World School district has lost 50% enrollment. The tax base no longer supports our educational system. The park promotes EDUCATION with environmental science, land management practises and gets people back into nature. SkyPark brings back lost jobs and opportunity to the region. The ECONOMIC contribution to our community is a necessity.

The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest or extremist, continue to burden our community as the minority few create hardship, overreaching conditions and fear among our governing bodies or lead agencies. SkyPark at Santa’s Village deserves to exist. The park has already proven to be a far superior solution for the state, county and local community, easily justifying OVERRIDING CONDITIONS at every level of entitlement.

SkyPark is more than just a park or a job, it’s a movement. It’s a change for the good of our community. SkyPark improves the environment and most importantly the HUMAN CONDITION. The local paper is full of depression, crime and tragedy. How many San Bernardino shootings, parade bombings or horrific assaults need to occur before we realize that people need exposure to recreation, education and amusement to exist.

Here is the contact info for the folks at the county that need to hear from all of us. You can email them or send letters. Please tell them what is on your mind, and how we need this project to be approved, and allowed to move forward.

County of San Bernardino

Janice Rutherford- Second District Supervisor

San Bernardino County Government Center

385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 5th floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

SupervisorRutherford@sbccounty.gov

Robert Lovingood – 1st
District Supervisor Chairman
San Bernardino County Government Center
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 5th floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415
www.sbcounty.gov/bosd1/contact/Email

Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187
Kevin.white@lus.sbccounty.gov

Terri Rahhal
Planning Director
Land Use Services Department
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187
Terri.rahhal@lus.sbccounty.go
Thanks in advance to all of you that are as concerned as I am about seeing this project succeed. And, please forward to all your friends in the community.

Jim Newcomb
Dear local mountain lovers,

An email has come to me that I feel is important to our community and worth the read. Please see below as it has come to me just this way.

From a friend of a friend:

I know this might be long, but please read it through, as it is extremely important for our community. I try to keep politics, but this is crucial.

Last Thursday, I did a wine tasting event at Skypark at Santa's Village, at the end I invited Bill Johnson to speak to the group, and bring us up to speed on progress. I was shocked to hear the reality that Skypark could be forced to shut down as early as this May, if the county does not act. As a group of concerned citizens, we can make our voices heard. Two things Bill brought up: 1) his temporary use permit expires at the end of March; 2) he needs the county to re-zone his property back to amusement park, so he can move forward with his vision for the property (this will happen in May). Without the re-zoning, there is no way for the park to survive.

My personal thoughts:
1) If Skypark at Santa's Village does not succeed, we will probably not see any new development on this mountain. Who would want to move forward with a commercial endeavor after seeing the extortion practices of the environmental groups and the in-activity of our county supervisors.
2) We need new development to draw people to our community, or else the current businesses will fail; the School district will continue to decline; real estate values will decline; and future investment will move to other growing communities (take a look at what is going on in Big Bear, since Mammoth Mountain bought the ski resorts).

3) We need jobs on the mountain, and SkyPark has employed 243 people.

I know it is a long shot to get people to do something, but we really need all of you to write letters. The petitions that have been circulating are good, but now we need to flood the county with personal letters.

Below is a recap of what Bill Johnson told my wine group:

SkyPark at Santa's Village is a new idea, based on a historic land use with today's innovation. The Park replaces electric rides with self powered features, and promotes the natural ecology. It uses existing trails to re-establish recreation, education and tourism all with NO ADVERSE EFFECTS.

SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark) is based upon an existing land use that is already built. The property once produced local foods as a small farm and ranch, before becoming the first franchised amusement park 1955. The Architecture is unmatched in the world as all of the original buildings were produced by the timber on the property. It has brought our community together with generations of hard work to preserve a CULTURAL RESOURCE.

At the time Santa's Village closed in '98, the mountain community was hit hard by an infestation of bark beetles; a very small black insect that destroyed over 1 million trees in the region. The mountain community was declared a natural disaster area and the "Santa's Village property" was the solution for harboring and processing timber, leaving an environmental mess. The property also contains a dense forest that requires continued forest management to provide FIRE PROTECTION for the surrounding community. SkyPark in partnership with NRCS has rehabilitated the land and continues to promote the natural habitat. The historic park has always contained horse back riding, hay rides, amusement rides and utility easements. It's proven over a half century of experience to be able to balance nature with human interaction. SkyPark has proven to be a SUSTAINABLE SOLUTION for the environment.

Santa's Village brings families to the community. The park promotes and attracts tourism from around the world. Since the closing of the Park in 1998, Rim of the World School district has lost 50% enrollment. The tax base no longer supports our educational system. The park promotes EDUCATION with environmental science, land management practices and gets people back into nature. SkyPark brings back lost jobs and opportunity to the region. The ECONOMIC contribution to our community is a necessity.

The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest or extremist, continue to burden our community as the minority few create hardship, overreaching conditions and fear among our governing bodies or lead agencies. SkyPark at Santa's Village deserves to exist. The park has already proven to be a far superior solution
for the state, county and local community, easily justifying OVERRIDING CONDITIONS at every level of entitlement.

SkyPark is more than just a park or a job, it's a movement. It's a change for the good of our community. SkyPark improves the environment and most importantly the HUMAN CONDITION. The local paper is full of depression, crime and tragedy. How many San Bernardino shootings, parade bombings or horrific assaults need to occur before we realize that people need exposure to recreation, education and amusement to exist.

Here is the contact info for the folks at the county that need to hear from all of us. You can email them or send letters. Please tell them what is on your mind, and how we need this project to be approved, and allowed to move forward.

Mike Morrell - State Senator  
103 Commerce Center Drive, Suite A=220  
Rancho Cucamonga, 91730  
Phone 909-919=7731  
Fax 909-919-7739  

Jay Obernolte - State Assembly  
15900 Smoke Tree  
Hesperia, Ca. 92345  
Phone 760-244-5277  

County of San Bernardino  
Janice Rutherford- Second District Supervisor  
San Bernardino County Government Center  
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 5th floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92415  
SupervisorRutherford@sbccounty.gov  

Robert Lovingood - 1st  
District Supervisor Chairman  
San Bernardino County Government Center  
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 5th floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92415  
www.sbccounty.gov/bosd1/contact/Email  

Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187  
Kevin.white@lus.sbccounty.gov  

Terri Rahhal
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187  
Terri.rahhal@lus.sbccounty.go

Thanks in advance to all of you that are as concerned as I am about seeing this project succeed. And, please forward to all your friends in the community.

We look forward to your support!

Sincerely,

Chrissy Hammer - Teel  
& Jeff Teel Jr.

Coldwell Banker Sky Ridge Realty  
BRE 01836455

Coldwell Banker Sky Ridge Realty  
PO Box 1089  
Blue Jay, CA 92371

See what's happening on our social sites  

GoLakeArrowhead.com, PO BOX 2922, Blue Jay, CA 92317

Sent by chrissyhammer35@gmail.com in collaboration with  

Try It free today
From: Magic Mike <redxmagicmike@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 8:12 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Sky park

Please open Sky Park now. There is not very much to entice me to bring my family up the hill. This would add a lot of fun. Even a small paintball park would be great.

Mike
cut through the red tape and get it open
We want this project on our mountain to bring back life.
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Claborn, Amy on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 9:05 AM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: Ms. Terri Rahhal—We Want SkyPark at Santa’s Village To Open Now

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92410-0187

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: J Lucio [mailto:jluriv@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 8:24 AM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Terri Rahhal—We Want SkyPark at Santa’s Village To Open Now

As a resident and homeowner in the San Bernardino Mountains, we are asking that all unnecessary delays and red tape stop regarding SkyPark at Santa’s Village.
Richard and Jodie Lucio
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N Arrowhead Ave, 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.sbcounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Kim Walker [mailto:kimsusanwalker@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 9:28 AM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: SkyPark at Santa's Village

As a 20 year member of the local SAN Bernardino Mountain Community, I am writing to lend my support to this business opening as soon as possible. This will provide outdoor recreation, job opportunities, and business opportunities for our local mountain communities.
Thanks for your consideration and support!

Sincerely,
Kim Walker

Sent from my iPhone
Dear County,
I am a hotel owner on the mountain and Santas village will help up generate more business which means more Bed tax and sales tax for you. Get real! Get past the red tape and stop getting in everyone's way please! I understand your role but you are killing our businesses with the extensive lengthy process. You get your check each week but we need help!
Thank you,
Trina Brettmann
Sleepy Hollow cabins
Thank you,

Tammy Freedman
Office Assistant III
Land Use Services
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 North Arrowhead Ave, 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Dennis W Cobb [mailto:denniscobb@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 1:01 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Skypark

We all want it open as soon as possible!

Regards,

Dennis Cobb

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
386 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Sandy Acciani [mailto:sandyacciani@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 2:51 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Terri Rahhal - We Want SkyPark at Santa's Village To Open Now

Hello Ms. Rahhal,

I would LOVE to have Santa's Village open again! I would go there as a child (I am 57) and it was magical! You were in the mountains (being a city kid that was great!) and you got to see Santa. What a better combo!

Anyways, I now live in Running Springs and I know this will really help our community!

Thanks so much!

Sincerely, Sandy Acciani

Sandy Acciani
Good evening I am a mother of three and a real estate agent in the mountain communities, My oldest child currently works at Skypark at Santa’s Village and loves it. I believe that not only will the communities surrounding Skypark but the county of San Bernardino will profit significantly once the Park opens. The sooner the better this has been a very long process. Please do what you can to open now.

Thank you

--

Best Regards,

Raynee Ceja, Realtor BRE#01898236
RE/MAX Lakeside BRE#01526050
Cell: (559)273-7025
Office:(909)337-9999
Fax:(909)336-9307
email: rayneeceja@gmail.com
White, Kevin - LUS

From: carolasnyder@gmail.com  
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 8:04 PM  
To: LUS - Customer Service  
Subject: Sky Park

Please open Sky Park for the Christmas Holidays 2016. Sincerely. Carol Snyder Sent from my iPhone
We are so eager to have Sky Park open. We have been waiting for at least two years now. This will be such a fantastic experience for all ages. And a boon to the economy of the mountain communities.

I have lived up here for 53 years, raised my children here, taken my kindergarten students from Lake Arrowhead Elementary to see Santa each December and to enjoy Santa's Village rides and other attractions.

We can hardly wait!

Helen Richardson's family and friends
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Claborn, Amy on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 3:19 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: Ms. Terri Rahhal - We Want SkyPark at Santa's Village To Open Now

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

-----Original Message-----
From: Aquaman8488 [mailto:Aquaman8488@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 2:49 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Terri Rahhal - We Want SkyPark at Santa's Village To Open Now

We Want SkyPark at Santa's Village To Open Now !!!
Please!
We have been waiting and waiting.
It will create JOBS and bring much needed tourism dollars to our mountains—while promoting conservationism and magical experiences.

Thank you.

Y & P Campbell
Ms. Terri Rahhal - We Want SkyPark at Santa's Village To Open Now

Debra
RE: Reopening of Santa’s Village

I have lived in Crestline over eighteen years and the mountain areas twenty-five years. My son and mother enjoyed the amusement park that was reasonable and close without the financial burden and strains of other southern California theme parks. I was delighted to know it was coming back and now I see on Rim of the World news that they are requesting the publics assistance in asking you to reopen the park.

So, I’m asking PLEASE REOPEN SKYPARK by this Christmas. My son has now blessed me with five children that I would love to enjoy it.

Thank you,

Mimi Taylor
Crestline resident
We mountain residents want Santa's Village to open and bring in tourists, provide jobs and keep our youth busy and out of trouble:

--
Alive, Free, Happy!
Please help see that our Santa's Village gets reopened for the holiday season. This mountain tradition is very dear to our hearts and economy and we would really love to be able to continue treating another generation of our children to "Santa's Village" for the holidays.

Jhni Pauloo
PO Box 2595
Big Bear City, CA 92314
Thanks.

Thank you,

Tammy Freedman
Office Assistant III
Land Use Services
Phone: 909-387-6311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 North Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.

www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

---

From: Edward Garnett [mailto:efgarnett@me.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 10:04 AM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: To Terri Rahhal - Santa’s Village

Enough is enough. The County has dragged their feet too long!

It’s time for you to get Santa’s Village opened in time for the holiday season.

Please get it done.

Thanks,
Edward Garnett
349 John Muir Rd.
Lake Arrowhead, CA. 92352
Cell - 805-630-3123

Sent from my iPad
Dear Ms. Rahhal,

As a full time resident and business owner in Lake Arrowhead and a member of the Lake Arrowhead Communities Chamber of Commerce, I wholeheartedly endorse the approval and issuance of any and all permits necessary for SkyPark at Santa’s Village to open as soon as possible.

SkyPark at Santa's Village will create hundreds of much needed jobs which will have a huge positive economic impact on our mountain resort community. Hotels, restaurants, shops, service companies and many other entities will also benefit economically by the opening of SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Mr. Johnson has created a truly magical Eco-park. SkyPark at Santa's Village has attractions, shops, restaurants, outdoor experiences and much much more for people of all ages and interests to enjoy.

I am very grateful to Mr. Johnson for his vision, fortitude and perseverance.

Sincerely,

Sandra J. Koos
Principal

---

K & E Promotions

www.KandEpromotions.com
kandepromotions@aol.com

458 Emerald Drive
PO Box 790
Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352

Phone - 909.337.5174
Sandra Koos - cell/text: 310-871-9887
Terry Ebert - cell: 562-900-7200
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Werner, Kristy on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 11:33 AM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: SkyPark at Santa’s Village

-----Original Message-----
From: Shawn Legg [mailto:sdeggo@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 11:31 AM
To: LUS - Customer Service <luscustomerservice@lus.sbccounty.gov>
Subject: SkyPark at Santa's Village

Hello Ms. Rahhal-

Our mountain community is looking forward to the long awaited opening of SkyPark at Santa’s Village. In fact many people in SoCal with fond memories of Santa’s Village are awaiting it as well. We hope that you and the SB County Planning Department staff will give permission quickly for its opening so that countless families can enjoy the upcoming holiday season at SkyPark!

Thank you,

Shawn D. Legg
Lake Arrowhead

81
Dear Ms. Rahhal,

We are mountain residents who have been very happy to see the project and progress of rehabilitation of the Santa’s Village property. One of the most standout memories we have of this project from the beginning was a statement made by personal from the county stating that the county was 100% in support of this worthy project and that SBC would do everything possible to help streamline the project to completion. We have been very disappointed that this has not been true in reality of the county attitude and actions.

It is our experience that the majority of residents are in support of this project and we are requesting the county make it’s final approvals so that this park can finally open.

We are kindly requesting you do what is in your power to see that this happens.

Thank you for your support in this matter.

~M
Ms. Rahhal,

We are asking you to please expedite the opening of Santa’s Village. Santa’s Village is about returning to making memories with our children and grandchildren. I went as a child, I took my daughter when she was a child, and now her son will soon get to share in the memories. 4 generations here Great Grandmother, Grandmother, mother and son.

The community will benefit also. Bringing in more revenue, jobs and skills for those seeking employment for the first time.

We are really looking forward to Santa’s village and having been spreading to word! Even in orange county people are eagerly anticipating Santa’s Village!

We thank you in advance!

Sincerely,
The Kenny Family

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S® 6, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone
The community needs Santa's Village/Sky Park. The park will bring more jobs and health insurance opportunities.
Ok. It’s time to cut all the ridiculous bureaucratic red tape and get Santa’s Village open so the public can enjoy it!

Concerned citizen,

Gene Warner

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
We want Santa's Village to open now, please!!!
FYI: This was in the CSU inbox.

Jennifer Moore
Land Use Technician Supervisor
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3249
385 N. Arrowhead Ave, 1st floor
San Bernardino, CA, 92415

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

From: Tim Odening [mailto:timodenning@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 3:38 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Terri Rahhal

Regarding: Sky Park at Santa's Village

I am a mountain resident (35 years). I also work for San Bernardino City Unified School District (23 years). I am writing to ask and encourage San Bernardino County to do all they can to expedite the opening of Sky Park. This is not just about the mountain communities. They will have a significant positive impact on the entire region. For example; my elementary school in San Bernardino is in the planning stages of some outstanding fieldtrips that will include a career pathways strand in the areas of: ecology, forestry, alternative energy, resort management, environmental sciences etc. The park by design will be an incredible educational resource. It is not just a theme park. The park leadership has already demonstrated a commitment to community involvement, and they aren't even open yet. One would think that something this positive for a region in crisis would be met with open arms. I for one do not understand the obstacles and the delays.

Thank You

Tim Odening
I am a resident of the mountain community and am asking for you assistance in getting Sky Park open for business! I have no connection to Sky Park other than an interest in seeing more options for visitors to our area so they have a place to enjoy our beautiful mountain in a safe and clean manner as well as providing much needed employment to so many. Thank You! Donna Newlin
Good Afternoon,
This email is in regards to the hurdles encountered by Sky Park in their efforts to open. I am in support of the park as it will give a boost to our local community. The park has been lovingly and painstakingly renovated and was done with the utmost respect to our environment. It would be a huge travesty if the park went bankrupt and was not able to open due to these hurdles.

Thank you for your consideration,

Allison DeHart
Sent from my iPhone
Ms. Rahhal,

As a mountain resident I am appalled that the county has made it increasingly difficult for Sky Park to open Santa's Village. Business is important for our small community and the delays are not only costly to the owners but costly to residents needing work and seeking to bring more people to the mountain businesses. It is another apparent example of overreaching government that is not for the people! Please make a concerted effort to move this project forward immediately, the season is upon us and the time to business is now.

Sincerely a concerned citizen,
Dr. Scott D deHart
Crestline

Statement of Confidentiality: The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee. The information may also be confidential and/or legally privileged. This transmission is sent for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction, or dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail, send a copy to jpurchas@mac.com and delete this message and its attachments, if any. E-mail is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC SS 2510-2521 and is legally privileged.
From: Marja Dowell <wasdutch@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 6:38 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Rahhal

Please consider getting SkyPark...Santa's Village In Sky Forest open SOON!
It is a fabulous place.

Have a great day,
Marja
Dear Ms. Rahhal,

I would like to ask you and your staff to do everything you can to expedite the requirements for the opening of Skypark at Santa's Village. It will be an asset to the whole mountain area in employment and tourism.

Thank you,
Carol Higginbotham
I am asking the Planning Department staff to work on getting the SKYPARK at Santa's Village park open. I have lived on this mountain over 30 years, and being a child raised up here, I see nothing but positive things coming from this park. And I can't wait to take my children there. Please work together in reopening the village!

Kind regards.

Sent from my iPhone
Hello Ms. Rahhal,

I'm writing to encourage the quick opening of SkyPark at Santa's Village. As a child, I visited the original Santa's Village every year, and have many fond memories. I cannot wait to take my own children and share the magic with them.

I believe this venue will attract visitors to the mountain and could have a very positive impact on the local economy up there, which is much needed.

Thank you,
Krista Woodgrift
From: nancy@nancymarvich.com  
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 5:47 AM  
To: LUS - Customer Service  
Subject: Ms. Rahhal

Director Terri Rahhal:

I am writing today to respectfully ask you and your staff work diligently to get Sky Park at Santa’s Village the necessary permits to open as soon as possible.

I am a full time resident having lived in the mountain communities since 1989. My husband and I have raised our two sons on the mountain and have sustained a local business through the good times and the bad.

Our community so desperately needs the economic boost Sky Park will generate. We have lost too many full time residence due to the lack of jobs.

Our youth needs a place to go to keep them active and out of trouble. Sky Park will meet this need in a healthy, environmental way.

This is extremely Important to the mountain residents with the community as a whole supporting Sky Park at Santa's Village.

Please do the right thing by not allowing a few people and organizations to delay this extremely important project.

Respectfully,
Nancy L. Marvich
909-827-7448

Sent from my iPhone
> Director Terri Rahhal:
>
> I am writing today to respectfully ask you and your staff work diligently to get Sky Park at Santa’s Village the necessary permits to open as soon as possible.
>
> I am a full time resident having lived in the mountain communities since 1989. My husband and I have raised our two sons on the mountain and have sustained a local business through the good times and the bad.
>
> Our community so desperately needs the economic boost Sky Park will generate. We have lost too many full time residence due to the lack of jobs.
>
> Our youth needs a place to go to keep them active and out of trouble. Sky Park will meet this need in a healthy, environmental way.
>
> This is extremely important to the mountain residents with the community as a whole supporting Sky Park at Santa’s Village.
>
> Please do the right thing by not allowing a few people and organizations to delay this extremely important project.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> Nancy L. Marvich
>
> 909-827-7448
>
> Sent from my IPhone
> Director Terri Rahhal:
>
> I am writing today to respectfully ask you and your staff work diligently to get Sky Park at Santa's Village the necessary permits to open as soon as possible.
>
> I am a full time resident having lived in the mountain communities since 1989. My husband and I have raised our two sons on the mountain and have sustained a local business through the good times and the bad.
>
> Our community so desperately needs the economic boost Sky Park will generate. We have lost too many full time residence due to the lack of jobs.
>
> Our youth needs a place to go to keep them active and out of trouble. Sky Park will meet this need in a healthy, environmental way.
>
> This is extremely important to the mountain residents with the community as a whole supporting Sky Park at Santa's Village.
>
> Please do the right thing by not allowing a few people and organizations to delay this extremely important project.
>
> Respectfully,
> Nancy Marvich
> 909-827-7448
> 
>
Ms. Rahhal,

Please, do whatever is necessary to open Sky Park at Santa's Village. Our community needs this to happen!

Thank you, Erin Willcutt

Sent from my iPhone
Good Morning,

I live in Lake Arrowhead and have been waiting intently for SKYPARK at Santa's Village to open. This will help mountain communities as well as the County of San Bernardino in terms of tax dollars and revenue generated. Please help this business to open as soon as logistically and legally possible.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

J. Hardyman

Sent from my iPhone

Jenesie
From: Joann Arriola <joannarriola@me.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 7:12 AM  
To: LUS - Customer Service 
Subject: Mrs Rahhal

Please open sky park at santas village. It is giving locals jobs and will bring revenue to our mountain communities

Thank you

Joann
Lake Arrowhead

Life doesn’t get better because you ignore reality. It gets better when you accept reality and learn from your mistakes.
Subject: Opening of Skypark at Santa's Village, Skyforest, CA.

My husband and I had the privilege of living in Skyforest for many years and working for Santa’s Village through its final years in the late 1990s. We are part of the Henck family who owned Skyforest. My husband was the general manager working closely with Putnam Henck. We still own two properties in Skyforest and visit yearly. We love the area and are great supporters of the new venture Skypark. We encourage the County of San Bernardino, CA, to quickly work through any problems that are holding up the opening of SkyPark so that the people of the mountain can access it for work and the tourist population that is so important to the economy of the mountains can enjoy it for recreation.

Thank you very much,

William and Deborah Grant
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-5223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the Intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Laure Ochart [mailto:laureochart@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 9:10 AM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Terri Rahhal

Ms. Rahhal,
I urge you to help in getting Sky Park at Santa's Village open as soon as possible. I am a lifelong mountain resident, and we desperately need this business here. We have suffered economically as a community recently due to various factors of which I am sure you and your staff are aware. Santa's Village will not only bring much-needed tourism to our community, but will be a large employer of our local youth and others.

I have heard that there are "environmental" concerns. I understand that this should always be a factor in decisions within our urbanized forest. However, I am confident that these concerns can be addressed efficiently. And, honestly, if Nestle can "legally" continue to pump outrageous amounts of water from our mountain water table, why can't a small environmentally aware company build a facility which will be of great value to the community?

Thank you for your time.
Laure Ochart
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-837-8311
Fax: 909-837-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave, 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov
County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Juliette Kayo [mailto: juliettekayo@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 9:10 AM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Rahhal

Please, help to open Santa's village in Skyforest CA.
Kids of all ages on the mountain really need a place to have fun. We don't have many resources for kids here in the mountains community.

Thank you,

Juliette Kayo
From: Lauri Carleton [mailto:twinfishes@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 10:52 AM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Rahhal’s

Please

Please

Please

we must get Skypark open!!!! NOW!!!
As a long time multiple homeowner this is a huge WIN for our Mountain community!!! We need it-Jobs-Influx of money, everything good associated with it!
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92410-0187

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Lauri Carleton [mailto:twinfishes@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 10:52 AM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Rahhal's

Please
Please
Please

we must get Skypark open!!!! NOW!!!
As a long time multiple homeowner this is a huge WIN for our Mountain community!!! We need it-Jobs-Influx of money, everything good associated with it!
Dear Terri,

I'm writing this email to you for your support in helping the reopening of the SKY FORREST SKYPARK. This is a huge opportunity to help the mountain communities provide a local attraction to help local business and families with new jobs and increased visitors to the mountain. This New Park will also bring in much needed taxes for SB County along with funds for improving the mountain communities.

Please help support and allow SKYPARK to Open it's doors before the winter arrives. It will benefit both locals along with all SB County residents.

Thank you for your hard work and any additional support to reopen this wonderful vintage childhood memory Santa Village park!

Regards,

Cory Stepanek
We are begging you to please do what you can do to help expedite the opening of Skypark at Santa's Village. This would provide many much needed jobs in the area.

Thank you for your consideration.
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-9223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Andrea Jennings [mailto:anrejen@me.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 3:24 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Terri Rahhal, County Planning Director

Dear Ms. Rahhal,

Having been a Crestline homeowner and an active supporter of our local businesses on the mountain for more than 40 years, I am especially looking forward to visiting SKYPARK with my grandchildren this holiday season. My family has many wonderful and magical memories of Santa's Village that we visited often as our children were growing up, and we are eager to share that same wonder and magic at SKYPARK.

As you know the San Bernardino Mountains relies heavily on tourism for it's survival. Our hotels, home rentals, restaurants, gift shop owner's and employees are ready and eager for the return of Santa's Village "SKYPARK" - Please!!!

I hope sincerely that you work diligently at opening SKYPARK as soon as possible.

Thank You,
Andrea Jennings
P. O. Box 1248
Crestline, CA 92325
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Claborn, Amy on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 3:04 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: Terri Rahhal - SKYPARK

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Blair [mailto:ericblair@llve.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 3:01 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Terri Rahhal - SKYPARK

Mrs. Rahhal -

Anything you can do to help move this project along would be greatly appreciated. Our mountain communities are suffering from various economic stressors and we're all hoping this can help turn things around.

Thank you!
Eric Blair

Sent from my iPhone
Amy C. Cliborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Lake Arrowhead Village Administration [mailto:Vgoodglick@pac-cap.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 12:15 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: To Ms. Rahhal re: Support for Santa's Village

Hello Ms. Rahhal,

I would like to toss my support into the basket for getting Santa's Village up and running this season! It would be such a boon to our struggling community. I don't know ANYONE who does not want Santa's Village to open as soon as possible! There is so much support for this iconic landmark and local business up here in the Mountain Communities. It would be a shame if it was stopped from opening on so many levels.

Vickie Goodglick
Marketing & Events Manager
Lake Arrowhead Village
28200 Hwy 189 Suite F-240 (mailing: PO Box 640)
Lake Arrowhead CA 92352
Tel: 909-337-2533
Fax: 909-337-9847
www.TheLakeArrowheadVillage.com
www.facebook.com/LakeArrowheadVillage
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Claborn, Amy on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 4:36 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: Santa's Village Skypark

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaime stiansen [mailto:jaimestiansen@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 4:33 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Santa's Village Skypark

To Terri Rahhal-
I am writing as a concerned resident in the San Bernardino Mountains in an effort to encourage you to assist Santa’s Village Skypark in getting open prior to the 2016 Holiday Season. As a local entrepreneur, mother, volunteer, and nature lover- I believe that we are at a critical time where we need to support small businesses, especially on our mountain. Our schools are struggling because of lack of funding, because families can’t afford to hold down work up here, our small town fofts the bill for clean up after thousands of people to visit the national forest each year. To each problem we encounter we are told to handle it ourselves in a lot of ways- and we do. We have organized volunteers to take care of the land and to fill in the gaps with our schools.

I believe that recreation is critical to the health of our future families, our children and individuals in the pursuit of happiness. It is my hope that the County of San Bernardino Planning division would support small business owners with dreams to bring more visitors to the mountains, and that much more to our County. We have been given a gift to live in a beautiful place and really want to give people an opportunity to “play” up here. Outdoor Recreation generates 646
billion dollars in consumer spending and has the potential to bring up visitors that will be good stewards of the environment which we desperately need.

Thank you for your time!

Jaime Stiansen
My Name is Jennifer Devine. 45 year resident of Lake Arrowhead. I used to go to Santa’s Village all the time as a child and even in teen years, several friends worked there.
Ever since Bill Johnson and his people have started the process to reopen it up for the better of our community as SkyPark they have ran into road blocks!! It’s ridiculous!! We want them open.

As a 25 year Realtor and Broker up here as well it is much needed for the benefit of home sales as well. Lake Arrowhead has suffered with large closures of businesses and low lake levels over the years. We used have The Ice Castle and World class ice shows, we used to have a roller rink, arcade and fun places for kids and Families to go (Like Santa’s Village) That has changed so much and this community needs help with revenue for schools, businesses and overall welfare of the people here in our Mountain Communities. It will create jobs and goodwill for many.

Please let them open and get going for the Holiday Season! Santa will visit if we can make a place for him to Live and spread love and good cheer to the children who in today’s world really need that!
San Bernardino County needs the help AS WELL and this is one business that can make a difference in money for our Community and County!!
Please help make it possible!

Best,
Jennifer Devine
jenmail2@aol.com
Dear Ms. Rahhal,

As a mountain resident for over 25 years I am asking you to help us get Santa’s Village Open. I owned a business in Blue Jay for almost 10 years and finally had to close because we didn’t have enough customers year round to keep it open.

Santa’s village will bring economic advantages to the County as well as the mountain cities. It will also employ many local people that need the jobs. It would nice if it could be open in time for Christmas. All the delays are really frustrating.

Any help you might give would be enormously appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mary Dippell
Past President of Rotary
Past Director of Lake Arrowhead Film Festival
Past Owner of Blue Jay Optical
SkyPark at Santa's Village

Ms. Rahhal, I have grown up in the Inland Empire and currently live in Redlands with a second residence in Lake Arrowhead. My parents took me to Santa's Village when I was growing up and we have taken our daughter to Santa's Village when she was little and it was a concert venue. It is important for the Inland Empire to get this site up and running. It is a valuable asset to our local mountain community and a historical and memorable location for many generations of Southern Californians and visitors from all over the nation.

I urge you to work hard to get this project open as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Susan Irving

(909) 499-0357
This letter is in reference to Skypark Santas Village. Our rural mountain area has struggled through two large fires and many in between. Our schools are in declining enrollment and we need additional jobs to curb our growing welfare rates. Please do all you can to move this project forward. Our community needs the jobs and who doesn’t need Santa!

Thank you for your time,
Jessica Mazakas
Full time resident
Please let Santa's village open soon. I went there as a child, and would love to take my grandson there this year for Christmas!

Thank you
From: Anna <annaraef@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 9:46 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Terri Rahhal - Skypark at Santa's Village

I urge you to expedite processing of Skypark at Santa's Village's permit in order to facilitate opening in time for this year's winter holidays. This park will be a great boon to the mountain community and will provide needed jobs to local residents.

As a long time mountain resident I have very fond memories of days spent at Santa's Village with my children. It is my wish and the wish of so many others that today's generation of children will have the same opportunity to enjoy this magical place as did our own children.

Please help Skypark at Santa's Village open for the winter holidays!

Anna Raef

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Ms. Rahhal,
I live in Running Springs and love the mountain life! However, our economy is very slow and needs a boost to it.

I strongly encourage you to do what ever is in your power to speed up the process of opening the new Skypark at Santa's Village!!

What a tremendous asset this will be for our mountain communities. It's sad to see just how long it has taken to actually go through all the red tape needed to get open.

Please, Please, Please do what you can to help!

Sincerely,
Sandy Dahl
Dear Terri Rahhal,

I live in the San Bernardino Mountains and have been patiently waiting for SkyPark at Santa's Village to reopen. On behalf of SkyPark I would like to ask that the Planning Department staff would work on getting the park open.

Thank You,
Tami
From: Jessica Mazakas <jmazakas@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2016 5:53 AM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms Rahhal

Good Morning Ms. Rahhal,

This note is in reference to Skypark Santa’s Village. Our mountain communities have have suffered multiple large fires that have lead to decline in population. Our school district is in constant declining enrollment. Our local welfare and low income population is growing. This is quite a dismal outlook for our community. Yet, we have a group of individuals that have created Skypark Santa’s Village which will increase our economy, offer jobs, revitalize a large land parcel that has been neglected for decades and revitalize a well known historical monument. Please help the planning committee to get the park open - ASAP - SANTA is Coming to town!

Jessica Mazakas
Today will be what you make it :) 
jmazakas@verizon.net
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Carol Stanley <stanleyhome@charter.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2016 10:56 AM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: Support for Sky Park at Santa’s Village

Dear Mr White,

I am writing to express my support for Sky Park Santa’s Village and Bill Johnson. My husband and I have lived in Lake Arrowhead full time since 2002. I also vacationed in Lake Arrowhead as a child back in the late 60’s and early 70’s. As a child I remember swimming in the lake from the village, going to Santa’s Village, renting a sail boat in the village, and ice skating in the outdoor skating rink in Blue Jay. These outdoor activities were some of the highlights of my visits.

In recent years there have been fewer and fewer opportunities for locals and visitors to enjoy the outdoors. The village does not have swimming or sailing anymore. The outdoor skating rink is gone (and the indoor one is closed) and Santa’s Village closed years ago. Currently when locals come to the mountains they find themselves without places to go. During the winter visitors are often found in an empty lot near Blue Jay playing in the snow or on the side of the roads. We have signs at the church we attend warning folks not to sled down the hillside, but we often find them there because there is no where else to go. Last year there was a problem with visitors playing in the snow at the Running Springs School and leaving trash there. Parents had to go in and clean after the weekend. Having a safe designated place for people to enjoy the outdoors would be a plus for our community and the visitors.

We have known the Johnson family for almost fifteen years. Their oldest daughter is the same age as our son. Bill Johnson was active at the high school assisting the mountain bike team when our older son was at the high school. Michelle has offered her talents to the schools through her artistic gifts. They both are very active in the community and I trust them to take good care of our forest which they love.

Thank you for your consideration. If you would like further thoughts feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Carol Stanley
9096159701
stanleyhome@charter.net
Hello,

I am writing to ask for your help with getting Santa’s Village park in the San Bernardino mountains open for business. As a mountain resident and business owner, I am super excited about the park and the benefits to the community and tourism to our county. We continue to face set backs upon opening and really need the extra help that someone like you can provide.

Thank You,

S. Eddinger
Good morning,

I'm writing to support the opening of Skypark at Santa's Village. As a local, raised here from a young age, Santa's Village has been a community staple for locals and tourists alike. When the community got word that the park was opening up again, it sent out a level of anticipation and excitement. Now that I have a toddler of why own, I hope to be able to take her to see Santa there this year and enjoy the park with her, as I did with my parents when I was her age. The community could definitely use the continued tourism through the winter months to support our mountain.

Thank you for your time!

---

Tia Stribling, REALTOR® Associate
Cell: (909)744-7567
BRE #01963943
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email.

Chrystale Sonick
Executive Secretary
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-4431
Fax: 909-387-3223
395 N. Arrowhead Ave
San Bernardino, CA 92410-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.

www.sbcounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Pamela Burger [mailto:pam.burger@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 9:27 AM
To: Hudson, Tom
Subject: New Santa’s Village

Our family would love to see this park get the permits they need to open this season. This park is really needed in the Mountain area. Please do what you can and let the community know what they can do to help.

Thanks for your time.

Pamela I. Burger
Certified Public Accountant-Inactive
pam.burger@roadrunner.com
(714) 401-4753
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Chrystale Sonick  
Executive Secretary  
Land Use Services Department  
Phone: 909-387-4431  
Fax: 909-387-3223  
385 N. Arrowhead Ave  
San Bernardino, CA, 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and Invest can prosper and achieve well-being.  
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jim Prater [mailto:jim@neverthirst.com]  
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 9:26 AM  
To: Hudson, Tom <Tom.Hudson@lus.sbcounty.gov>  
Subject: Santa's Village

It sure would be wonderful to be able to take my grandchildren to Santa's Village. I support the use permit. James Prater, GVL resident

Sent from my iPhone
From: Arlene Tymczyszyn <arlenetym@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 6:37 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: WE SUPPORT SKYPARK AT SANTA'S VILLAGE!

Please allow SkyPark at Santa's Village to open now! We need it for our community! Thank you for your consideration!
Arlene & Bob Tymczyszyn P.O. Box 4804, Blue Jay, CA 92317
THANK YOU!

Arlene Tymczyszyn
Cuisine d'Arlene
P.O. Box 4804
Blue Jay, CA 92317
909-337-1250
909-844-0206
To whom it may concern;

As a full time resident of Lake Arrowhead, I fully support the Temporary Use Permit for SkyPark, Santa's Village, which would allow its much anticipated opening this Holiday season. I believe that the environmental documentation for the entire project being completed simultaneously, with the partial opening of the Park at this time, is undoubtedly a just win/win for our environmental protection concerns, community, and visitors to our beautiful mountain.

Sincerely,
Marlena Yarbrough
28200 HWY 18
PO Box 50-PMB 178
Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352

Email: marlena.yarbrough@gmail.com
Cell: (909) 744-4331
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email)
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From: George Terlaak [mailto:gter1@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2016 11:53 AM  
To: Hudson, Tom  
Subject: RE Conditional Use Permit

As a Mountain Community resident in Green Valley Lake, I urge you to expedite the process to grant a Conditional Use Permit to Sky Park at Santa's Village. With the upcoming holiday season, the opening and operation of Sky Park will bring employment opportunity and tourist revenues to our struggling mountain communities. Your support is very much needed and appreciated.  
George Terlaak
From: haileybobbyisalah <halleybobby/salah@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2016 3:40 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Website Customer Service I would like to express my support of a permit for land use to the Santa's Village project in the Arrowhead area. Maryanne Rangel 9093023269

Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android Device
1) If SkyPark at Santa's Village does not succeed, we will probably not see any new development on this mountain. Who would want to move forward with a commercial endeavor after seeing the extortion practices of the environmental groups and the in-activity of our county supervisors.

2) We need new development to draw people to our community, or else the current businesses will fail; the School district will continue to decline; real estate values will decline; and future investment will move to other growing communities (take a look at what is going on in Big Bear, since Mammoth Mountain bought the ski resorts).

3) We need jobs on the mountain, and SkyPark has employed 243 people.

I know it is a long shot to get people to do something, but we really need all of you to write letters. The petitions that have been circulating are good, but now we need to flood the county with personal letters.

Below is a recap of what Bill Johnson told my wine group:

SkyPark at Santa's Village is a new idea, based on a historic land use with today's innovation. The Park replaces electric rides with self-powered features, and promotes the natural ecology. It uses existing trails to re-establish recreation, education and tourism all with NO ADVERSE EFFECTS.

SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark) is based upon an existing land use that is already built. The property once produced local foods as a small farm and ranch, before becoming the first franchised amusement park 1955. The Architecture is unmatched in the world as all of the original buildings were produced by the timber on the property. It has brought our community together with generations of hard work to preserve a CULTURAL RESOURCE.

At the time Santa's Village closed in '98, the mountain community was hit hard by an infestation of bark beetles; a very small black insect that destroyed over 1 million trees in the region. The mountain community was declared a natural disaster area and the "Santa's Village property" was the solution for harboring and processing timber, leaving an environmental mess. The property also contains a dense forest that requires continued forest management to provide FIRE PROTECTION for the surrounding community. SkyPark in partnership with NRCS has rehabilitated the land and continues to promote the natural habitat. The historic park has always contained horse back riding, hay rides, amusement rides and utility easements. It's proven over a half century of experience to be able to balance nature with human interaction. SkyPark has proven to be a SUSTAINABLE SOLUTION for the environment.

Santa's Village brings families to the community. The park promotes and attracts tourism from around the world. Since the closing of the Park in 1998, Rim of the World School district has lost 50% enrollment. The tax base no longer supports our educational system. The park promotes EDUCATION with environmental science, land management practices and gets people back into nature. SkyPark brings back lost jobs and opportunity to the region. The ECONOMIC contribution to our community is a necessity.

The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest or extremist, continue to burden our community as the minority few create hardship, overreaching
conditions and fear among our governing bodies or lead agencies. SkyPark at Santa’s Village deserves to exist. The park has already proven to be a far superior solution for the state, county and local community, easily justifying OVERRIDING CONDITIONS at every level of entitlement.

SkyPark is more than just a park or a job, it’s a movement. It’s a change for the good of our community. SkyPark improves the environment and most importantly the HUMAN CONDITION. The local paper is full of depression, crime and tragedy. How many San Bernardino shootings, parade bombings or horrific assaults need to occur before we realize that people need exposure to recreation, education and amusement to exist.
Here is the contact info for the folks at the county that need to hear from all of us. You can email them or send letters. Please tell them what is on your mind, and how we need this project to be approved, and allowed to move forward.

Thank you!

VIRGINIA PALENO
BRE01228469
TELE 909-744-5075
CELL or TEXT 909-273-7511
CAPRE (California Professional Real Estate)
Lake Arrowhead, Crestline, Beverly Hills, Fashion Island, Palm Springs
my website
HI,

I am writing to you today for we have to save Sky Park Santa Village from closing.

It has already helped our community by giving jobs to our youth along with adults, as it is they have lost money by not being able to compete the park.

This has to stop now, the area was used as a lumber area which brought hazard to our forest plus a terrible eye sore.

We need to have people come to the mountains to visit and enjoy the area, as it is people are moving off the mountain to find jobs, our schools are loosing enrollment, property prices will go down. THIS WILL BRING BACK OUR COMMUNITY.

We need your help to get this done.

Thank you

Vicki & Gary Wickersham
RE/MAX Lakeside Real Estate
Lake Arrowhead, Ca 92352
909-754-9878 Gary
909-754-9881 Vicki
Email: VickiWickersham@hotmail.com
Web Site: VickiSellsLakeArrowhead.com
Li#01219295 & 01701352
I grew up in Lake Arrowhead please listen to the public and let SkyPark move forward!

The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest or extremist, continue to burden our community as the minority few create hardship, overreaching conditions and fear among our governing bodies or lead agencies. SkyPark at Santa's Village deserves to exist. The park has already proven to be a far superior solution for the state, county and local community, easily justifying OVERRIDING CONDITIONS at every level of entitlement.

SkyPark is more than just a park or a job, it's a movement. It's a change for the good of our community. SkyPark improves the environment and most importantly the HUMAN CONDITION.

Thank you,
Linda(Shafe) Roddick

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
My husband and myself totally support the renewing of the conditional use permit for Sky Park at Santa's Village. This project has brought and will bring more economic growth to our area. The 'no growth' attitude of a small group is working. Our school are suffering yet another round of cuts due to declining enrollment. The last number I heard for full time residence was 21%. We are experiencing economic death. Please renew the conditional use permit.

Thank You Mike and Mary Orr

24890 Edelweiss Crestline

maryorr1945@gmail.com
Dear Honorable Board Members,

Please inform the Planning Department that you want this project and the EIR on your May Agenda so that SkyPark at Santa’s Village can continue to draw visitors to San Bernardino Mountains, and continue to employ over 240+ citizens of our County.

This is an important tourist attraction, and if the EIR is not heard by the Board of Supervisors in time for summer operations of the bike trails (on old horse trails – better environmentally than horses) and the Zip Line, and other summer operations, YOU WILL BE BLAMED FOR ITS FAILURE, AND IT WILL BE VERY PROMINENT IN THE MEDIA AND AMONG YOUR VOTERS – COUNTY-WIDE.

SkyPark at Santa’s Village has been “in process” for over three (3) long years ... re-opening something that had been operated for decades, and was an important tourist attraction (and employer) for the County before it closed.

They cannot survive financially without these summer-time uses.

Please don’t let slow processing be responsible for killing this important tourism project that has a very minimal impact on the environment – less impact than the previous Santa’s Village operations, less impact than the housing project that was proposed earlier (the Board approved a re-zone to allow development on this property), and less impact than the logging operations that were allowed previously.

This project has very strong support from our community.

Thank-you for support for this project.

Diane R. Gladwell, MMC
office 909.337.3516
cell 951.288.7360

This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise us by reply e-mail (Info@gladwellgov.org), and delete the message. Thank you very much.
Dear Kevin White, Senior Planner

I am urging you to extend the use permit of Sky Park at Santa's Village and rezone the property back to an amusement park to continue and advance operations.

It is VITAL to our mountain communities to have this economic resource open and running for tourism, local businesses, jobs, and recreation.

This land was created for this purpose over 50 years ago, and the opposing minority have their own narrow environmental agenda which turns a blind eye to the tremendous benefits it offers everyone.

The current owners have also set it up to be Sustainably Run under its own power and water utilizing existing/renewable sources and trails.

Sky Park at Santa’s Village employs over 200 people in our communities and is bringing in tax revenue to our county.

Sky Park at Santa’s Village beautifies the location once again from the recent bark beetle log storage yard which was a blight on our mountain tourism.

The mountain communities needs Sky Park at Santa’s Village open and operational to benefit our real estate values, school enrollment, jobs and a much needed source of tourism revenues.

We need to redefine ‘San Bernardino’ as a beautiful recreation destination instead of it’s current notoriety as a place for crime, poverty and terrorism.

Please grant the permits and rezoning so that we in the mountain communities can offer a family-friendly, historic park for all to use and enjoy. It will be a premier destination for San Bernardino County.

Thank you,

Shari Eddinger
291 Chipmunk Dr.
Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352-144
The perception is that San Bernardino County is so corrupt, that Santa's Village hasn't opened because more County Inspectors and officials want their palms greased. At least that is the general feeling of folks who live in the San Bernardino Mountains. Come on, let's get this going, the County is missing out on the income from taxes that will be generated by Santa's Village.
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-367-8311
Fax: 909-367-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Frank Sottile [mailto:fsott@topproducer.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 2:12 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Terri Rahhal - We Want SkyPark at Santa's Village To Open Now

please do all you can to make this project happen.

Thanks

Frank Sottile

RE/MAX Lakeside

760-952-0019 direct

760-269-3562 fax

License #00900300

If you do not wish to receive future emails, please click the link to Unsubscribe: Unsubscribe.
Please take a moment to complete our Minute Satisfaction Survey [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email).

---

Amy C. Claborn  
Land Use Technician  
Land Use Services Department  
Phone: 909-387-5311  
Fax: 909-367-8223  
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor  
San Bernardino CA 92415-0167

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.  
[www.SBCounty.gov](http://www.SBCounty.gov)

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

---

From: PhilGmail [mailto:phil.simmons252@gmail.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 2:19 PM  
To: LUS - Customer Service  
Subject: Ms. Terri Rahhal - We Want SkyPark at Santa's Village To Open Now

The Skypark project is going to be one of the most important additions to our mountain in decades. Please support it.

Thank you,

Philip S. Simmons, Esq.  
(310) 439-4119  
[www.simmonsgroupconsulting.com](http://www.simmonsgroupconsulting.com)

Don't use time or words carelessly. Neither can be retrieved.
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lisa Bolanos [mailto:remaxlisab@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 2:20 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Santa’s Village

We want it open!

Pardon my brevity. Sent from my Ipad.
Lisa Bolanos, JD
Broker Associate
Re/Max Lakeside
PO Box 808
Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352
909-380-9955
909-337-4000
Fax: 909-752-5727
BRE#01846120
From: Claborn, Amy on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 2:27 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: Sky Park at Santa Village

Importance: High

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave, 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Vicki - Gary Wickersham [mailto:vickiwickersham@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 2:26 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Sky Park at Santa Village
Importance: High

HI
I am a realtor for the past 23 years living at Lake Arrowhead, We get asked all of the time what is there to do for kids and I have to tell them there is NOTHING to do. They can’t swim, lake private, can’t go to the parks, they are private also

Everyone I know is very excited to have Santa come back to the mountains, it will bring money back into our community and jobs.

I went to Santa Village when I was a kid and being older I can’t wait to see the new changes along with all the new activities they have for the kids.

WE NEED TO GET THIS OPEN!! Lets stop with all of the running around you are making them do and let’s start to bring money back into our community, Plus think of the taxes you will be getting.

thanks for listening
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Freedman, Tammy - LUS on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 3:02 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: Ms. Terri Rahhal - We Want SkyPark at Santa's Village To Open Now

Thank you,

Tammy Freedman
Office Assistant III
Land Use Services
Phone: 909-387-8511
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 North Arrowhead Ave, 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92410

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Imelda Bridges [mailto:imeldabridges@outlook.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 2:36 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Ms. Terri Rahhal - We Want SkyPark at Santa's Village To Open Now
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Claborn, Amy on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 3:21 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: Open Sky Park!

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-397-6311
Fax: 909-397-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave, 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

From: Denise Taber [mailto:deetaber@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 3:05 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Open Sky Park!

we all want this to open NOW, the mountain needs this, and long time coming.

Warmest Regards,
DENISE TABER

CELL / TEXT: (909) 744-4339
E MAIL: deetaber@yahoo.com
** SEARCH all listings immediately- go to : www.DeniseTaber.Realtor
#01303959 ReMax-Lakeside
offices in Lake Arrowhead, Blue Jay, Redlands-serving Mountain Resorts, Lake Arrowhead, Crestline to Big Bear & Inland Empire; all Southern California regions.
** DO YOU HAVE ANY FRIENDS/ FAMILY WHO ARE BUYING OR SELLING A HOME? I APPRECIATE REFERRALS ! HAVE THEM CALL ME- THANK YOU.
Call
Send SMS
Add to Skype
You'll need Skype Credit
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Claborn, Amy on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 3:23 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: Sky Park opening

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn
Land Use Technician
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-8311
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

-----Original Message-----
From: Karen Rudolph [mailto:mnrudi@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 3:22 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Sky Park opening

Please work with this fine company to open Sky Park as soon as possible.

They have invested so much in the community and will be creating so many much-needed jobs in the locale economy.

It's time to support this local business and issue WHATEVER permits are necessary.

This project is so needed and so beneficial for the community NOW!!

Karen Rudolph, Twin Peaks

"Live life, love life."
From: maddogpeck <maddogpeck@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 5:25 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Terry rahhal ..please open Santa's village NOW!!

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE smartphone
Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Amy C. Claborn  
Land Use Technician  
Land Use Services Department  
Phone: 909-387-8311  
Fax: 909-387-3223  
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Floor  
San Bernardino CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.  
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Celise-Reyes [mailto:jenicelise@me.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 3:48 PM  
To: LUS - Customer Service  
Subject: Santa's Village

Hi,

I am a mountain resident. Can you please let me know how we can assist you to allow Santa's Village to re-open?

The business will employ dozens of local families and provide needed income to our area.

We are confused at why the opening is being held up.

Can you please let us know how we can help?

Thank you,

Jennifer Celise
White, Kevin - LUS

From: Werner, Kristy on behalf of LUS - Customer Service
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 4:34 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: FW: Sky Park

-----Original Message-----
From: Susan [mailto:helsuz@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 4:32 PM
To: LUS - Customer Service
Subject: Sky Park

To whom it may concern,
I have been a resident in the mountains for almost 40 years. Both my children worked at Santa's Village as well as hundreds of other mountain residents. I have attended concerts there as well as fund raising events. It is a perfect location for a business such as this Centrally located for residents and tourists alike. It would bring in jobs and revenue to our community. I, as well as all residents and tourists that I've spoken too, can't wait for this business to open. It would have such a positive impact on our community!
Thank you,
The Cut Above Hair Salon
Susan Heisler

Sent from my iPhone
I am a long time (31 years) Lake Arrowhead resident and pay taxes to the County of San Bernardino.

This e-mail is sent with the request that the County of San Bernardino do everything within its power to facilitate the opening of Santa's Village at Skypark. A spirit of cooperation by the County will be appreciated by residents of the mountain.

Living in a tourist area makes one aware of how vitally important tourism is to the local businesses and economy on the mountain. With the opening of Santa's Village at Skypark many, many local businesses will reap benefits from this new endeavor, see increases in their business and which will also be financially rewarding to them. Additionally, the same can be said for the County.

Marie E. Simmonds
P. O. Box 861
Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352
Dear Terri Rahhal -
We are so excited to have Santa's Village return to the San Bernardino Mtns! We used to go there as kids and are very pleased that our grandchildren will get to experience the revival of the new and improved Christmas park experience. Please get it approved by this Christmas so we can bring them!
Thank you,
Dave & Lea Beltramo
Yucaipa
Dear Ms. Rahhal,

I, like many, have been anxiously awaiting the opening of Santa's Village / Skypark. I grew up in the San Bernardino mountains and now live in Northern California. I am really excited to bring my children to the park that I visited when I was their age this December!

My parents still live on the mountain and we frequently discuss the local economy. The mountain is struggling and this park can offer jobs and much needed local revenue. I urge you to do your due diligence, of course, but to also think about the economical impact (and JOY!) that this park can bring. It will bring families from all over Southern California who will undoubtedly patronize other San Bernardino county businesses as well (ie grabbing some Rosa Maria's and fueling up before the drive up the mountain).

I hope to soon be reading the opening dates, hours, and ticket prices so that I can book my trip back to the I.E. I

With Respect,
Audrey Rieben
Oakland, CA.
Dear Kevin White:
The Association of Building Contractors of the San Bernardino Mountains is in support of the Sky Park. The park would be a huge benefit to the economy of the mountain communities and we feel that the project is environmentally sound.

Thank You,

Susan Parks, Executive Director
Dear Supervisors, and others who are viewed as the powers who are not doing their job and apparently are preventing Sky Park at Santa's Village from opening,

Please read the following:

1) If Skypark at Santa's Village does not succeed, we will probably not see any new development on this mountain.
2) We need new development to draw people to our community, or else the current businesses will fail; the School district will continue to decline; real estate values will decline; and future investment will move to other growing communities (take a look at what is going on in Big Bear, since Mammoth Mountain bought the ski resorts).
3) We need jobs on the mountain, and Skypark has employed 243 people.

*SkyPark at Santa's Village is a new idea, based on a historic land use with today's innovation. The Park replaces electric rides with self powered features, and promotes the natural ecology. It uses existing trails to re-establish recreation, education and tourism all with NO ADVERSE EFFECTS.*

*SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark) is based upon an existing land use that is already built. The property once produced local foods as a small farm and ranch, before becoming the first franchised amusement park 1955. The Architecture is unmatched in the world as all of the original buildings were produced by the timber on the property. It has brought our community together with generations of hard work to preserve a CULTURAL RESOURCE.*

At the time Santa's Village closed in '98, the mountain community was hit hard by an infestation of bark beetles; a very small black insect that destroyed over 1 million trees in the region. The mountain community was declared a natural disaster area and the "Santa's Village property" was the solution for harboring and processing timber, leaving an environmental mess. The property also contains a dense forest that requires continued forest management to provide FIRE PROTECTION for the surrounding community. Skypark in partnership with NRCS has rehabilitated the land and continues to promote the natural habitat. The historic park has always contained horse back riding, hay rides, amusement rides and utility easements. It's proven over a half century of experience to be able to balance nature with human interaction. Skypark has proven to be a SUSTAINABLE SOLUTION for the environment.

Santa's Village brings families to the community. The park promotes and attracts tourism from around the world. Since the closing of the Park in 1998, Rim of the World School district has lost 50% enrollment. The tax base no longer supports our educational system. The park promotes EDUCATION with environmental science, land management practises and gets people back into nature. Skypark brings back lost jobs and opportunity to the region. The ECONOMIC contribution to our community is a necessity.
The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest or extremist, continue to burden our community as the minority few create hardship, overreaching conditions and fear among our governing bodies or lead agencies. SkyPark at Santa's Village deserves to exist. The park has already proven to be a far superior solution for the state, county and local community, easily justifying OVERRIDING CONDITIONS at every level of entitlement.

SkyPark is more than just a park or a job, it's a movement. It's a change for the good of our community. SkyPark improves the environment and most importantly the HUMAN CONDITION. The local paper is full of depression, crime and tragedy. How many San Bernardino shootings, parade bombings or horrific assaults need to occur before we realize that people need exposure to recreation, education and amusement to exist.

What Is the problem?
Please use some common sense, some backbone and get this project approved!

Sincerely,

Dr. Patrick and Jo Bonita Rains
To whom it may concern,

My name is Karl Brandt and I am writing this letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village. I would like to address the issues of the prolonged process of finalizing the park’s Environmental Impact Report, the prolonged permitting process and the forced delay of opening the rest of the park. I am currently the Risk Manager at SkyPark at Santa’s Village; however, my background gives me more knowledge on the impact of the project than simply working for the company. I began working in the Outdoor Adventure Industry in 2006 as a guide for various activities. It was at this point that I began educating individuals and myself about enjoying recreation in the outdoors while minimizing the impact of those activities. I became a Leave No Trace Trainer in 2012 and also became a professional hiking and backpacking guide in Yosemite the same year. Being an avid adventurer and educator has taught me so much about the impact humans have on the planet. In 2011, I began my master’s program and have completed my Masters of Science Degree in Integrated Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Education with a focus in Science and Environmental Education. Most of my projects, including my culminating project were on Environmental Education topics. On top of my education and guiding experience, I also spent five years of my career working at Snow Valley, ending as the Ski Patrol Director, Terrain Park Manager and Risk Manager. I have seen the impacts that outdoor recreation can have on the environment and the damage that it can cause and I can see that SkyPark at Santa’s Village is doing all they can to make the park and the forest the healthiest they can.

There are many different organizations opposing the project at SkyPark because they are concerned about the impact the project will have on the forest and they want to make sure the project is executed properly. I completely agree with them wanting the project to be executed properly and with the least amount of impact as possible. SkyPark is accomplishing those same goals with every project they begin and develop. There are concerns about the Southern Rubber Boa (SRB) habitat on the property. I have done extensive research on the SRB and have come to the following conclusions. There is not a lot of information on the SRB, which is not necessarily a direct correlation with a lack of population. The SRB is a very secretive animal, nocturnal or crepuscular, and they live mostly underground or under other coverings. There may not be a lot of information about them simply because they are hard to find. SRB’s are also known to travel very short distances. The furthest distance one has been tracked to travel is 300 yards. This means their actual living area is small, which indicates that it is important to keep people out of rock outcrops and in areas between rock outcrops and riparian areas. SkyPark has both areas in the North end of the property, however it is possible to have mountain bike trails through this area without any disturbance to the SRB. Any proposed mountain bike trails will be designed with the ecosystem as the first consideration. These habitats will not be infringed upon. Another concern that has been raised is the area where the pond restoration project is taking place. Prior to the current owners purchasing the property, there were hundreds of beetle infested trees all over the area along with trash and waste scattered throughout. There was no type of filtration system from the parking lot/highway to Hooks Creek. The lack of filtration allowed any waste and oil from the road to wash straight to Hooks Creek and then to Deep Creek. NRCS assisted in a restoration project of this area in which all of the waste was removed and a series of ponds and creeks were established. The first pond is a sediment pond immediately north of the parking lot which leads to an area for the creek to flood out. The series of these systems allows the water to filter out any toxins before being introduced to the creeks. This is the best filtration system that has been in place for at least the last 20 years, if not longer. The pond area was also infested with weeds and stinging nettle. These plants were removed with plans of replanting with native species to bring the area back to where it was before the damage of the logging company. How is improving the area to better filter water, increasing the number of native plants, and restoring the ecosystem harmful to the environment? I cannot
answer that question either. The “environmental” fights that are being put up as you read this letter are subjective and political, not for the best interest of the environment.

I worked in what I consider to be the most beautiful National Park in the US for four years, Yosemite National Park. Working and living here truly gave me an appreciation for preservation and I know the importance of it. It is important that people get to return to places like Yosemite 25 years after their first visit and see the same thing, experiencing how nature can prevail. Preservation is important for the United States; however, it should be in the correct places. There are over 17 million residents in the Greater Los Angeles area, all within a short drive of SkyPark at Santa’s Village. Most of these people do not get the opportunity to travel to places like Yosemite, however they have the resources to travel to our local mountains. It is SkyPark at Santa’s Village’s goal to invite these residents to our local mountains and be able to spend a full day adventuring in the forest. We want to provide a safe and exciting place for people to experience the forest and ecosystems that exist in it. We want the future generation of our country to be able to enjoy nature, so they will continue to see the need for the forest and outdoor recreation. If this political fight persists in regard to this project, these goals will never be accomplished. The forest at SkyPark at Santa’s Village and the surrounding National Forest should be enjoyed responsibly, not restricted from use. All of the construction and development that is proposed and completed has been done with the highest regard to the forest and ecosystems. There is no reason to restrict this project any further and it is time for our representatives, like yourself, to help a project that has little harm on the environment.

Yes, there are many areas within the surrounding National Forest for people to recreate in, but most people do not know how to use that land appropriately. We all know there are not many people patrolling all of those areas to ensure user responsibility. SkyPark however is staffed 24-hours a day. It will be easy and attainable to ensure proper use of the forest, keeping it as natural as possible while still allowing people to enjoy and use the land.

I am urging our leaders from the State of California and San Bernardino County to help the approval process move along for this project. The resistance to the project is unwarranted and unnecessary and the park should not be halted any further because of these organizations personal feelings. The permitting process should be objective and in the best interest of the residents of that area. It is time to redirect the approval process for a company that is treating the environment with respect while providing a great opportunity for both employees and guests. Thank you for your time in reading this letter and thank you in advance for any assistance you can send our way. Please contact me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Kari Brandt
kbrandt@skyparksantasvillage.com
(909) 553-5588
To whom it may concern,

My name is Nicol Eisenberg and I am a resident of Skyforest. I am writing this letter in support of Skypark at Santa's Village. Skypark has brought over 200 jobs to the community. It brings lots of people to the mountain who might not have visited us and given them an opportunity to experience our mountain and everything it has to offer in a wholesome family setting. As an employee of Skypark I can first hand tell you of all the good they are doing. The educational programs they will be bringing are very important. In a time where everyone is in a hurry and only concerned with themselves, Skypark is bringing nature back to the community. Please let Skypark continue to provide a much needed opportunity for people to learn about our environment and how to take care of our planet. Thank you for your time.

Nicol Eisenberg
10th March, 2017

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this letter on behalf of SkyPark at Santa’s Village. I am Justin Tomasello, a 17 year resident of the San Bernardino County Mountains. I am writing this letter in regards to SkyPark, and the business they are running. As an employee of SkyPark for nearly 6 months, and a member of their security team, I have experienced first hand their treatment of the environment and the community. This establishment has beyond exceeded my expectations. From the upper management, to every employee, every person cares about this park, the environment around it, and the local communities. With the local communities being small in population, it is extremely hard to find jobs on the mountain. SkyPark has provided hundreds of jobs to the mountain residents employing many high schoolers, single parents, and many more! SkyPark has brought back an attraction that is overall helping the mountains thrive financially. I have spoken to a few local restaurant owners who have told me that since the opening of SkyPark they have seen an increase in business.

Since my first day as an employee I have experienced the love this park has for the environment around it. The park has shown me, that they will stop at no ends to take care of the environment, and any other aspects of the community. A first hand experience I have showing their love for the environment was when a few employees rescued an injured owl who had been struck by a car on the highway in the middle of the night. The employees not only rescued it, but got in contact with a predatory bird rehabilitation center, and gave the owl to the center. A little over 2 weeks later we were successfully able to release the healthy owl back into the environment. The owners continue to educate the employees and the public about the importance of preserving the environment we live in!
Statement of support for SkyPark and their Management Team

This is John Senger, full time Lake Arrowhead resident and part time SkyPark employee. I write in support of the venue at Santa's Village and seek your approval and support while suggesting expedited approval of the Park's pending permit applications.

Since the mid-seventies, I have been involved in mine permitting/environmental compliance and hazardous materials management and emergency response responsibilities. Expertise germane to SkyPark permitting responsibilities include erosion control, revegetation and watershed management. I understand the magnitude of commitment required to be a responsible property steward. I feel the Management Team at SkyPark has the required integrity and moral character to live up to their responsibilities to the Public and the Regulatory Authorities in a responsive and proactive manner.

Please consider this an endorsement of the honor and discipline evident in my dealings with the SkyPark Management Team and a positive referral suggesting prompt permit approval. We are as dedicated as you are to maintaining environmentally responsible business operations and performing our duties in the interest of resource conservation predicated on honor and integrity.

Sincerely,

John C. Senger

csenger@gmail.com

909-334-7-8800
March 28, 2017

Mr. Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor  
San Bernardino, CA  92415

Dear Mr. White;

I am a full-time resident in Lake Arrowhead and have been for more than 20 years.

Recently I visited SkyPark at Santa’s Village and was very impressed with the facility and management. The design and activities are very mindful of any environmental impact and have been successful in protecting the area. The endeavor has also provided needed jobs to residents in the area, and hopefully will bring visitors and new revenues to the mountain.

I am aware that your Board has not been overly supportive of SkyPark and their obtaining permits necessary to complete their project. I ask that you and your Board become true representatives of the majority of people not just a few.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Baldwin  
POB 564  
Blue Jay, CA  
92317  
karen92317@gmail.com  
cell: 909-227-9821
To whom it may concern,

My name is Kari Brandt and I am writing this letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village. I would like to address the issues of the prolonged process of finalizing the park's Environmental Impact Report, the prolonged permitting process and the forced delay of opening the rest of the park. I am currently the Risk Manager at SkyPark at Santa's Village; however, my background gives me more knowledge on the impact of the project than simply working for the company. I began working in the Outdoor Adventure Industry in 2006 as a guide for various activities. It was at this point that I began educating individuals and myself about enjoying recreation in the outdoors while minimizing the impact of those activities. I became a Leave No Trace Trainer in 2012 and also became a professional hiking and backpacking guide in Yosemite the same year. Being an avid adventurer and educator has taught me so much about the impact humans have on the planet. In 2011, I began my master's program and have completed my Masters of Science Degree in Integrated Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Education with a focus in Science and Environmental Education. Most of my projects, including my culminating project were on Environmental Education topics. On top of my education and guiding experience, I also spent five years of my career working at Snow Valley, ending as the Ski Patrol Director, Terrain Park Manager and Risk Manager. I have seen the impacts that outdoor recreation can have on the environment and the damage that it can cause and I can see that SkyPark at Santa's Village is doing all they can to make the park and the forest the healthiest they can.

There are many different organizations opposing the project at SkyPark because they are concerned about the impact the project will have on the forest and they want to make sure the project is executed properly. I completely agree with them wanting the project to be executed properly and with the least amount of impact as possible. SkyPark is accomplishing those same goals with every project they begin and develop. There are concerns about the Southern Rubber Boa (SRB) habitat on the property. I have done extensive research on the SRB and have come to the following conclusions. There is not a lot of information on the SRB, which is not necessarily a direct correlation with a lack of population. The SRB is a very secretive animal, nocturnal or crepuscular, and they live mostly underground or under other coverings. There may not be a lot of information about them simply because they are hard to find. SRB's are also known to travel very short distances. The furthest distance one has been tracked to travel is 300 yards. This means their actual living area is small, which indicates that it is important to keep people out of rock outcrops and in areas between rock outcrops and riparian areas. SkyPark has both areas in the North end of the property, however it is possible to have mountain bike trails through this area without any disturbance to the SRB. Any proposed mountain bike trails will be designed with the ecosystem as the first consideration. These habitats will not be infringed upon. Another concern that has been raised is the area where the pond restoration project is taking place. Prior to the current owners purchasing the property, there were hundreds of beetle infested trees all over the area along with trash and waste scattered throughout. There was no type of filtration system from the parking lot/highway to Hooks Creek. The lack of filtration allowed any waste and oil from the road to wash straight to Hooks Creek and then to Deep Creek. NRCS assisted in a restoration project of this area in which all of the waste was removed and a series of ponds and creeks were established. The first pond is a sediment pond immediately north of the parking lot which leads to an area for the creek to flood out. The series of these systems allows the water to filter out any toxins before being introduced to the creeks. This is the best filtration system that has been in place for at least the last 20 years, if not longer. The pond area was also infested with weeds and stinging nettle. These plants were removed with plans of replanting with native species to bring the area back to where it was before the damage of the logging company. How is improving the area to better filter water, increasing the number of native plants, and restoring the ecosystem harmful to the environment? I cannot
answer that question either. The "environmental" fights that are being put up as you read this letter are subjective and political, not for the best interest of the environment.

I worked in what I consider to be the most beautiful National Park in the US for four years, Yosemite National Park. Working and living here truly gave me an appreciation for preservation and I know the importance of it. It is important that people get to return to places like Yosemite 25 years after their first visit and see the same thing, experiencing how nature can prevail. Preservation is important for the United States; however, it should be in the correct places. There are over 17 million residents in the Greater Los Angeles area, all within a short drive of SkyPark at Santa's Village. Most of these people do not get the opportunity to travel to places like Yosemite, however they have the resources to travel to our local mountains. It is SkyPark at Santa's Village's goal to invite these residents to our local mountains and be able to spend a full day adventuring in the forest. We want to provide a safe and exciting place for people to experience the forest and ecosystems that exist in it. We want the future generation of our country to be able to enjoy nature, so they will continue to see the need for the forest and outdoor recreation. If this political fight persists in regard to this project, these goals will never be accomplished. The forest at SkyPark at Santa's Village and the surrounding National Forest should be enjoyed responsibly, not restricted from use. All of the construction and development that is proposed and completed has been done with the highest regard to the forest and ecosystems. There is no reason to restrict this project any further and it is time for our representatives, like yourself, to help a project that has little harm on the environment.

Yes, there are many areas within the surrounding National Forest for people to recreate in, but most people do not know how to use that land appropriately. We all know there are not many people patrolling all of those areas to ensure user responsibility. SkyPark however is staffed 24-hours a day. It will be easy and attainable to ensure proper use of the forest, keeping it as natural as possible while still allowing people to enjoy and use the land.

I am urging our leaders from the State of California and San Bernardino County to help the approval process move along for this project. The resistance to the project is unwarranted and unnecessary and the park should not be halted any further because of these organizations personal feelings. The permitting process should be objective and in the best interest of the residents of that area. It is time to redirect the approval process for a company that is treating the environment with respect while providing a great opportunity for both employees and guests. Thank you for your time in reading this letter and thank you in advance for any assistance you can send our way. Please contact me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Kari Brandt
kbrandt@skyparksantasvillage.com
(909) 553-5588
Dear Mr. Kevin White,  

March 28, 2017

I am writing to express my support for Sky Park Santa's Village and Bill and Michelle Johnson. My husband and I have lived in Lake Arrowhead full time since 2002. I also vacationed in Lake Arrowhead as a child back in the late 60's and early 70's. As a child I remember swimming in the lake from the village, going to Santa's Village, renting a sail boat in the village, and ice skating in the outdoor skating rink in Blue Jay. These outdoor activities were some of the highlights of my visits.

In recent years there have been fewer and fewer opportunities for locals and visitors to enjoy the outdoors. The village does not have swimming or sailing anymore. The famous outdoor skating rink in Blue Jay is gone and the indoor one closed a few years ago. When locals come to the mountains they find themselves without places to go. During the winter visitors are often found in an empty lot near Blue Jay playing in the snow or on the side of the roads. We have signs at the church we attend warning folks not to sled down the hillside, but we often find them there because there is nowhere else to go. Last year there was a problem with visitors playing in the snow at the Running Springs School and leaving trash there. Parents had to go in and clean after the weekend. Having a safe designated place for people to enjoy the outdoors would be a plus for our community and the visitors.

We have known the Johnson family for almost fifteen years. Their oldest daughter is the same age as our son. Bill Johnson was active at the high school assisting the mountain bike team when our older son was at the high school. Michelle has offered her talents to the schools through her artistic gifts. They both are very active in the community and I trust them to take good care of our forest which they love.

Since SkyPark at Santa's Village has opened I have taken two groups of visitors there and my husband and I went there on Valentine's Day. We have found it a great asset to our community already. I also know a number of people who work there and need that income. I urge you to put SkyPark on your priority list. Please support our community by supporting SkyPark ASAP.

Thank you for your consideration. If you would like further thoughts feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Carol Stanley
PO Box 2812 Lake Arrowhead/28127 Arbon Lane
9096159701
stanleyhome@charter.net
Dear Kevin,

The Arrowhead community is fully in support of Skypark at Santas Village.

The owners have done and are willing to do any and everything to rehabilitate what was a distressed property. It is pathetic the barriers that have been placed in front of this project especially by California Fish and Wildlife, the County of San Bernardino and Cal Trans. I'm sure the owners will do any REASONABLE improvement of this PRIVATE property that will to allow them to finish this massive project and move towards a full operation.

Please help get this project on the county docket for a vote so it can move forward with a FULL use permit. It will provide WHOLESALE family activities for people who will come from everywhere, provide stable local jobs for our community and tax revenue for the county. EVERYONE WINS.

Thanks for listening and please step up,

[Signature]

Richard Teachout

P.O. Box 485

Skyforest, CA 92385
3-27-17

Dear Senior Planner Kevin White,

The local Arrowhead community is in full support of Skypark at Santas Village.

The owners are quality people with only the property and communities best interest at heart. They are willing to do any and everything to rehabilitate what was a seriously distressed property. It is pathetic the barriers that have been placed in front of this project especially by California Fish and Wildlife and the County of San Bernardino. These owners will do any REASONABLE improvement of this PRIVATE property that will to allow them to finish this massive project and move towards a full operation.

Please help get this project on the county BOARD OF SUPERVISORS docket for a vote so it can move forward with a FULL use permit.

This project will provide WHOLESALE family activities for people who will come from everywhere, provide stable local jobs for our community and tax revenue for the county. EVERYONE WINS.

Thanks for listening and please step up,

Susan Pirolo

P.O. Box 4393

Crestline, CA 92325
3-27-17

Dear Planning Director Kahhal,

The local Arrowhead community is in full support of Skypark at Santas Village.

The owners are quality people with only the property and communities best interest at heart. They are willing to do any and everything to rehabilitate what was a seriously distressed property. It is pathetic the barriers that have been placed in front of this project especially by California Fish and Wildlife and the County of San Bernardino. These owners will do any REASONABLE improvement of this PRIVATE property that will to allow them to finish this massive project and move towards a full operation.

Please help get this project on the county BOARD OF SUPERVISORS docket for a vote so it can move forward with a FULL use permit.

This project will provide WHOLESOME family activities for people who will come from everywhere, provide stable local jobs for our community and tax revenue for the county. EVERYONE WINS.

Thanks for listening and please step up,

Susan Pirolo
P.O. Box 4393
Crestline, CA 92325.
Bill Johnson: General Manager
Skypark @ Santa’s Village
28950 Hwy 18
Sky Forest CA 92385

March 21st 2017

Dear Mr. Johnson,

WOW! Was I surprised with our visit to Skypark @ Santa’s Village yesterday!

Went there many years ago with our young son and witnessed a ‘tire & worn-out’ place.

Our party of 3 adults (wife, local good friend & myself) walked about the impressive complete facilities and had a great, with better than outstanding service, lunch at St. Nick’s Patio – Grille.

Overall I observed,

The visual attention to details....the cleanliness and proper order of the structures....the friendliness of your staff: ‘the villagers’....the service & quality of the food (great hotdogs by the way) ....the many & various signs & photo opportunities....the detailed-consistent themed offerings.... and the general quality & world-class impressions of Santa’s Village.

We walked throughout the village....talked with your various “well informed “ folks...admired all the detailed craftsmanship....and purchased a ‘now valuable’ keepsake.

As a former executive cast member at Disneyland (1995 thru 2001) managing our 18 corporate participant marketing partners’ advertising, promotions and special broadcast events.....I don’t offer my review or praise lightly.

I wish You, Your Villagers and All at Skypark @ Santa’s Village, every success in all your plans & efforts. We’ll be back up to visit again, soon.

Meanwhile, If I might be of any assistance or guidance....do feel free to call upon me.

Dan Skahill
3147 Samoa Place
Costa Mesa CA 92626
(714) 444-2451
TO: Terri Rahhal
Planning Director
Land Use Services Department
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and
citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your
approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our
community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino
County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social
stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a
project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of
this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village
has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at
Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village. My name is Russell Bridwell, a member of both housekeeping and the Adventure Crew Staff at the park. I am writing in an effort to move our elected San Bernardino County officials to approve, support and expedite the use of our forest. I’ve worked at SkyPark for five months with a fantastic experience in training and work environments that exceeds my expectations immensely. The profound amount of care, excitement, and appreciation is confidently shared with all of the other employees and visitors of SkyPark.

I feel as though SkyPark at Santa’s Village will not only bring the community education of our forests, wildlife and fun, but will bring us closer together. Our forests have vast amount of potential for SkyPark to expand and express just how incredible an experience citizens of the community can have. Ever since I began working at SkyPark, I’ve met a plethora of new people of our community and had created friendships with people I would’ve never met otherwise.

I confidently hope for the consideration of the San Bernardino County officials to approve, support and expedite the use of our forests of Santa’s Village so the park may continue to expand our efforts to enhance the education and safety of the community while fulfilling fun and excitement of the park.

Thank you San Bernardino County officials for your attention to this matter. If you may have any questions for me please feel free to contact me on my cell or email.

Thank you,

Russell Bridwell
(909) 362-3586
Bigoruss@live.com
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village. My name is Russell Bridwell, a member of both housekeeping and the Adventure Crew Staff at the park. I am writing in an effort to move our elected San Bernardino County officials to approve, support and expedite the use of our forest. I've worked at SkyPark for five months with a fantastic experience in training and work environments that exceeds my expectations immensely. The profound amount of care, excitement, and appreciation is confidently shared with all of the other employees and visitors of SkyPark.

I feel as though SkyPark at Santa's Village will not only bring the community education of our forests, wildlife and fun, but will bring us closer together. Our forests have vast amount of potential for SkyPark to expand and express just how incredible of an experience citizens of the community can have. Ever since I began working at SkyPark, I've met a plethora of new people of our community and had created friendships with people I would've never met otherwise.

I confidently hope for the consideration of the San Bernardino County officials to approve, support and expedite the use of our forests of Santa's Village so the park may continue to expand our efforts to enhance the education and safety of the community while fulfilling fun and excitement of the park.

Thank you San Bernardino County officials for your attention to this matter. If you may have any questions for me please feel free to contact me on my cell or email.

Thank you,

Russell Bridwell
(909) 362-3586
Bigoruss@live.com
To whom this may concern,

I’m writing this letter in support of SkyPark Santa’s Village. My name is Kenneth Acosta and I have concerns with why SkyPark is not fully open yet. The park has been open since December 3rd, 2016 and is only allowed to run 10% of the park due to restriction the county of San Bernardino, and Fish and Wildlife groups have put on the park. The park has 250 acres of land that they own with beautiful mountain bike and hiking trails with beautiful ponds. I’m an employee at SkyPark and have been since August of 2016. When I started we only had 35 employees and at our busiest time of the year Christmas, we had over 200 employees. It’s hard to run a company of 200 employees when you are not allowed to run the park the way it’s supposed to be run or how the owners envisioned it to run due to the lack of cooperation from the county of San Bernardino and Fish and Wildlife. The park is supposed to be an ecofriendly environment. Everything the park does is for the betterment of the area as a whole.

Being an employee and seeing the unutilized potential SkyPark has due to the restrictions that have been put on the park is very sad. Not being able to use the bike and hiking trails really hurts the park. We have 16 miles of trails that can’t be used due to these restriction as well as a very large meadow area that can’t be utilized. Not being able to utilize these major parts makes it hard to keep business going. We have people coming up to us all the time asking when are we going to be able to rise the trails and go out to the meadow area? And all we can say is hopefully in the summer time. Not being able to run the park at full capacity means we can’t do our educational program so we can make people aware of everything that is going on in our mountain areas as well as the park area. I’ve lived in the mountains community for over 25 years and this has been a major boost to our economy and a big boost to our community. The Park has generated over 200 jobs in the last few months and could do more if the park was open to max capacity. Since the park has been opened the flow of people coming up to the mountain areas has gone up. Which in turn brings more business to the mountain area.

What I’m asking of you is to help out with our County and Fish and Wildlife problems. If you are able to make them cooperate with us and not be so hesitant to let us be a fully operational park, or helping us by showing your support to SkyPark, that would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and thank you for reading my letter.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Acosta

[Signature]
3/23/17

Dear Mr. White:

I am writing in support of Bill Johnson’s re-zoning and permit applications for Sky Park and Santa’s Village in Sky Forest, CA. I recently visited Santa’s Village with two visitors from Costa Mesa and we were impressed with the family-oriented activities, cleanliness of the facility, and the quality of the food and merchandise.

Sky Park and Santa’s Village contributes to the mountain communities in a variety of ways.
- Since my guests had visited the original Santa’s Village with their son, who is now 33 years old, they were impressed with the preservation of the historical aspects of the park.
- Economically, Sky Park and Santa’s Village provides jobs for several hundred adults and teenagers.
- Sky Park and Santa’s Village contributes to the County’s Master Plan for the Mountain Communities by providing bike paths, hiking trails, zip lines, ice skating, fishing and other outdoor activities compatible with the mountain environment.
- Ecologically, Sky Park has preserved the meadows, ponds, and other green space damaged by the recent logging activities.
- In addition to the general admission visitors, Sky Park and Santa’s Village provides educational tours for local schools teaching the guests about local history, mountain flora and fauna, and the importance and preservation practices for the mountain environment.

I have also attached a copy of a letter that one of my guests, a former Disneyland executive, wrote to Bill Johnson in support of Sky Park and Santa’s Village.

Because of the above positive contributions to the mountains communities described above, please support the necessary zoning changes and permit approvals so that Sky Park and Santa’s Village can continue with its plans.

Regards,

Deborah Knowlton- Czarnecki
P.O. Box 139
Twin Peaks, CA 92391
Statement of support for SkyPark and their Management Team

This is John Senger, full time Lake Arrowhead resident and part time SkyPark employee. I write in support of the venue at Santa’s Village and seek your approval and support while suggesting expedited approval of the Park’s pending permit applications.

Since the mid-seventies, I have been involved in mine permitting/environmental compliance and hazardous materials management and emergency response responsibilities. Expertise germane to SkyPark permitting responsibilities include erosion control, revegetation and watershed management. I understand the magnitude of commitment required to be a responsible property steward. I feel the Management Team at SkyPark has the required integrity and moral character to live up to their responsibilities to the Public and the Regulatory Authorities in a responsive and proactive manner.

Please consider this an endorsement of the honor and discipline evident in my dealings with the SkyPark Management Team and a positive referral suggesting prompt permit approval. We are as dedicated as you are to maintaining environmentally responsible business operations and performing our duties in the interest of resource conservation predicated on honor and integrity.

Sincerely,

John C. Senger

jcsenger@gmail.com

909-334-7-8800
I am writing this letter to support Sky Park at Santa’s Village. My name is Brandon Fischer, I am writing this letter to inform you of the great opportunity that Sky Park at Santa’s Village has to offer to the community. I currently work at Sky Park at Santa’s Village as a Security Guard. In the time that I have worked here I have really grown to like this company and what they do. The Mountain bike park and Zip line is what is going to truly make this place thrive which is why I am reaching out to you.

I believe not letting the park use its own resources to better the community is unfair. With the Bike park and zip line added it will help bring more people to the mountains and help continue to add jobs year-round. It’s going to get people outdoors and be an unforgettable experience with everything they offer. Sky Park is not here to harm the environment and I have heard plans on the park having educational tours and hikes to educate the public about the wildlife and wetlands.

I would like you to give Sky Park at Santa’s Village a chance to show you by allowing them to open the entire part of the park on restriction by giving them the permit to open Mountain biking, Zip Lining, Hiking trails, and camping to the public. Thank you for your attention to this matter, if you have any questions I am available at any time at (909)499-2313.

Sincerely,
March 24, 2017

Terri Rehhal
Planning Director
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Dear Terri;

I am a full-time resident in Lake Arrowhead and have been for the past 4 years. As a point of interest, I was born in San Bernardino where my dad was a civic leader. His involvement in the city was endless, and was an excellent example to me.

Now to the reason for my letter. Last week I visited SkyPark at Santa’s Village and was very impressed with the facility and management. The design and activities are very mindful of environmental impact and have been successful in protecting the area. The endeavor has also provided needed jobs to residents in the area, and hopefully will bring visitors and new revenues to the area.

I am aware that your board has not been overtly supportive to SkyPark and them obtaining permits needed to complete the project. I ask that you and your Board become true representatives of the majority of people not just a few.

Thank you for your consideration.

[Signature]

William H Wilson
PO Box 638
Lake Arrowhead, Ca 92352
858-373-8161
Dear Terri,

The Arrowhead community is fully in support of Skypark at Santas Village.

The owners have done and are willing to do any and everything to rehabilitate what was a distressed property. It is pathetic the barriers that have been placed in front of this project especially by California Fish and Wildlife, the County of San Bernardino and Cal Trans. I'm sure the owners will do any REASONABLE improvement of this PRIVATE property that will to allow them to finish this massive project and move towards a full operation.

Please help get this project on the county docket for a vote so it can move forward with a FULL use permit. It will provide WHOLESALE family activities for people who will come from everywhere, provide stable local jobs for our community and tax revenue for the county. EVERYONE WINS.

Thanks for listening and please step up,

Richard Teachout

P.O. Box 485

Skyforest, CA 92385
March 13, 2017

To you who govern and protect the citizens of California,

We, the residents of the San Bernardino National Forest in Lake Arrowhead, need your help. Our mountain area used to be a destination, a place where people could come to rid themselves of their fears of crime, pollution and overcrowding where they live, to come up to the mountains and breathe clean air and relax and just have fun.

Unfortunately we are faced with losing the one new development in our area that has given people a destination to visit, a reason to come up here and explore...and spend the cash that helps revitalize our community. That development is SkyPark at Santa’s Village. My family moved here in 1981 and our children were regular visitors to Santa’s Village and many of our neighbors kids worked at the park. When the park closed in 1998 due to the pine bark beetle infestation, our school district lost 50% of their enrollment.

Santa’s Village has been revamped and somewhat repurposed and expanded in ways that protects the environment and promotes education with environmental science, land management practices and brings people back into nature. SkyPark brings back lost jobs and opportunity to the region. The economic contribution to our community is a necessity.

The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest or extremist groups continues to burden our community. The temporary use permit expires at the end of March. Bill Johnson, a mountain resident his whole life is the brainchild and driving force behind the development of SkyPark at Santa’s Village. He needs the county to re-zone the property back to Amusement Park, so he can move forward with his vision for the property. Without the re-zoning, there is no way for the park to survive. SkyPark at Santa’s Village is based on existing land use that is already built. All of the original buildings were built of timber on the property. It has brought out community together with generations of hard work to preserve a cultural resource. SkyPark is a new idea, based on historic land use, with today’s innovations. The Park replaces electric rides with self-powered features and promotes the natural ecology. And it employs our residents and will employ even more if these obstacles are removed.

Lastly, this revitalization of our mountain area could bring tax dollars to the county if we could get back on the map and become a destination again. Please bring this issue to anyone you think can help our situation. If it’s not on your agenda directly, I’m sure you know others in government that do know the supervisors that are giving in to special interests to stop the continuation of SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Thank you so much for listening and I hope you can help.

Sue Weaver

Realtor, Coldwell Banker Sky Ridge Realty
From: Michelle Hutton <Hutton@cbappteam.com>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2017 2:25 PM
To: White, Kevin - LUS
Subject: Sky Park at Santas Village

Dear Mr. White,

I am a long time resident of Lake Arrowhead. I have been raised here on the mountain since the mid 60's. I married a long time mountain resident and we have raised our children here. My first job in high school was at Santa's Village and I have many fond memories of visiting park over the years. I am devastated to hear the issues Bill and Michelle Johnson are having in getting the park successfully running. It is inexcusable this project does not have the green light to start moving forward and bring growth and prosperity to our mountain. I am asking for your help to make this happen.

SkyPark at Santa's Village is a new idea, based on a historic land use with today's innovation. The Park replaces electric rides with self powered features, and promotes the natural ecology. It uses existing trails to re-establish recreation, education and tourism all with NO ADVERSE EFFECTS.

SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark) is based upon an existing land use that is already built. The property once produced local foods as a small farm and ranch, before becoming the first franchised amusement park 1955. The Architecture is unmatched in the world as all of the original buildings were produced by the timber on the property. It has brought our community together with generations of hard work to preserve a CULTURAL RESOURCE.

At the time Santa's Village closed in '98, the mountain community was hit hard by an infestation of bark beetles; a very small black insect that destroyed over 1 million trees in the region. The mountain community was declared a natural disaster area and the "Santa's Village property" was the solution for harboring and processing timber, leaving an environmental mess. The property also contains a dense forest that requires continued forest management to provide FIRE PROTECTION for the surrounding community. SkyPark in partnership with NRCS has rehabilitated the land and continues to promote the natural habitat. The historic park has always contained horse back riding, hay rides, amusement rides and utility easements. It's proven over a half century of experience to be able to balance nature with human interaction. SkyPark has proven to be a SUSTAINABLE SOLUTION for the environment.

Santa's Village brings families to the community. The park promotes and attracts tourism from around the world. Since the closing of the Park In 1998, Rim of the World School district has lost 50% enrollment. The tax base no longer supports our educational system. The park promotes EDUCATION with environmental science, land management practices and gets people back into nature. SkyPark brings back lost jobs and opportunity to the region. The ECONOMIC contribution to our community is a necessity.

The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest or extremist, continue to burden our community as the minority few create hardship, overreaching conditions and fear among our governing bodies or lead agencies. SkyPark at Santa's Village deserves to exist. The park has already proven to be a far superior solution for the state, county and local community, easily justifying OVERRIDING CONDITIONS at every level of entitlement.

SkyPark is more than just a park or a job, it's a movement. It's a change for the good of our community. SkyPark improves the environment and most importantly the HUMAN CONDITION. The local paper is full of depression, crime and tragedy. How many San Bernardino shootings, parade bombings or horrific assaults need to occur before we realize that people need exposure to recreation, education and amusement to exist.

Our community needs this development now!!! Again, I am asking for your help. Please use your influence to make sure we can enjoy Sky Park and all that it has to offer for many years to come.

Sincerely,
Michelle Hutton

Michelle Hutton
Arrowhead Professional Partners
Coldwell Banker Sky Ridge Realty
27214 State Hwy 189 Suite F
Blue Jay, CA 92317
909-336-7902 direct
909-663-4433 cell
909-336-2400 fax
www.arrowheadprofessionalpartners.com

SKY RIDGE REALTY

 Independently Owned & Operated
TO: Terri Rahhal
   Planning Director
   Land Use Services Department
   385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
   San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and
citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your
approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our
community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino
County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social
stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a
project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of
this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village
has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at
Santa's Village.

Sincerely,
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Terri Rahhal
   Planning Director
   Land Use Services Department
   385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
   San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Terri Rahhal
    Planning Director
    Land Use Services Department
    385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
    San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert E. McConnell
March 24, 2017

Mr. Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Dear Mr. White;

I am a full-time resident in Lake Arrowhead and have been for the past 4 years. As a point of interest, I was born in San Bernardino where my dad was a civic leader. His involvement in the city was endless, and was an excellent example to me.

Now to the reason for my letter. Last week I visited SkyPark at Santa’s Village and was very impressed with the facility and management. The design and activities are very mindful of environmental impact and have been successful in protecting the area. The endeavor has also provided needed jobs to residents in the area, and hopefully will bring visitors and new revenues to the area.

I am aware that your board has not been overtly supportive to SkyPark and them obtaining permits needed to complete the project. I ask that you and your Board become true representatives of the majority of people not just a few.

Thank you for your consideration.

William H Wilson
PO Box 638
Lake Arrowhead, Ca 92352
858-373-8161
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

This project is invited to our community!
TO: Terri Rahhal
   Planning Director
   Land Use Services Department
   385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
   San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and
citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your
approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our
community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino
County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social
stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a
project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of
this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village
has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at
Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187  

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

Ronba Ryada
TO: Kevin White
   Senior Planner
   Land Use Services Department
   385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
   San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White
   Senior Planner
   Land Use Services Department
   385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
   San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White  
   Senior Planner  
   Land Use Services Department  
   385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
   San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
3/1/07
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

Aylene H. Popka, Ph. D.

Please do whatever you can to make this happen!
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,  

[Signature]
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[signature]
TO: US Congressman Col. Paul Cook 8th district
State of California
1222 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White
    Senior Planner
    Land Use Services Department
    385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
    San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and
citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your
approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our
community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino
County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social
stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a
project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of
this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village
has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at
Santa's Village.

Sincerely,
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dele Bobadilla
TO: Kevin White
   Senior Planner
   Land Use Services Department
   385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
   San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Handwritten Signature]
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. **Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.**

Sincerely,

Angela Yap-Bradley
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Chair, Mt. ADV. Council
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
April 2, 2017

Mr. Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Ave 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Dear Mr. White:

I am a full-time resident in Lake Arrowhead and have been for 13 years.

SkyPark at Santa’s Village is a very special facility. It means so much to our community. It provides so much more than jobs and activities. It is maintaining a place that is of historical value. It is providing quality of life for the mountain residents and tourists who can visit and enjoy the property. It is supporting a huge environmental effort to preserve the plant life and animals that inhabit the area. It provides an environmental education platform for our schools plus brings new families to our mountain to support our underfunded school district.

A good life involves supporting and lifting up those who wish to make our communities better. SkyPark does this and there is overwhelming evidence that the owners are respectful, patient and hard working citizens who have followed all of the guidelines and requirements only to be constantly delayed — it is so sad to see good honest people treated in such a way — I ask you to walk a mile in their shoes.

I am aware that your board has not been overly supportive of SkyPark and the obtaining permits needed to complete the project. I ask that you and your Board understand the huge support for this project in our community. If you do not provide assistance in aiding this facility in obtaining the permits needed, you will be going against the will of the majority of the mountain residents — not a legacy to be proud of.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lynne Morales
PO Box 517
Cedar Glen, CA 92321
909 337 8862
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ronda Rynak
March 20, 2017

Mr. Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Dear Mr. White,

I am a full-time resident in the Lake Arrowhead Area and have been for 20 years.

I work at SkyPark at Santa’s Village and am very impressed with the facility and management. The design and activities are very mindful of any environmental impact and have been successful in protecting the area. The endeavor has also provided much needed jobs to residents in the area, and hopefully will bring visitors and new revenues to the mountain and to the County of San Bernardino. The Park also seeks to educate visitors on the environment, how to protect and appreciate it!

I am aware that your board has not been overly supportive of SkyPark and them obtaining permits needed to complete the project. I ask that you and your Board become true representatives of the majority of people not just a few. The lack of support is puzzling to many of the County’s residents as this would again bring revenue and visitors to our County.

Thank you for your timely consideration.

[Signature]

John T. Burrows IV
PO Box 1580
31461 Ocean View Drive
Running Springs, CA 92382
909-939-0619
April 2, 2017

Terri Rehhal
Planning Director, Land Use Services Dept
385 N Arrowhead Ave 1st Floor
San Bernardino CA 92415

Dear Terri Rehhal:

I am a full-time resident in Lake Arrowhead and have been for 13 years.

SkyPark at Santa’s Village is a very special facility. It means so much to our community. It provides so much more than jobs and activities. It is maintaining a place that is of historical value. It is providing quality of life for the mountain residents and tourists who can visit and enjoy the property. It is supporting a huge environmental effort to preserve the plant life and animals that inhabit the area. It provides an environmental education platform for our schools plus brings new families to our mountain to support our underfunded school district.

A good life involves supporting and lifting up those who wish to make our communities better. SkyPark does this and there is overwhelming evidence that the owners are respectful, patient and hard working citizens who have followed all of the guidelines and requirements only to be constantly delayed – it is so sad to see good honest people treated in such a way – I ask you to walk a mile in their shoes.

I am aware that your board has not been overly supportive of SkyPark and the obtaining permits needed to complete the project. I ask that you and your Board understand the huge support for this project in our community. If you do not provide assistance in aiding this facility in obtaining the permits needed, you will be going against the will of the majority of the mountain residents – not a legacy to be proud of.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lynne Morales
PO BOX 517
Cedar Glen, CA 92321
909 337 8862
March 20, 2017

Terri Rehhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92415  

Dear Terri Rehhal,

I am a full-time resident in the Lake Arrowhead Area and have been for 18 years.

I work at SkyPark at Santa’s Village and am very impressed with the facility and management. The design and activities are very mindful of any environmental impact and have been successful in protecting the area. The endeavor has also provided much needed jobs to residents in the area, and hopefully will bring visitors and new revenues to the mountain and to the County of San Bernardino. The Park also seeks to educate visitors on the environment, how to protect and appreciate it!

I am aware that your board has not been overly supportive of SkyPark and them obtaining permits needed to complete the project. I ask that you and your Board become true representatives of the majority of people not just a few. The lack of support is puzzling to many of the County’s residents as this would again bring revenue and visitors to our County.

Thank you for your timely consideration.

Amanda Burrows.  
PO Box 1580  
31461 Ocean View Drive  
Running Springs, CA 92382  
909-939-0619
March 20, 2017

Mr. Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Dear Mr. White,

I am a full-time resident in the Lake Arrowhead Area and have been for 20 years.

Recently, I visited SkyPark at Santa’s Village and was very impressed with the facility and management. The design and activities are very mindful of any environmental impact and have been successful in protecting the area. The endeavor has also provided much needed jobs to residents in the area, and hopefully will bring visitors and new revenues to the mountain and to the County of San Bernardino. The Park also seeks to educate visitors on the environment, how to protect and appreciate it!

I am aware that your board has not been overly supportive of SkyPark and them obtaining permits needed to complete the project. I ask that you and your Board become true representatives of the majority of people not just a few. The lack of support is puzzling to many of the County’s residents as this would again bring revenue and visitors to our County.

Thank you for your timely consideration.

John T. Burrows III
PO Box 1580
31461 Ocean View Drive
Running Springs, CA 92382
909-939-0619
March 20, 2017

Mr. Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st Floor  
San Bernardino, CA  92415  

Dear Mr. White,

I am a full-time resident in the Lake Arrowhead Area and have been for 20 years.

I work at SkyPark at Santa’s Village and am very impressed with the facility and management. The design and activities are very mindful of any environmental impact and have been successful in protecting the area. The endeavor has also provided much needed jobs to residents in the area, and hopefully will bring visitors and new revenues to the mountain and to the County of San Bernardino. The Park also seeks to educate visitors on the environment, how to protect and appreciate it!

I am aware that your board has not been overly supportive of SkyPark and them obtaining permits needed to complete the project. I ask that you and your Board become true representatives of the majority of people not just a few. The lack of support is puzzling to many of the County’s residents as this would again bring revenue and visitors to our County.

Thank you for your timely consideration.

[Signature]

Stephanie Burrows  
PO Box 1580  
31461 Ocean View Drive  
Running Springs, CA 92382  
909-939-0619
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Devin Bobadilla
TO: Terri Rahhal  
Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187  

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. **Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.**

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO:  Kevin White  
      Senior Planner  
      Land Use Services Department  
      385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
      San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187  

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and  
citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your  
approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our  
community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino  
County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social  
stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.  

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a  
project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of  
this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village  
has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at  
Santa's Village.  

Sincerely,  

Robert E. McConnell
TO: Kevin White
      Senior Planner
      Land Use Services Department
      385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
      San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and
citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your
approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our
community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino
County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social
stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a
project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of
this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village
has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at
Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Aylene H. Popka, Ph.D.
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187  

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa's Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I've ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa's Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa's Village.

Sincerely,  

[Signature]
TO: Terri Rahhal
Planning Director
Land Use Services Department
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,
TO:       Kevin White
          Senior Planner
          Land Use Services Department
          385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
          San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and
citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your
approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our
community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino
County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social
stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a
project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of
this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village
has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. Approve SkyPark at
Santa’s Village.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
TO: Kevin White  
Senior Planner  
Land Use Services Department  
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

This is a letter in support of SkyPark at Santa’s Village (SkyPark). As a taxpayer and citizen of San Bernardino County, I would like to see SkyPark get approved now. Your approval of this project brings Jobs, education, recreation and a sustainable ecosystem to our community. The project has the ability to bring a new wealth of income into San Bernardino County from tourism. The benefits to our local school district, small businesses and social stability as a community alone is enough to warrant the approval of SkyPark.

I understand there are a number of issues that must be considered for the approval of a project like SkyPark. But, this is unlike any project I’ve ever seen. It is good for the people of this county. Whatever, the cause of the delay, there is no excuse. SkyPark at Santa’s Village has worked and waited too long to be put off with additional delays. **Approve SkyPark at Santa’s Village.**

Sincerely,
March 31, 2017

Ms. Terri Rehhal
Planning Director
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Ave, 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Dear Ms. Rehhal;

My wife and I are full-time residents in Lake Arrowhead and have been for a number of years. We have also owned a retail business here for over 10 years.

We visit SkyPark at Santa’s Village quite often and are very impressed with the facility and management. The design and activities are very mindful of any environmental impact and have been successful in protecting the area. The endeavor has also provided needed jobs to residents in the area, and hopefully will bring visitors and new revenues to the mountain.

We are aware that your office has not been overly supportive of SkyPark and their obtaining permits needed to complete the project, in a timely manner. We ask that you become a true representative of the majority of people, not just a few.

As business owners we were very aware of how important tourism is to our community and to the residents that need jobs. Skypark is an ideal place for teenagers in our area to work and interface with locals and tourists to broaden their knowledge. Please act now to keep Skypark on our mountain and help us thrive as a community. This is a feather in the cap of San Bernardino County and what we have to offer those that live near and far as recreation on our mountain.

Thank you for your consideration.

Harvey and Ginny Durand
PO Box 738
Lake Arrowhead, Ca 92352
909-336-9490
March 13, 2017

To you who govern and protect the citizens of California,

We, the residents of the San Bernardino National Forest in Lake Arrowhead, need your help. Our mountain area used to be a destination, a place where people could come to rid themselves of their fears of crime, pollution and overcrowding where they live, to come up to the mountains and breathe clean air and relax and just have fun.

Unfortunately we are faced with losing the one new development in our area that has given people a destination to visit, a reason to come up here and explore...and spend the cash that helps revitalize our community. That development is SkyPark at Santa’s Village. My family moved here in 1981 and our children were regular visitors to Santa’s Village and many of our neighbors kids worked at the park. When the park closed in 1998 due to the pine bark beetle infestation, our school district lost 50% of their enrollment.

Santa’s Village has been revamped and somewhat repurposed and expanded in ways that protects the environment and promotes education with environmental science, land management practices and brings people back into nature. SkyPark brings back lost jobs and opportunity to the region. The economic contribution to our community is a necessity.

The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest or extremist groups continues to burden our community. The temporary use permit expires at the end of March. Bill Johnson, a mountain resident his whole life is the brainchild and driving force behind the development of SkyPark at Santa’s Village. He needs the county to re-zone the property back to Amusement Park, so he can move forward with his vision for the property. Without the re-zoning, there is no way for the park to survive. SkyPark at Santa’s Village is based on existing land use that is already built. All of the original buildings were built of timber on the property. It has brought out community together with generations of hard work to preserve a cultural resource. SkyPark is a new idea, based on historic land use, with today’s innovations. The Park replaces electric rides with self-powered features and promotes the natural ecology. And it employs our residents and will employ even more if these obstacles are removed.

Lastly, this revitalization of our mountain area could bring tax dollars to the county if we could get back on the map and become a destination again. Please bring this issue to anyone you think can help our situation. If it’s not on your agenda directly, I’m sure you know others in government that do know the supervisors that are giving in to special interests to stop the continuation of SkyPark at Santa’s Village.

Thank you so much for listening and I hope you can help.

Sue Weaver

Realtor, Coldwell Banker Sky Ridge Realty
Kevin White - Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st floor
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

It has been brought to my attention that the Conditional Use Permit for Skypark at Santa’s Village expires in a couple weeks, but even more concerning is the zoning issues that continue to plague the full opening of the park. If not approved by May, it is my understanding they may be forced to shut down.

As a Lake Arrowhead resident for the last 16 years, I know this community and the value that Skypark at Santa’s Village will, and has already, added to the mountain. We have limited draws for tourism on our side of the mountain. We also have limited employment opportunities for those that choose to live up here full time.

Skypark at Santa’s Village has created a new optimism for tourism. We are seeing investors looking at commercial and business opportunities up here for the first time in years. If Skypark were not to succeed, due to the environmentalist pressure and inactivity of our county supervisors, then why would any potential investor come to our community? They would see that there are too many challenges, and it wouldn’t be worth their time.

Tourism is what drives the mountain economy. If we draw people to the area, they can discover this great rural community. If there are jobs and things to do, they may even buy a primary home, or a vacation property. We need more families on the mountain. Since 1998, when Santa’s Village shut down, we have seen enrollment in our local school district decline by 50%. Now I am not suggesting that Santa’s Village was the cause, but there is certainly an opportunity to turn those numbers around with the success of the new Skypark at Santa’s Village.

The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest, or environmental extremist, continue to burden our community as the minority few create hardship, overreaching conditions and fear among our governing bodies or lead agencies. SkyPark at Santa’s Village deserves to exist. The park has already proven to be a far superior solution for the state, county and local community, easily justifying OVERRIDING CONDITIONS at every level of entitlement. More tourism, and more full time residents makes for a higher tax base within the county. We cannot let these environmental groups extort the project or the county. They must be called out fro what they are doing! Our mountain needs revitalization, and Skypark is the start of that process. I’m sure the county could also use the tax dollars that our area could bring, if we could get back on the map and become a destination again. You should have a vested interest in this situation. No, you have a duty to support what the majority of citizens on this mountain need. Now is the time to step up and do what is right for our community.

I ask you to support Skypark at Santa’s Village with all the necessary permits and zoning issues that are holding back the success of this beautiful project.

Sincerely,

Jim Newcomb
PO Box 2757
Blue Jay, Ca 92317
Hm 909-337-8115
Cell 909-754-6157
Terri Rahhal - Planning Director  
Land Use Services Department  
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., 1st floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92414-0187

It has been brought to my attention that the Conditional Use Permit for Skypark at Santa’s Village expires in a couple weeks, but even more concerning is the zoning issues that continue to plague the full opening of the park. If not approved by May, it is my understanding they may be forced to shut down.

As a Lake Arrowhead resident for the last 16 years, I know this community and the value that Skypark at Santa’s Village will, and has already, added to the mountain. We have limited draws for tourism on our side of the mountain. We also have limited employment opportunities for those that choose to live up here full time.

Skypark at Santa’s Village has created a new optimism for tourism. We are seeing investors looking at commercial and business opportunities up here for the first time in years. If Skypark were not to succeed, due to the environmentalist pressure and inactivity of our county supervisors, then why would any potential investor come to our community? They would see that there are too many challenges, and it wouldn’t be worth their time.

Tourism is what drives the mountain economy. If we draw people to the area, they can discover this great rural community. If there are jobs and things to do, they may even buy a primary home, or a vacation property. We need more families on the mountain. Since 1998, when Santa’s Village shut down, we have seen enrollment in our local school district decline by 50%. Now I am not suggesting that Santa’s Village was the cause, but there is certainly an opportunity to turn those numbers around with the success of the new Skypark at Santa’s Village.

The Permitting process has stopped the success of the park. The abuse by special interest, or environmental extremist, continue to burden our community as the minority few create hardship, overreaching conditions and fear among our governing bodies or lead agencies. SkyPark at Santa’s Village deserves to exist. The park has already proven to be a far superior solution for the state, county and local community, easily justifying OVERRIDING CONDITIONS at every level of entitlement. More tourism, and more full time residents makes for a higher tax base within the county. We cannot let these environmental groups extort the project or the county. They must be called out fro what they are doing! Our mountain needs revitalization, and Skypark is the start of that process. I’m sure the county could also use the tax dollars that our area could bring, if we could get back on the map and become a destination again. You should have a vested interest in this situation. No, you have a duty to support what the majority of citizens on this mountain need. Now is the time to step up and do what is right for our community.

I ask you to support Skypark at Santa’s Village with all the necessary permits and zoning issues that are holding back the success of this beautiful project.

Sincerely,

Jim Newcomb  
PO Box 2757  
Blue Jay, Ca 92317  
Hm 909-337-8115  
Cell 909-754-6157
March 14\textsuperscript{th}, 2017

Terri Rahhal
Planning Director
Land Use Services Dept.
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. First Floor
San Bernardino, Ca. 92415-0187

I just found out that Sky Park at Santa’s Village may close the end of March. I believe the park needs the zoning required to stay open. I’m amazed that special interest groups are able to stop this rezoning. Apparently the interests of the few out way the interests of the many.

Sky Park is the first large scale commercial development we have seen in many years. Employing several hundred mountain residence in the renovation and operation. And has brought many visitors to our local mountain area.

My husband and I have been a mountain residence for 45 plus years and have seen special interest groups bankrupt many residential developments. Now they are sending a loud and clear message that the mountain is not the place for any development.

It’s time to turn this trend around. It’s time to provide visitors and residents some form of good family entertainment that adds to our economy.

Mike and Mary Orr
24890 Edelweiss
Crestline, Ca. 92325
P.O. Box 1020
Crestline, Ca. 92325
Please Support SkyPak
Santa's Village, Our Mountain Community, need the jobs

Sincerely

[Signature]

Senior Associate Farnel White

Please Support SkyPak
Santa's Village, Our Community needs the jobs

Sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Public,

Please suggest they people and the economy of the area have

Community

267 Cheyenne Rd
92352

What the water, please suggest they park be

Andri Yulio, the community planning needs the job

Sincerely,

267 Cheyenne Rd.
Mr. White,

Please see the attached comments. The document is password-protected, but only for modifications. You should be able to open it as read-only.

Please confirm that you received this email and were able to open the attachment.

Thank you.

Drew Feldmann
Conservation Chair
San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society

---

Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-3067
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

---

Hello Kevin,

Thanks for the email note and link to the Final EIR for the SkyPark Project. However, it appears that Audubon's comments are not included in the Final EIR. This is a serious matter, since Audubon raised several significant issues about the adequacy of key sections of the DEIR. The absence of our comments means that the Final EIR cannot be considered complete.
Please let us know as soon as possible how the County plans to correct this oversight.

Thank you for your attention.

From: White, Kevin - LUS <Kevin.White@lus.sbcounty.gov>
To: 'Drew Feldmann' <drewf3@verizon.net>
Cc: davegoodward <davegoodward@earthlink.net>; Rahhal, Terri <Terri.Rahhal@lus.sbcounty.gov>
Sent: Tue, May 9, 2017 5:02 pm
Subject: RE: Audubon Comments on SkyPark Project

Mr. Feldmann,

Thank you for your email bringing this matter to our attention. We apologize for the inadvertent omission of the San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society (Audubon) letter in the FEIR. County Staff along with our consultant team has reviewed the correspondence and we are in the process of preparing a response to the letter. As you know, the project is scheduled to be heard by the County Planning Commission on May 18, 2017. At that time staff will present an overview of the project, the environmental analysis and the associated comments and responses. The Audubon comment letter will be provided to the Planning Commission and posted for public review with the Planning Commission staff report. Please note that the Planning Commission role in the review of this project will be to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors is the review authority for certification of the EIR and for a decision on the project. In advance of the public hearing by the Board of Supervisors, the FEIR will be amended to include the Audubon letter with a comprehensive response.

Please take a moment to complete our 1 Minute Satisfaction Survey
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LUS_Email

Kevin White
Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department
Phone: 909-387-3067
Fax: 909-387-3223
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Our job is to create a county in which those who reside and invest can prosper and achieve well-being.
www.SBCounty.gov

County of San Bernardino Confidentiality Notice: This communication contains confidential information sent solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you are not authorized to use it in any manner, except to immediately destroy it and notify the sender.
Sonick, Chrystale

From: Vanhorne, Scott  
Sent: Friday, May 12, 2017 12:26 PM  
To: White, Kevin - LUS  
Subject: FW: full-time resident in the Mountain Communities of Lake Arrowhead for over 20 years and am in favor of SkyPark at Santa’s Village

Are you including support letters in the packet to the PC about Santa’s Village? If so, here’s one…

SV

From: Polly Sauer  
Reply-To: Polly Sauer  
Date: Friday, May 12, 2017 at 1:27 AM  
To: Supervisor Rutherford  
Subject: full-time resident in the Mountain Communities of Lake Arrowhead for over 20 years and am in favor of SkyPark at Santa’s Village

Dear Supervisor Janice Rutherford:

With to advise you I have been a full-time resident in the Mountain Communities of Lake Arrowhead for over 20 years and am in favor of SkyPark at Santa’s Village being able to operate.

With respect and a grateful heart for your service,

Polly

Polly Sauer  
V: 909.806.5284

Support My Goal and Eighth Year Walking 50 Miles Raising Funds To Cure MS By Clicking Here
Dear Mr. White,

As a 60 year resident of California, I came to Santa's Village as a child and brought my own children there as well. We've owned a second home in Cedar Glen for almost seven years and have been excited about SkyPark at Santa's Village. Friends and relatives of ours in other Southern California cities have been looking forward to coming and enjoying this unique place.

Learning that it might close was very depressing news which frankly I don't understand; the benefits are many: local people are able to have jobs on a project that will bring life back to the area; the economy can only be improved; visitors can once again enjoy the park which has even been enhanced; a part of the mountain heritage will be returned to Lake Arrowhead.

Please do no allow this project to be stopped. So many are relying on you!

Sincerely,

Bonnie Elconin

22262 Hazel Crest
Mission Viejo, CA 92692
belconin@cox.net
949-472-1302
Environmental Impact Report
(See Separate Link)
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1-1:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td><strong>MM AES-1:</strong> Trees that are removed as a result of roadway improvements, shall be replaced by replanting of native species at a minimum height of 8 feet at a 2:1 ratio of new trees to removed trees in the vicinity of the area they were removed. A landscape plan which includes the species, size, and location of trees to be planted shall be submitted to and approved by San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department and Caltrans.</td>
<td>Applicant’s Contractor or Consultant to prepare and submit Tree Replacement Landscape Plan to the San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department and Caltrans for review and approval. Applicant’s Contractor to plant trees consistent with approved Landscape Plan</td>
<td>Post-Construction</td>
<td>San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department and Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1-2:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not substantially damage scenic resources.</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1-3:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding.</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td><strong>MM AES-2:</strong> All exterior and permanent lighting shall be the minimum lumen (measure of the total quantity of visible light emitted by a source), shielded downward, and stationed at the minimum height in order to light the target area. The County of San Bernardino Building and Safety</td>
<td>Applicant’s Contractor</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>San Bernardino County Building and Safety Department, Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.1-4:</strong> Implementation if the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views.</td>
<td>Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SkyPark at Santa’s Village Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department will review construction plans for compliance with applicable codes, including the Night Sky Protection Ordinance, and will conduct final inspection approval for issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM AES-3: All lighting to be installed for the Fantasy Forest Trail shall be at the minimum lumen, shielded downward, and stationed at the minimum height in order to light the target area. All Fantasy Forest Trail lighting shall not extend beyond and illuminate more than 50 feet into the forest from the edge of either side of the trail. Upon completion of the Fantasy Forest Trail a report shall be completed by the contractor that verifies the lighting does not extend more than 50 feet into the adjacent forest. This report shall be submitted to the Land Use Services Department for review and approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.2-1: Implementation of the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact Statement

### Significance

No impact. No mitigation is necessary.

### Mitigation Measure

No impact. No mitigation is necessary.

### Monitoring Period

No impact. No mitigation is necessary.

### Monitoring Agency

No impact. No mitigation is necessary.

### Impact 4.2-2: Implementation of the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

### Impact 4.2-3: Implementation of the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).

### Impact 4.2-4: Implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

### Impact 4.2-5: Implementation of the Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

### Air Quality

### Impact 4.3-1: Implementation of the Project would not violate air quality standards or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction.

| MM AQ-1: | Prior to issuance of any Grading Permit, San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans, and specifications stipulate that, in Applicant’s Contractor | Construction | San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department |

| Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. | | | |

San Bernardino County

May 2017

1.0-3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust prevention measures, as specified in the SCAQMD’s Rules and Regulations. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off-site. Implementation of the following measures would reduce short-term fugitive dust impacts on nearby sensitive receptors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Apply soil stabilizers or moisten inactive areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Water exposed surfaces as needed to avoid visible dust leaving the construction site (typically 2-3 times/day).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimize in-out traffic from construction zone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose material and require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3-2:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not violate air quality standards or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation during long-term operations.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3-3:</strong> Development associated with implementation of the proposed project would not result in localized emissions impacts or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3-4:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3-5:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3-6:</strong> Short-term construction activities associated with the implementation of the proposed project and other related cumulative projects, would not result in significant air pollutant emission impacts.</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</td>
<td>Refer to Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1.</td>
<td>Applicant’s Contractor</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3-7:</strong> Development associated with implementation the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not result in significant impacts pertaining to operational air emissions.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SkyPark at Santa’s Village Project
#### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3-8:</strong> Development associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3-9:</strong> Development associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Biological Resources

**Impact 4.4-1:** Implementation of the proposed Project may have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

| MM BIO-1: | A qualified biologist or botanist shall conduct a pre-construction clearance survey for special-status plant species on the project site during the appropriate blooming period prior to trail creation or construction in new areas. If present, any special-status plants shall be clearly flagged for avoidance with a suitable buffer zone during construction by the qualified biologist/botanist. Physical barriers shall be strategically placed as directed by the biologist/botanist around any identified special-status plant species, preventing guests from entering these areas. A letter report summarizing the results of the pre-construction plant survey and any placement of physical barriers to protect special-status plants shall be prepared by the "Qualified Biologist retained by applicant" | Pre-Construction and Construction | San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department |  |  |

San Bernardino County  
May 2017  
1.0-6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-2:</td>
<td></td>
<td>All work areas shall be visibly flagged or staked prior to construction. Construction activities shall be limited to these approved work areas except with prior authorization from regulatory agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-3:</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) shall be implemented to educate all construction personnel of the area’s environmental concerns and conditions, including special-status species, and relevant environmental protection measures. The WEAP will constitute the conveyance of environmental concerns and appropriate work practices, including spill prevention, emergency response measures, protection of sensitive resources, and proper implementation of BMP's, to all construction and maintenance personnel. All new workers that arrive after construction has started shall be trained under the WEAP within two days’ time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-4:</td>
<td></td>
<td>All brush, debris, and cleared vegetation shall be removed from the project site and disposed of properly or reused elsewhere on-site in an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approved location where it will not wash into any riparian areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-5:</td>
<td></td>
<td>For Class II streams, defined as those supporting aquatic life other than fish, a buffer of 75 feet (23 meters) on either side of the stream (measured from the high water mark) will be flagged and avoided. For Class III streams, defined as those not supporting aquatic life, a buffer of 25 feet (8 meters) on either side of the stream (measured from the high water mark) will be flagged and avoided. On-site streams are expected to be classified as a combination of Class II and Class III streams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-6:</td>
<td></td>
<td>All trails shall be kept in a maintained state sufficient to clearly determine where the trail lies. Where trails are located within and adjacent to sensitive habitat areas, signs and physical barriers shall be strategically placed along the trail, under direction of a qualified biologist, to prevent guests from wandering outside of the trail boundaries and to inform them off-trail use of the park is strictly prohibited and enforced and will result in ejection from the park without a refund of any entry fees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-7:</td>
<td></td>
<td>A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction clearance survey for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special-status wildlife species (including California spotted owl, San Bernardino flying squirrel, and southern rubber boa) on the project site immediately prior to trail creation or construction in new areas. Special-status wildlife shall be avoided by waiting for them to leave an area before working in it. A letter report summarizing the results of the pre-construction clearance survey for special-status wildlife species shall be prepared by the biologist and be submitted to the San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-8:</td>
<td></td>
<td>A biologist shall be on-site when work (e.g. trail clearing) is conducted in suitable habitat for SRB. All duff, debris, and downed logs in proposed work areas shall be examined for SBR by a qualified biologist no more than 5 days prior to disturbance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-9:</td>
<td>Retain 9 logs per acre of all age and decay classes greater than or equal to 12 inches (31 centimeters) in diameter and 20 feet (6 meters) long. At least 3 of the logs should be Class 1 logs with a minimum diameter of 12 inches (31 centimeters). Half of the logs should be 20-36 inches (51-96 centimeters) in diameter. A biologist shall coordinate where the logs should be placed for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maximum wildlife usability. Exceptions will be made in fuel break areas.</td>
<td>MM BIO-10: All rocky outcrops shall be avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM BIO-11: Brush piles for burning or chipping will not be created within 300 feet (92 meters) of rock outcrops and existing logs in rubber boa habitat. If this is not possible, exclusionary fencing will be placed around brush piles to prevent usage by boas prior to burning or chipping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM BIO-12: Brush piles for burning or chipping will not be created within bald eagle roosts during occupancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM BIO-13: All construction shall occur outside of January 1-September 15 (this time frame includes both the passerine and raptor nesting season). If construction occurs during this time period, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird clearance survey in all work areas and all areas within 500 feet of the general construction zone. This shall occur no more than one week prior to construction. Active nests shall be given an avoidance buffer, typically 300 feet for non-listed, non-raptor species, and 500 feet for listed and raptor species. This buffer shall remain in place until the young fledge or the nest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>otherwise becomes inactive, and may be reduced with approval from CDFW and/or USFWS. The nest(s) shall be monitored at least once each week during active construction to determine status. If an established buffer is still causing animal stress or potential abandonment of nest, work will stop until a biologist can establish a new buffer to ensure no take is incurred. A letter report summarizing the results of the preconstruction nesting bird clearance survey and any active nests and buffer areas shall be prepared by the biologist and submitted to the San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-14:</td>
<td></td>
<td>The applicant will retain 10-15 hard snags per 5 acres (minimum of 16 inches/41 centimeters diameter at breast height and 40 feet/12 meters tall). Live and dead oaks that are at least 14 inches (35 centimeters) diameter at breast height will be retained unless they pose falling hazards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-15:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No work will be allowed within 400 meters of known California spotted owl activity areas during the Limited Operating Period (LOP) between February 1 and August 15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-16:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No work will be allowed during the LOP in the entire project area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-17:</td>
<td></td>
<td>If owl surveys have not been conducted, all suitable habitat shall be avoided during the LOP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-18:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Known nest sites will be buffered by 400 meters (as identified by a qualified biologist) and avoided in perpetuity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-19:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wildlife trees will be marked and avoided by a qualified biologist. All snags in nesting or foraging areas shall be left intact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-20:</td>
<td></td>
<td>In known or suitable nesting areas, percent canopy cover shall not be reduced below 70%. In areas of known or suitable foraging, percent canopy cover shall not be reduced below 50%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-21:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Downed woody debris shall be left at 10-15 tons per acre in nesting and foraging habitat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-22:</td>
<td></td>
<td>All woodrat nests shall be avoided and buffered by 10 feet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-23:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 10 percent or more of stumps, targeting those showing some level of decomposition, should be left at two to three feet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-24:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slash piles should be left in approved areas. Slash piles should be three to four feet high and four to six feet in diameter. There should be two to three slash piles per acre. They should not be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>burned. Slash piles should be placed approximately 50 feet from roads and houses.</strong> <strong>MM BIO-25:</strong> Prior to any new work (e.g. clearing for trail construction or maintenance) that are conducted in suitable habitat for southern rubber boa, all duff, debris, and downed logs in proposed work areas shall be examined for southern rubber boa by a biologist no more than 5 days prior to disturbance; the biologist conducting this survey must hold a Memorandum of Understanding from the CDFW allowing take of southern rubber boa. During construction or maintenance, a qualified biologist familiar with southern rubber boa ecology and identification shall be on-site at all times to monitor for southern rubber boa in the work area(s). Any incidences of injuring or killing an individual southern rubber boa shall be reported immediately to SkyPark Management who shall notify CDFW within 24 hours. The qualified biologist shall be responsible for submitting daily construction or maintenance monitoring reports, noting specifically if any southern rubber boa refugia (e.g., downed logs, boulders) were disturbed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-26:</td>
<td></td>
<td>during construction or maintenance and/or if any southern rubber boa were found, and if so, the quantity of each and its condition at the time that the construction or maintenance site was left for the day. In addition, a final monitoring summary will be written upon completion of the monitored work and submitted to CDFW within 30 calendar days of construction or maintenance completion. The report shall include start and end dates of the monitored work, known project effects on southern rubber boa, occurrences of incidental take of southern rubber boa, and other pertinent information regarding the success or failure of the monitoring in protecting southern rubber boa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately twenty acres (20.2 acres) of high quality southern rubber boa habitat in the northernmost extent of the project site will be set aside as mitigation lands for the project. A restrictive covenant will be placed over these 20.2 acres and will provide for conservation of that property in perpetuity (refer to Exhibit 4.4-5, Conservation Area). The conservation area will not undergo any new development of any kind. Some maintenance of the existing road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SkyPark at Santa’s Village Project
#### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.4-2:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</td>
<td><strong>MM BIO-27:</strong> Permanent and temporary impacts to drainage feature D-2 (as identified in the Jurisdictional Delineation Report) from the widening of SR-18 shall be mitigated to less than significant levels through off-site compensatory mitigation at a minimum of 1:1 ratio for impacts, as deemed appropriate by</td>
<td>Qualified Biologist retained by applicant</td>
<td>Pre-Construction of SR-18 improvement</td>
<td>USACE, RWQCB, CDFW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and biking trail segments located in the conservation area may be necessary after severe weather events. Any new, illegal trails into this area will be immediately closed off with a berm, rocks, or a similar method to discourage guests from using them and will be restored to original conditions. To protect the mitigation area, SkyPark Management shall place appropriate fencing and/or natural barriers and signage around the perimeter of conservation area. Except for existing trails in the conservation area (portions of existing single track bike trail and existing access road), the public shall not have access to the mitigation area, and no activities shall be permitted within the site, except maintenance of habitat, including the removal of nonnative plant species, trash, and debris, and the installation of native plant materials.
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1.0-15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.4-3:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Clean Water Act Section 404 (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</td>
<td>MM Bio-27 above.</td>
<td>Qualified Biologist to be retained by applicant</td>
<td>Pre-Construction of SR-18 improvements</td>
<td>USACE, RWQCB, CDFW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.4-4:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</td>
<td>Less than significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.4-5:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinances.</td>
<td>Less than significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.4-6:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.</td>
<td>No Impact.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Impact 4.5-1:** Implementation of the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. | MM CR-1: Changes to Historical Resource  
- Project activities should be consistent with “plans for rehabilitation to ensure that the undertaking maintains consistency with the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties” (36 CFR part 68; see http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehab/standard.htm). The Standards are intended to pertain to rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.  
- Project design should be prepared and applied in consultation with a professional that meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior Professional Qualification Standards for Historic Architecture (see http://www.nps.gov/history/locallaw/arch_stnds_9.htm) | Contractor to halt construction if potential resource is discovered. | Construction | San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department |
| **Impact 4.5-2:** Implementation if the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA guidelines Section 15064.5. | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. | MM CR-2: Changes to an Archaeological Resource  
- An archaeological monitor shall be present during any earthmoving activities proposed within the project site boundaries. The | Contractor to halt construction if potential resource is discovered. | Construction | San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department |
### Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Impact 4.5-3:** Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a Tribal Cultural Resource. | Less than Significant.      | Monitor shall work under the direct supervision of a cultural resource professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction work in the vicinity of any find until the project archaeologist can evaluate it.  
  - In the event of a new find, salvage excavation and reporting shall be required. | Qualified paleontologist and the County to confer on discovered resources and appropriate mitigation.  
  Qualified paleontologist to prepare treatment plan (if necessary). | No mitigation is necessary.  |                                                                                                        |
| **Impact 4.5-4:** Implementation of the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. | Less than Significant.      |                                                                                      |                                                                                                     | No mitigation is necessary.  |                                                                                                        |
| **Impact 4.5-5:** Implementation of the Project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. | MM CR-3: Encountering Human Remains  
  - If human remains are encountered during the project activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the | Contractor to halt construction if potential resource is discovered |                                                                                                          | San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department |
County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately.

- If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC.

### Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

**Impact 4.6-1:** Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic groundshaking; seismic-related ground

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Failure, including liquefaction; or landslides. | | MM GEO-1: Development and use of new hiking and mountain biking trails as well as use of existing trails shall implement the following avoidance, design, and maintenance measures:  
- Discourage or prohibit off-trail travel through education (information given to guest before they use trails, include in park rules), signage on trails, and strategic placement of boulders, downed timber, split rail fence segments;  
- Design trails with sustainable grades and avoid fall-line alignments;  
- When possible, build trails in dry, cohesive soils that easily compact and contain a larger percentage of coarse material. These soils better resist erosion by water, wind, or displacement by feet and tires;  
- Minimize trail muddiness by avoiding flat terrain, wet soils, and drainage-bottom locations;  
- Use grade reversals to remove water from trail treads. Grade reversals are permanent and sustainable. When they are | SkyPark Operator | Operation | San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department |
<p>| <em>Impact 4.6-2: Implementation of the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</em> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designed into a trail’s alignment they remain 100 percent effective and require minimal maintenance;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If it is not possible to install proper drainage on a trail, consider rerouting trail sections that are most problematic, or possibly hardening the trail;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In flatter areas, elevate and crown trails to prevent muddiness, or add a gravel/soil mixture in low spots; Integrating ramps where turns or change in direction are likely to occur on trails. The trails would be more vulnerable to erosion during turns because of decrease in speed and possible skidding, thus adding ramps would decrease erosion; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Temporarily close trails that are prone to muddiness during rainy or snowmelt seasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.6-3: The Project site is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.6-4:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) that would create a substantial risk to life or property.</td>
<td>Less than significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.6-4:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.</td>
<td>Less than significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenhouse Gas Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.7-1:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.7-2:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.7-3:</strong> Greenhouse gas emissions generated by the proposed project, combined with other related cumulative projects, would not have a significant impact on global climate change.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.7-4:</strong> The proposed project, combined with other related cumulative</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects, would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.8-1</strong>: Implementation of the Project would involve the routine transport, storage, use and disposal of hazardous materials. However, this would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Existing regulations applicable to hazardous materials would be compiled to minimize impacts.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.8-2</strong>: Implementation of the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.8-3</strong>: Implementation of the Project would/would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.8-4:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.8-5:</strong> Implementation of the Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport where such a plan has not been adopted.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.8-6:</strong> Implementation of the Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.8-7:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.8-8:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas and where residences are intermixed with wildlands.</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</td>
<td>MM HAZ-1: No smoking will be strictly enforced on the property, including but not limited to the campground site and Santa’s Village. MM HAZ-2: There will be no wood burning fires that create windblown embers. The campground site will include a few community fire rings that are supplied by natural gas lines extended from SkyPark Operator</td>
<td>Operation San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SkyPark at Santa’s Village Project
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa’s Village to the campground. The fire rings will be monitored during use.</td>
<td>MM HAZ–3:</td>
<td>Santa’s Village to the campground. The fire rings will be monitored during use. A comprehensive Spill Prevention and Response Plan shall be prepared that outlines the site-specific monitoring requirements and lists the BMPs necessary to prevent hazardous material spill and to contain and clean up a hazardous material spill, should one occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

**Impact 4.9-1:** Implementation of the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.9-2:** Implementation of the Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a new deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.9-3:** Implementation of the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</td>
<td>MM HYDRO-1 Hydrogeological testing shall be conducted by a qualified hydrogeologist to confirm the assumption used in this EIR analysis that the groundwater at SkyPark is directly connected to the surface water of Hooks Creek. The results of this testing shall be submitted to the San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.</td>
<td>San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>Pre-Construction, Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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If the results of the hydrogeological testing confirms the assumption used in this EIR analysis, that there is connectivity between the groundwater source for SkyPark’s wells and the surface water flow in Hooks Creek, a groundwater and surface water monitoring plan shall be developed and implemented and shall include:

- Installation of a stream gage on Hooks Creek, or other monitoring mechanism if Hooks Creek is ephemeral and only flows during storm events, at a location downstream of the Project boundary.
- Installation of an inline flowmeter on all Project pumping wells in order to record instantaneous and cumulative groundwater production.
- Baseline monitoring of groundwater levels at a minimum of three months prior to opening day. Groundwater monitoring shall be conducted on a monthly basis.
### Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- On-going monitoring of groundwater levels and Hooks Creek streamflow rates to provide the data necessary to assess the role of Project pumping on changes in stream flow rates (if any).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Baseline and on-going monitoring of groundwater levels and Hooks Creek streamflow rates will be submitted to the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board on an annual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Within one year of opening day the threshold for change (reduction) in the streamflow rate that warrants implementation of adaptive management steps shall be established by a qualified hydrogeologist in coordination with Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The adaptive management steps that shall be implemented if the threshold for change in Hooks Creek is exceeded include one or more of the following until such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.9-4:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>time that monitoring data shows the threshold is no longer exceeded for two consecutive months:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce or eliminate use of on-site groundwater for irrigation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce or eliminate use of on-site groundwater for potable/operational uses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase delivery and use of water from Skyforest Mutual Water Company for potable/operational uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.9-5:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.9-6:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.9-7:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on the County’s FEMA Flood Zone Map.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.9-8:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.9-9:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.10-1:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not physically divide an established community.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.10-2:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SkyPark at Santa’s Village Project
#### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.10-3:** Implementation of the Project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

No impact. No mitigation is necessary.

### Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 4.11-1: Implementation of the Project would not</th>
<th>Less than Significant.</th>
<th>No mitigation is necessary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.11-2: Implementation of the Project would not</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 4.12-1: Grading and construction associated with project implementation could result in significant temporary noise impacts to nearby noise sensitive receptors.</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</th>
<th>MM NOI-1: Prior to Grading Permit issuance, the Project applicant shall prepare a construction noise management plan that identifies measures to be taken to minimize construction noise on surrounding sensitive receptors (e.g., residential uses) and includes specific noise management measures to be included into Project plans and specifications subject to review and approval by the San Bernardino Planning Department. The Project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the San Bernardino Contractor</th>
<th>Pre-Construction</th>
<th>San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| County Planning Director that the Project complies with the following:           |              | • Construction contracts specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state required noise attenuation devices.  
• The County shall require that the contractor maintain and tune-up all construction equipment to minimize noise emissions.  
• Construction haul routes shall be designed to avoid noise sensitive uses (e.g., residences, convalescent homes, etc.), to the extent feasible.  
• Stationary equipment shall be placed so as to maintain the greatest possible distance to the sensitive receptors.  
• A qualified “Noise Disturbance Coordinator” will be retained amongst the construction crew who shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the Disturbance Coordinator shall notify the County within 24 hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g.,... |                                    |                                |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.12-2:</strong> Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in significant vibration impacts to nearby sensitive receptors.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>starting too early, malfunctioning muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the compliant, as deemed acceptable by the San Bernardino County Planning Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.12-3:</strong> Traffic generated by the proposed Project would not significantly contribute to existing traffic noise in the area or exceed the County’s and City’s established standards.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>Construction activities shall take place during weekdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., and are prohibited on Sundays and Federal holidays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.12-4</strong> The proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in long-term stationary ambient noise levels.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.12-5:</strong> The proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to aircraft noise.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.13-1:</strong> The proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.13-2:</strong> The proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.13-3:</strong> The proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.14-1:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities.</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.15-1:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.15-2:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment related to recreation facilities.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Transportation/Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.16-1:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.</td>
<td>MM TRA-1: As part of the street improvement plans, the Project Proponent shall design a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 18 and the project access. It shall include the following:  - The north and south legs shall be designed with 36-foot roadways to accommodate two outbound lanes (one shared through/right turn lane and one left turn lane) and one inbound lane.  - Provide for pedestrian indications and crosswalks at the intersection.  - Provide 432.5 foot westbound and eastbound left turn lanes on State Route 18.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Pre-Construction</td>
<td>San Bernardino County Planning Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contractor Pre-Construction San Bernardino County Planning Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.16-2:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.</td>
<td>No Impact.</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.16-3:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.16-4:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.16-5:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Implementation Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>Monitoring Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.16-6:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.17-1:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not result in the Project exceeding wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.17-2:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.17-3:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.17-4:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not result in a need for new or expanded water entitlements.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsible Implementation Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Period</td>
<td>Monitoring Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.17-5:</strong> Implementation of the Project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.17-6:</strong> Implementation of the Project would not affect landfill capacity.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.17-7:</strong> Implementation of the Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.</td>
<td>Less than Significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>