

December 2019 | Response to Comments  
State Clearinghouse No. 2019109054

# ST. FRANCES OF ROME CHURCH PROJECT

City of Wildomar

*Prepared for:*

**City of Wildomar**

Matthew Bassi, Planning Director  
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201  
Wildomar, CA 92595  
951.677.7751

*Prepared by:*

**PlaceWorks**

Mark Teague, AICP, Associate Principal  
3910 Normal Street, Suite C  
San Diego, California 92103  
619.299.2700  
info@placeworks.com  
www.placeworks.com



## Table of Contents

Section	Page
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 DOCUMENT FORMAT.....	1
1.3 CEQA REQUIREMENTS REGARDING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES.....	1
<b>2. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>

## APPENDICES

Appendix A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

## Table of Contents

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This document includes a compilation of the public comments received on the St. Frances of Rome Church Project Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (collectively, “MND”; State Clearinghouse No. 2019109054) and the City of Wildomar’s (City) responses to the comments.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a lead agency is not required to prepare formal responses to comments on an MND. However, CEQA requires the City to have adequate information on the record explaining why the comments do not affect the conclusion of the MND that there are no potentially significant environmental effects. In the spirit of public disclosure and engagement, the City—as the lead agency—has responded to all written comments submitted on the MND during the 30-day public review period, which began October 22, 2019, and ended November 20, 2019.

## 1.2 DOCUMENT FORMAT

**Section 1, *Introduction*.** This section describes CEQA requirements and the content of this document.

**Section 2, *Response to Comments*.** This section provides a list of agencies and persons commenting on the MND, copies of comment letters received during the public review period, and individual responses to written comments. To facilitate review of the responses, each comment letter has been reproduced and assigned a letter. Individual comments for each letter have been numbered, and the letter is followed by responses with references to the corresponding comment number.

**Section 3, *Revisions to the MND*.** This section contains revisions to the MND text and figures as a result of the comments received by agencies and interested persons as described in Section 2, and/or errors and omissions discovered subsequent to release of the MND for public review.

**Appendix A, *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*.** This document lists all the mitigation measures required for implementation of the project, the phase in which the measures would be implemented, and the enforcement agency responsible for compliance. The monitoring program provides 1) a mechanism for giving the lead agency staff and decision makers feedback on the effectiveness of their actions; 2) a learning opportunity for improved mitigation measures on future projects; and 3) a means of identifying corrective actions, if necessary, before irreversible environmental damage occurs.

## 1.3 CEQA REQUIREMENTS REGARDING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (b) outlines parameters for submitting comments on negative declarations and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of MND’s should be on the proposed findings that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. If the commenter

## 1. Introduction

believes that the project may have a significant effect, they should: (1) Identify the specific effect, (2) Explain why they believe the effect would occur, and (3) Explain why they believe the effect would be significant.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (c) further advises, “Reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.”

Section 15204 (d) also states, “Each responsible agency and trustee agency shall focus its comments on environmental information germane to that agency’s statutory responsibility.” Section 15204 (e) states, “This section shall not be used to restrict the ability of reviewers to comment on the general adequacy of a document or of the lead agency to reject comments not focused as recommended by this section.”

Finally, CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to potentially significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the environmental document.

## 2. Response to Comments

---

This section provides all written comments received on the circulated MND and the City's response to each comment.

Comment letters and specific comments are given letters and numbers for reference purposes. Where sections of the MND are excerpted in this document, they are indented. The following is a list of all comment letters received on the circulated MND during the public review period.

<b>Letter Reference</b>	<b>Commenting Person/Agency</b>	<b>Date of Comment</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
A	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	October 29, 2019	5
B	Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Arysa Gonzalez Romero	October 30, 2019	9
C	CAL FIRE/Riverside County Fire Department, Adria Reinertson	November 13, 2019	13
D	Department of Toxic Substances Control	November 15, 2019	17
E	Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, Cheryl Madrigal	November 19, 2019	23
F	Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse	November 20, 2019	27

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*



## 2. Response to Comments

LETTER A –Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Deborah De Chambeau. (2 pages)

JASON E. UHLEY  
General Manager-Chief Engineer



RECEIVED  
NOV 04 2019  
CITY OF WILDOMAR

1995 MARKET STREET  
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501  
951.955.1200  
FAX 951.788.9965  
www.rcflood.org

### RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

227992

October 29, 2019

City of Wildomar  
Planning Department  
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201  
Wildomar, CA 92595

Attention: Matthew Bassi

Re: PA 19-0017 Initial Study and MND  
APNs 366-330-011, 366-170-058 and 005


The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) does not normally recommend conditions for land divisions or other land use cases in incorporated cities. The District also does not plan check City land use cases, or provide State Division of Real Estate letters or other flood hazard reports for such cases. District comments/recommendations for such cases are normally limited to items of specific interest to the District including District Master Drainage Plan facilities, other regional flood control and drainage facilities which could be considered a logical component or extension of a master plan system, and District Area Drainage Plan fees (development mitigation fees). In addition, information of a general nature is provided.

The District's review is based on the above-referenced project transmittal, received October 21, 2019. The District **has not** reviewed the proposed project in detail, and the following comments do not in any way constitute or imply District approval or endorsement of the proposed project with respect to flood hazard, public health and safety, or any other such issue:

A-1

- ☐ This project would not be impacted by District Master Drainage Plan facilities, nor are other facilities of regional interest proposed.
- ☐ This project involves District proposed Master Drainage Plan facilities, namely, \_\_\_\_\_. The District will accept ownership of such facilities on written request of the City. Facilities must be constructed to District standards, and District plan check and inspection will be required for District acceptance. Plan check, inspection, and administrative fees will be required.
- ☐ This project proposes channels, storm drains 36 inches or larger in diameter, or other facilities that could be considered regional in nature and/or a logical extension of the adopted Wildomar Master Drainage Plan. The District would consider accepting ownership of such facilities on written request of the City. Facilities must be constructed to District standards, and District plan check and inspection will be required for District acceptance. Plan check, inspection, and administrative fees will be required.
- ☒ This project is located within the limits of the District's Wildomar Valley Area Drainage Plan for which drainage fees have been adopted. If the project is proposing to create additional impervious surface area, applicable fees should be paid by cashier's check or money order only to the Flood Control District or City prior to issuance of grading or building permits. Fees to be paid should be at the rate in effect at the time of issuance of the actual permit.

## 2. Response to Comments

		- 2 -	October 29, 2019
		City of Wildomar	
		Re: PA 19-0017, Initial Study and MND	
		APNs 366-330-011, 366-170-058 and 005	
			227992
A-1	CONT'D	<input type="checkbox"/>	An encroachment permit shall be obtained for any construction related activities occurring within District right of way or facilities, namely, _____. For further information, contact the District's Encroachment Permit Section at 951.955.1266.
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The District's previous comments are still valid (see attached letter dated 2/21/19).
		<b><u>GENERAL INFORMATION</u></b>	
		This project may require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board. Clearance for grading, recordation, or other final approval should not be given until the City has determined that the project has been granted a permit or is shown to be exempt.	
A-2		If this project involves a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapped floodplain, then the City should require the applicant to provide all studies, calculations, plans, and other information required to meet FEMA requirements, and should further require that the applicant obtain a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) prior to grading, recordation, or other final approval of the project and a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) prior to occupancy.	
		If a natural watercourse or mapped floodplain is impacted by this project, the City should require the applicant to obtain a Section 1602 Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and a Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or written correspondence from these agencies indicating the project is exempt from these requirements. A Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification may be required from the local California Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to issuance of the Corps 404 permit.	
		Very truly yours,	
			
		DEBORAH DE CHAMBEAU	
		Engineering Project Manager	
		c: Riverside County Planning Department	
		Attn: Jason Killebrew	
		SLJ:blm	

## 2. Response to Comments

### A. **Response to Comments from Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Deborah De Chambeau, Engineering Project Manager, dated October 29, 2019.**

A-1 The commenter indicates that the project site is located with the District's Wildomar Valley Area Drainage Plan, and states that if additional impervious surface area is created, applicable fees should be paid to the Flood Control District or the City prior to the issuance of grading or building permits. The commenter also states that the District's previous comments, dated February 21, 2019, which stated that the project involves the District proposed Master Drainage Plan facilities for which the District will accept ownership on written request of the City, are still valid.

The proposed project design was specifically modified to reflect the comments of February 21, 2019. Payment of Flood Control fees is required by Section 16.32.040 of the Wildomar Municipal Code.

A-2 The commenter states that the proposed project may require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board, and that if the proposed project involves a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapped floodplain, then the City should require the applicant to provide all studies, calculations, and other information required to meet FEMA requirements. The commenter also states that if a natural watercourse or mapped floodplain is impacted by this project, the City should require the applicant to obtain a Section 1602 Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and a Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

As the proposed project involves clearing, grading, or excavation that causes soil disturbance of one or more acres, it is subject to the provisions of the NPDES. The project site is not within a FEMA mapped floodplain; the project site is within Zone X, indicating minimal risk of flooding, and therefore, the proposed project is not required to submit documentation to meet the FEMA mapped floodplain requirements. The project applicant would prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and would implement best management practices (BMPs) to ensure that impacts to natural watercourses or mapped floodplains are minimized. As stated on Page 42 of the IS/MND, the proposed project is developed with asphalt and buildings and in use as a church. There are no wetlands or water courses on the project site.

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Response to Comments

LETTER B – Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Arysa Gonzales Romero. (1 page)

**From:** [Matthew Bassi](#)  
**To:** [Jasmine Osman](#); [Mark Teague](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CEQA Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for St. Frances of Rome Church Project (PA No. 19-0017)  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 30, 2019 11:21:06 AM

---

For the file

**Matthew C. Bassi**  
Planning Director

**City of Wildomar**  
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201  
Wildomar, CA 92595  
Work: 951-677-7751 x213  
Fax: 951-698-1463

City Hall Hours:  
Monday - Thursday  
8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.  
(Friday's by Appointment)

*Please note that email correspondence with the City of Wildomar, along with attachments, may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and therefore, may be subject to disclosure unless otherwise exempt.*

---

**From:** Gonzalez Romero, Arysa (TRBL) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2019 11:01 AM  
**To:** Matthew Bassi <mbassi@cityofwildomar.org>  
**Subject:** CEQA Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for St. Frances of Rome Church Project (PA No. 19-0017)

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

B-1

Greetings,

A records check of the Tribal Historic preservation office's cultural registry revealed that this project is not located within the Tribe's Traditional Use Area. Therefore, we defer to the other tribes in the area. This letter shall conclude our consultation efforts.

Thank you,

Arysa Gonzalez Romero  
Historic Preservation Technician  
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians  
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Palm Springs, CA 92264  
D: 760-883-1327 | C: 760-831-2484

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Response to Comments

**B. Response to Comments from Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Arysa Gonzalez Romero, Historic Preservation Technician, dated October 30, 2019.**

B-1 The commenter states that a records check revealed that this project is not located within the Tribe's Traditional Use Area, and therefore, defer to other tribes in the area. The commenter indicates that this letter concludes consultation.

The City thanks the Tribe for their response and acknowledges that consultation has been concluded.

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*



## 2. Response to Comments

LETTER C – CAL FIRE/Riverside County Fire Department, Adria Reinertson, Deputy Fire Marshal (1 page)

**From:** [Reinertson, Adria@CALFIRE](mailto:Reinertson.Adria@CALFIRE)  
**To:** [Matthew Bassi](#)  
**Subject:** IS/MND for St. Frances of Rome  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 13, 2019 2:03:19 PM

---

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

C-1

Mr. Bassi,

The Fire Department Strategic Planning Bureau received the above project. I have reviewed the initial study and do not have any comments at this time. If and when this project is approved, the planning case and subsequent construction plans will be reviewed by the Elsinore/Wildomar office. Thank you.

**Adria Reinertson**

Deputy Fire Marshal/Office of the Fire Marshal  
CAL FIRE/Riverside County Fire Department  
Direct: 951-955-5272 | Main: 951-955-4777  
2300 Market St., Ste 150, Riverside, CA 92501  
[adria.reinertson@fire.ca.gov](mailto:adria.reinertson@fire.ca.gov) | [www.rvcfire.org](http://www.rvcfire.org)

■ Leadership ■ Competence ■ Integrity ■ Safety ■ Customer Service ■

The Office of the County Fire Marshal is committed to facilitating fire and life safety solutions by empowering its employees to serve our community through innovation and partnership.

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Response to Comments

### **C. Response to Comments from CAL FIRE/Riverside County Fire Department, Adria Reinertson, Deputy Fire Marshal, dated November 13, 2019.**

C-1 The comment states that the Fire Department Strategic Planning Bureau has received and reviewed the Initial Study and does not have comments at this time. The comment states that if and when the project is approved, the planning case and subsequent construction plans will be reviewed by the Elsinore/Wildomar Office.

The comment is noted, and the City will provide the planning case and subsequent construction plans to the Elsinore/Wildomar Office if the proposed project is approved.

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Response to Comments

LETTER D – Department of Toxic Substances Control, Chia Rin Yen, Environmental Scientist (3 pages)



**Jared Blumenfeld**  
Secretary for  
Environmental Protection



### Department of Toxic Substances Control

**Meredith Williams, Ph.D.**  
Acting Director  
5796 Corporate Avenue  
Cypress, California 90630



**Gavin Newsom**  
Governor

November 15, 2019

Mr. Matthew C. Bassi  
Planning Director  
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201  
Wildomar, California 92595  
[mbassi@cityofwildomar.org](mailto:mbassi@cityofwildomar.org)

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, SAINT FRANCIS OF  
ROME CHURCH, WILDOMAR (PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 19-0017)

Dear Mr. Bassi:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) received your Initial Study and Negative Declaration for Saint Francis of Rome Church project located at 21591 Lemon Street in Wildomar.

The project proposes onsite and offsite improvements which include (1) converting the existing church to a multi-purpose building, (2) removing the existing modular classrooms, (3) constructing a total area of 27,393-square-foot for church, office and classroom/meeting room, and (4) reconstructing the parking lot with additional parking spaces.

DTSC reviewed the Initial Study and has the following comments for Section 9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials:

1. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) stated that the project site had been historically used for agricultural purposes from approximately 1938 until 1961 when orchards were removed from the project site. The Phase I ESA recommended no further investigations justifying that the risk of residual soil contamination was and would be reduced by grading activities. DTSC disagrees with this recommendation for the following reasons:
  - a. Residual chemical related chemicals (including organochlorine pesticides, herbicides and metals) may be found in the soil due to past agricultural use. Emissions of the potential soil impacted by agricultural related chemicals during the soil stockpiling and transportation should be evaluated in the Initial Study for construction activities.



## 2. Response to Comments

Mr. Matthew C. Bassi  
November 15, 2019  
Page 3

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research (via e-mail)  
State Clearinghouse  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, California 95812-3044  
[State.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov](mailto:State.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov)

Mr. Dave Kereazis (via e-mail)  
Office of Planning & Environmental Analysis  
Department of Toxic Substances Control  
[Dave.Kereazis@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Dave.Kereazis@dtsc.ca.gov)

Ms. Yolanda M. Garza (via e-mail)  
Brownfields Restoration and School Evaluation Branch  
Site Mitigation and Restoration Program  
[Yolanda.Garza@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Yolanda.Garza@dtsc.ca.gov)

Schools Evaluation and Cleanup Team Reading File – Cypress Office

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*



## 2. Response to Comments

### **D. Response to Comments from Department of Toxic Substances Control, Chia Rin Yen, Environmental Scientists, dated November 15, 2019.**

- D-1 The commenter states that the DTSC disagrees with the recommendation of the Phase I ESA prepared for the proposed project because residual chemical related chemicals may be found in the soil and states that emissions of potential soil impacted by agricultural related chemicals during the soil stockpiling and transportation should be evaluated in the Initial Study.

The proposed project has been used as church and gathering site since 1961. The project site has been graded several times to provide for construction since 1961, and the grounds have been maintained with landscaping. As shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph of the IS/MND, the site is currently developed with buildings, paved and gravel parking, and accessory structures.

The commenter expresses concern that historical use of agricultural chemicals prior to 1961 could result in contaminated soils leading to dust from construction or hauling of materials to/from the project site. The IS/MND addresses construction impacts beginning on Page 35 of the IS/MND, and references construction requirements established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403. Table 1 of Rule 403 lists several best management practices (BMP) that will control dust during all phases of construction, including clearing and grubbing, cut and fill, disturbed soil, earth moving activities and hauling of materials. Examples of required BMPs include soil stabilization, covering of loads, watering of unpaved or exposed soils, etc. The precise combination of BMPs used for the project will depend on the type of construction outlined in the improvement plans submitted as part of the construction permit. As shown on Figure 4, Site Plan, completion of project will further cover the soil, and will continue to maintain the landscaping on the project site.

There is nothing in the record that suggests the materials on the project site are contaminated. In preparing this response, Brian Brennan of EFI Global, the firm that prepared the Phase 1, was contacted and stated that conventional dust control methods as required by SCAQMD Rule 403 would be adequate to address this issue.

- D-2 The commenter states that the transportation of soil potentially impacted by agricultural related chemicals should also be discussed in the Initial Study.

On page 34 of the IS/MND, it states that approximately 1,100 cubic yards of materials would be exported from the site. This would be all material, including building materials, and may include some soil. As stated in response to D-1, there is no evidence to suggest that the soil is contaminated, and SCAQMD dust control measures will address dust associated with construction.

- D-3 The commenter states that if demolition is being planned, an investigation should be conducted for the presence of other related hazardous chemicals such as lead-based paints or products, mercury, and asbestos containing materials.

## 2. Response to Comments

The proposed project would not result in demolition, and as a result, the presence of other related hazardous chemicals would not occur. Nonetheless, the proposed project would comply with all local, state, and federal laws regarding hazardous materials.

- D-4 The commenter indicates that any investigation and/or remediation should be conducted under a workplan approved and overseen by a regulatory agency that has jurisdiction to oversee hazardous substance cleanups.

See response to comments D-1 and D-3.

- D-5 The commenter states that if backfilling activities are required, DTSC recommends the imported fill materials be characterized in accordance with the Information Advisory Clean Imported Fill Material to minimize the possibility of introducing contaminated soil onto the site.

The proposed project would require cut and fill for the site, which would disturb topsoil. The proposed project would comply with Chapter 33 of the 2016 California Building Code related to grading and excavation, as well as other applicable building regulations and standard construction techniques.

## 2. Response to Comments

LETTER E – Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, Cheryl Madrigal, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer/Cultural Resource Manager (1 page)

### RINCON BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS Cultural Resources Department

One Government Center Lane · Valley Center, California 92082 ·  
(760) 297-2635 Fax: (760) 749-8901



November 19, 2019

Response sent via email:  
[mbassi@cityofwildomar.org](mailto:mbassi@cityofwildomar.org)

Matthew C. Bassi  
City of Wildomar  
23873 Clinton Keith Road  
Wildomar, CA 92595

Re: St. Frances of Rome Church Project (PA No. 19-0017)

Dear Mr. Bassi,

This letter is written on behalf of the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians. Thank you for providing us with the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the above referenced project. The identified location is within the Territory of the Luiseno people, and is also within Rincon's specific area of Historic interest.

We have reviewed the provided MND and we are in agreement with the following recommendation under Section Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources which states:

"The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians may assign individuals to monitor all grading, excavation, and groundbreaking activities as well, and the tribal monitors shall be allowed on-site during any construction activities that could potentially impact cultural resources".

Rincon would like to be considered for Luiseno Tribal Monitoring, if Soboba or Pechanga are unavailable. Additionally, we would like to add to TRI-5 b iii. "The collections and associated records shall be transferred to a curation facility in Riverside County meeting the above federal standards to be accompanied by a curation agreement and payment of any fees necessary for permanent curation."

If you have additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact our office at your convenience at (760) 297-2635.

Thank you for the opportunity to protect and preserve our cultural assets.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Madrigal  
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer  
Cultural Resource Manager

Bo Mazzetti  
Tribal Chairman

Tishmall Turner  
Vice Chairwoman

Steve Stallings  
Council Member

Laurie E. Gonzalez  
Council Member

Alfonso Kolb  
Council Member

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Response to Comments

**E. Response to Comments from Rincon Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, Cheryl Madrigal, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer/Cultural Resource Manager, dated November 19, 2019.**

E-1 The commenter states that the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians is in agreement with the proposed mitigation measures as provided in the MND, and states that the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians would like to be considered for Luiseno Tribal Monitoring if Soboba or Pechanga are unavailable. The commenter also asks that Mitigation Measures TRI-5 b.iii. be revised to add “Riverside County.”

This minor revision can be found in Section 3, *Revisions to the MND*, in this Final MND.

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank*

## 2. Response to Comments

LETTER F – Governor’s Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse, Scott Morgan, Director,  
State Clearinghouse (1 page)



Gavin Newsom  
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research  
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Kate Gordon  
Director

November 20, 2019

RECEIVED

NOV 25 2019

CITY OF WILDOMAR

Matthew C. Bassi  
Wildomar, City of  
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201  
Wildomar, CA 92595

Subject: St Frances of Rome Church (Planning Application No. 19-0017)  
SCH#: 2019109054

Dear Matthew C. Bassi:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named MND to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on 11/19/2019, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) available on the CEQA database for your retrieval and use. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

“A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation.”

**Check the CEQA database for submitted comments for use in preparing your final environmental document:** <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2019109054/2>. Should you need more information or clarification of the comments, **we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.**

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan  
Director, State Clearinghouse

cc: Resources Agency

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044  
TEL 1-916-445-0613 state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov www.opr.ca.gov

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*



## 2. Response to Comments

**F. Response to Comments from Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse, Scott Morgan, Director, State Clearinghouse, dated November 20, 2019.**

F-1 The commenter states that the State Clearinghouse submitted the project MND to selected state agencies for review and that comments from the responding state agency is available on the CEQA database.

The City received and responded to the responding agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). See response to comments for Letter D, above.

## 2. Response to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank*

## 3. Revisions to the MND

---

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section contains revisions to the MND based upon (1) additional or revised information required to prepare a response to a specific comment; (2) applicable updated information that was not available at the time of the MND publication; and/or (3) typographical errors. This section includes additional clarification to mitigation requirements included in the MND. The provision of these additional mitigation measures does not alter any impact significance conclusions as disclosed in the MND. Changes made to the MND are identified here in ~~strikeout text~~ to indicate deletions and in underlined text to signify additions.

### 3.2 MND REVISIONS IN RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

The following text has been revised in response to comments received on the MND.

---

Page 15, Section IV, *Executive Summary*, and Pages 105 through 106, Section VI. 19, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, was updated in response to comment E-1 to reflect the revision to Mitigation Measure TRI-5 b.iii. The following text is revised to include the addition of “Riverside County” in the Mitigation Measure.

---

TRI-5 b.iii. Only if (i) and (ii) above cannot be employed, curation shall be arranged with an appropriate qualified repository that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79. The cultural resources would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers/tribal governments for further research and culturally appropriate use. The collections and associated records shall be transferred to a curation facility in Riverside County meeting the above federal standards to be accompanied by a curation agreement and payment of any fees necessary for permanent curation.