

**APPENDIX 1.0(C)**

---

**Minutes from Public Scoping Meeting**

**SPECIFIC PLAN 4  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
SCOPING MEETING  
TUESDAY, JULY 31, 2001**

Assistant Planning Director Craig Hensley brought the meeting to order, introduced himself and welcomed all members of the Public present to the Scoping Meeting for the Environmental Impact Report for the property at the end of Valley Center adjacent to Gainsborough Road. He also pointed out that comment sheets were available that could be completed within the next week to provide information to be included in the scope of the EIR.

Assistant Director Hensley then provided a brief history of the property. In the late 1970's an application for Tract 47910 was filed and went through the process of a supplemental EIR. This was supplemental to the EIR that was prepared for the balance of Specific Plan 4 which was approved by the City Council in 1980. This also provided entitlement for the 19 lots of this project in the zoning approval. The tract map that was approved in 1980 was never recorded and therefore expired, but the division into 19 lots is still a part of the City approved Specific Plan. In 1990 the property owner went through the tentative tract map process again, which was also approved at 19 lots, this tract map also expired; no environmental work was done during this application, approval was based on the 1980 EIR.

Last year, Sunrise, the property owner, made an application to amend the Specific Plan to make changes to the development standards, but maintain the number of lots at 19. This proposal went through the approval process, the Planning Commission recommended approval to the City Council. The City Council felt that the most proper process for the environmental review of the project was an EIR. The City has hired a consultant to do this.

The City hired, and will manage, Impact Sciences, an Environmental Consulting firm to prepare the EIR on this project. Sunrise will be responsible for paying for the consultant through a deposit account that is maintained by the City. Assistant Director Hensley then reminded the audience that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss what should be studied in the EIR, not whether or not 19 lots on this property was a good idea. He then introduced Ken Cook from Impact Sciences.

Mr. Cook informed the audience that he would briefly discuss 3 topics— Environmental Review process, purpose and objectives of the environmental review process, and a description of the contents of the Draft EIR.

### CEQA Process

- The first step is preparation of an initial study. This is a screening level analysis which assists the City in determining whether an EIR is required, and if so what topics should be studied in the EIR.
- If it is determined that an EIR is required the next step is consultation. This step consists of 2 parts, one is required and one is optional.
  - The first is creation of a Notice of Preparation—a document that is submitted to state agencies for 30 day review. It includes a brief project description and the environmental setting, the intent is to provide sufficient information so that the state agencies can make informed input to help define the topics to be considered in the EIR.
  - The second portion of the consultation process is occurring tonight in the form of a scoping meeting, this is not required. This is an optional element conducted by the city to help solicit input from the residents on the topics to be considered in the EIR.
- After the 30 day review period has closed the city will collect all the comments and review them to finalize the topics that will be contained in the draft EIR.
- Processing and creation of the Draft EIR is the next step. This involves preparation of any necessary technical reports, preparation of EIR sections that will be required, and City review.
- Once the city has reviewed and concurs that it reflects the independent judgment of the agency on the impacts of the project the draft EIR is sent out for 45 day review. At the end of the 45 days the city will review all of the comments submitted on the Draft EIR and provide written responses to all comments. If necessary, based on the contents of the comments any minor modifications, clarifications, or corrections to the Draft EIR will be made.
- This is then packaged into the Final Environmental Impact Report.
- The final step in the process is Planning Commission and City Council Public Hearings. At which they will consider certification of the EIR and project approval or denial.

### Objectives of CEQA

CEQA stands for the California Environmental Quality Act. It was enacted in 1972, and is based loosely on the National Environmental Policy Act.

CEQA objectives are numerous, including:

- Foremost is identification of impacts and any necessary mitigation.
- Promote coordination between agencies
- Enhance public participation
- Enhance public awareness of the review process
- Promote agency coordination

CEQA identifies some specific required content that must be in every EIR, including:

- Project description—which must have sufficient information to allow for an understanding of the potential impacts.
- Discussion of the existing setting or baseline conditions—used to provide a preview of how the project will affect the environment.
- Discussion of the potential impacts along with any mitigations identified.
- Discussion of alternatives to the project which could feasibly mitigate, avoid, or lessen the identified significant impacts.
- Summary of information.

#### Contents of Draft EIR

The City has preliminarily identified topics for consideration in this EIR. This is a Focused EIR, in which the City proposes to address 4 topics:

- Geotechnical and soil issues
- Hydrology and water quality
- Biological resources and
- Archaeological resources.

Mr. Cook then turned the meeting back over to Assistant Director Hensley who solicited comments from the Public.

**Danny Haberern**  
**1506 Middleton Road**  
**San Dimas, California**

Mr. Haberern inquired as to how Impact Sciences was selected to perform the Environmental Impact Report. Assistant Director Hensley explained that Requests For Proposals were sent out to three different firms, two proposals were received. Both firms were interviewed by the City and Impact Sciences was selected because they are the best qualified, have a lot of experience and have in-house biological staff.

Mr. Haberern asked if this firm was suggested by anybody else involved in the project, how the City became aware of this firm. Assistant Director Hensley said that there are many firms that deal with Environmental Impact Reports, being in the profession and knowledge of firms that perform this service lead the City to Impact Sciences.

Mr. Haberern received verification that the firm had not previously performed any work for any of the property owners involved in this proposed development. Also the City has a Three-Party Agreement that addresses the financial arrangement which is standard in all EIR's, the developer will pay for the EIR through a deposit account that is maintained by the City.

Mr. Cook clarified for Mr. Haberern that a Focused EIR is being performed on the property, which will focus on the four topics previously listed. The ultimate

content of the EIR will be based on the review of the key comments and the issues that arise at this meeting. Assistant Director Hensley pointed out that these were the topics indicated by preliminary review and the testimony taken at the City Council Meetings. The City's intent is to meet the requirements of State Law in providing this EIR.

In response to Mr. Haberern's request Mr. Cook provided a list of issues not currently proposed for this EIR but that would typically be reviewed for projects of a larger magnitude, including: air quality, noise, and public services (fire, police, sheriffs, libraries, utility services).

**John Choma**  
**1106 Edinburgh Road**  
**San Dimas, California**

Mr. Choma asked how the four topics identified were chosen. Assistant Director Hensley explained that through discussions with Mr. Cook, other staff at Impact Sciences, and testimony at the City Council meeting these topics were identified. Mr. Cook further explained that all topics were reviewed in the initial review, but that in the City's judgment, and based on the comments received during the City Council and Planning Commission Hearings these are the four topics that were identified as requiring further environmental review.

Mr. Choma inquired about issues such as noise and traffic which were not listed, as items that have been specifically identified by legal counsel representing the San Dimas Foothills Conservancy. Mr. Cook explained that the purpose of this meeting was to solicit input from residents on the topics to be considered. Mr. Choma said he would like the topics to be considered that were listed in a letter hand-delivered to City Hall earlier in the day.

Mr. Choma asked if the developer had any input in selecting the firm that would prepare the EIR. Assistant Director Hensley said that a copy of the proposal had been sent to the developer's attorney as they were allowed to review the document but that the City alone made the selection.

Per Mr. Choma's request Assistant Director Hensley agreed to provide the Conservancy with the credentials of Impact Sciences and the individuals who would be conducting the study.

**Caroline Brown**  
**680 Alta Vista Drive**  
**Sierra Madre, California**

Ms. Brown said that with regard to the question of who who represents the people in this process that they would be the elected officials in the City of San

Dimas. And that they are looking out for the best interests of the City and the people.

She applauded Mr. Hensley and Mr. Cook for their presentation, and said that some topics that may need to be added to the topics covered could include: traffic, lighting, city services, noise, air pollution, and aesthetics.

She said she was concerned that people understand that CEQA demands that the public participate in the protection of their environment. This is why the City is going through this process, it is also an effort to dispel doubts that arise when people don't understand or feel excluded from the process.

**Sean Hart**  
**1278 Stonehinge Drive**  
**San Dimas, California**

Mr. Hart said he assumed that the biological and archaeological resources would include the potential detriment to endangered plants, animals and birds that utilize the corridor. He stressed that the SEA Report being updated by LA County does consider this a fragmented corridor for land animals and a corridor for birds. He also reported that the Conservancy had already had biologists identify the California Gnat Catcher in the area.

Mr. Hart said that he would like the study to include a review of the developer's proposed grading and the feasibility of it.

**Stephen Dreaer**  
**1400 N. Amerst**  
**Claremont, California**

Mr. Dreaer said that he was in the Ph.D. Botany program at Rancho Santa Botanic Garden in Claremont and the manager of the Bernard Biological Field Station in Claremont. He reported that he is familiar with the Walnut Creek Park area, and that this habitat is almost nonexistent in the LA Basin.

Mr. Dreaer said that he did not believe this project had any mitigation possibility. Any adverse impacts on the relict riparian system could not be recreated elsewhere. He said that he believed the area was a blue-line stream and therefore the waters belong to the people of the United States, this brings in federal issues; and the Army Corps of Engineers holds jurisdiction over blue-line streams. He said he was concerned with non-native vegetation being allowed in the area and the runoff that would result from fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and all other home chemicals.

Mr. Dreaer said that his second concern pertains to the impact on what may be endangered plants in the Walnut Creek Corridor. He said that he did not believe

the area had ever been fully botanically surveyed. He said a quality floral survey should be included in the EIR that would be performed in spring and winter and not in August when everything is dormant.

Mr. Haberern asked if the developer had any input into the selection of Impact Sciences, if they had suggested this firm to do the EIR. Assistant Director Hensley explained that discussions were held with the developer's attorney regarding whether they had any experience with the firms submitting proposals. The selection was based on the proposals submitted. Mr. Haberern verified that Impact Sciences does not have any business dealings with Sonrise or any of the other property owners.

**Kathleen Hermann  
958 Wellington Road  
San Dimas, California**

Ms. Hermann commented on the web-site for Impact Sciences and asked if it would be possible to be kept up to date with the EIR report through the web-site. Mr. Cook said that his firm had participated in web-hosted EIR's before, but that procedure was not anticipated for this project, but that the firm does have the capability to create CD's of the EIR if the City requested.

Pursuant to Ms. Hermann's questions Mr. Cook provided information regarding Impact Sciences including:

- The firm has 35 employees in two offices, in Oakland and Agoura Hills;
- Mr. Cook has been in the consulting business for 11 years and with the firm for 6 ½ years, he did not immediately know the average length of the employment of the firm's employees;
- The average job cost out of the Agoura office is difficult to compute because the firm works on projects of all sizes ranging in job cost from \$5,000 to \$500,000;
- The average time required to perform a thorough EIR looking at all the issues is 9 months;
- The officers are involved in the daily business operations; and
- To his knowledge none of the firm's employees have family or friends that live in San Dimas or any other connections to the city to Mr. Cook's knowledge.

Ms. Hermann requested that the issues of fire access and water main and fire hydrant placement and connection be included in the EIR.

She concluded by requesting that the City consider providing information on the web-site or a CD; but she did say that she did not want to increase the costs for the project. Assistant Director Hensley said that City Staff would inquire into the formats that would be feasible, and that the EIR would definitely be provided in a hard copy format. He also said that the EIR on CD or the City's web-page was an excellent idea that the City would attempt to do if possible.

**Al Hermann**  
**958 Wellington Road**  
**San Dimas, California**

Mr. Hermann said that he was a chemist and that he had two primary concerns. The first was how baselines would be established. Mr. Cook explained that CEQA establishes baseline as the existing characteristics of the site at the time the Notice of Preparation is prepared. Mr. Hermann said he had worked with baselines for over 40 years and that a baseline needs to be taken on a right of consideration—it has to be over a period of time, and the various parameters present during various seasonal periods need to be taken into consideration.

Secondly, Mr. Hermann said he had concerns with health considerations—specifically water and air pollution and their effects upon human health. He asked if this topic should be included in the EIR and whether or not Impact Sciences was equipped to discuss it. Mr. Cook said that the firm was equipped to address any topic included in the EIR. With respect to health risk assessments Mr. Cook said he did not have in-house capability but that there were a number of firms he had contact with who are qualified and capable of analyzing the topic. Mr. Hermann requested a list of those firms and their experience and qualifications in those matters. Mr. Hermann said that a letter had been provided to Mr. Hensley from the Water Quality Control Regional Board in which Commissioner Rod Collins has provided a series of specific glutens that he would like to see quantified and addressed in the EIR.

Mr. Hensley said the City was glad to have cooperation from the Water Quality Board since its cooperation in the past had been minimal and that the issues would be addressed.

**Dan Cross**  
**1324 Stonehinge**  
**San Dimas, California**

Mr. Cross said he was not a biologist or a chemist—simply a very angry homeowner who believes that a very callous City Council was ready to destroy what he sees as one of the most beautiful parts of the City of San Dimas.

Mr. Cross then questioned the process by which the consultant was selected, who made the decision and why a member of the community wasn't involved in the process. Mr. Hensley replied that the standard procedure for hiring a consultant was followed; and that himself and Larry Stevens, the Community Development Director made the final decision.

Mr. Cross then asked who paid Mr. Cook's salary. Mr. Hensley explained that the through a 3-Party Agreement the owner, Sonrise, is required to deposit

money into a deposit account with the City, and then the City pays and manages Impact Sciences. Mr. Cross inferred from this that Impact Sciences was being paid by the developer.

**Victoria Cross**  
**1324 Stonehenge**  
**San Dimas, California**

Ms. Cross said that she would like to see included in the proposed Draft EIR the following:

- Congestion and traffic issues;
- Noise;
- Public safety issues;
- Water main capacity;
- Infrastructure support, including underground utilities, water and sewer lines to be added, or existing lines that would be tapped, the sources and type of draw that would be on the existing community, and any additional improvements that need to happen; and
- Air and water pollution including health risks.

**Lee Cromer**  
**237 W. Baseline Road**  
**San Dimas, California**

Ms. Cromer said she is a member of the Equestrian Commission. She discussed numerous topics she believed the developer had considered in the process of designing the project. Her main concerns were with the impact of traffic on the adjacent horse trails, and she said that this needed to be considered in the final plans from the developer.

Ms. Cromer verified with Mr. Hensley that all documents previously submitted to the City on the subject property, and all comments and items received during the EIR process would be turned over to Impact Sciences for use in preparation of the document.

**Mike Moghadam**  
**1136 Edinburg Road**  
**San Dimas, California**

Dr. Moghadam said he had concerns with fire access and how the amount of congestion in the area contributes to the security of the area after dark.

Dr. Moghadam also said he like an idea suggested by Dr. & Mrs. Choma that the community pool together to attempt to acquire the land and maintain it as open space.

**Pam Stevens**  
**1451 Windsor Drive**  
**San Dimas, California**

Ms. Stevens verified with Mr. Hensley that the California Department of Fish & Wildlife had been apprised of the project, and are on the list for the Notice of Preparation.

Ms. Stevens questioned the methods used in selecting Impact Sciences and how many times the company had been used by the Sunrise attorney for projects. Mr. Cook said he had worked with the attorney on a team in the past but that he had never been hired by the attorney or worked for the developer, Sunrise.

Assistant Director Hensley stated for the record that neither Sunrise nor their attorney had any influence with the City hiring Impact Sciences. He said that he understood the concern being raised; but it was important to understand that the City is managing the contract with Impact Sciences. The City's number one goal with any Environmental Impact Report, including this one, is that the document be legally defensible.

An unidentified voice questioned whether Impact Sciences had any relations with the developer, any financial agreements in the past would show any partiality on their behalf. Assistant Director Hensley reiterated that the firm would be impartial in providing an accurate, legally defensible technical document for the City. The purpose of the Scoping Meeting, which is not required by state law, is to get input from the community and to provide information.

Mr. Cook interjected that the document would be reviewed by the City, it will reflect the City's independent judgment. Mr. Cook said that he was working for the City, not the applicant. He would be paid by the City, and would respond to the City's requests. Mr. Cook reinforced that he would have no dealings with the project applicant in any fashion. Assistant Director Hensley reinforced this by pointing out that in the contract the City has with Implied Sciences they are not allowed to have any contact what so ever with the developer, the developer's attorney, or even the head of Sunrise Christian Schools without express permission from the City.

**Marc Anthony Hernandez**  
**1245 E. Orange Grove Boulevard**  
**Pasadena, California**

Mr. Hernandez said he was representing Mr. Anthony Morales, a tribal spokesman for the Gabrielano-Tongva Tribe. Mr. Morales had expressed concern that he was not notified of this project. Mr. Hernandez read into the record a letter written by Mr. Morales:

I, Anthony Morales, Chairperson of the Gabralindo Tonga, spoke with Marc Anthony regarding the Walnut Creek development project. My concerns are that we leave this area in its natural and current state. If any development, let it be natural and multi-cultural center for all. My apologies for not being here in person, but due to my work commitment I will be out of town. I've given Mr. Marc Anthony Hernandez the right and permission to speak on my behalf. Thank you.

Mr. Hernandez provided the tribal office phone number, 626-286-1632; and his home number. He said that members of the tribe were concerned on cultural, archaeological, and historical levels and were unaware of the project. They would like to provide some input. Assistant Director Hensley replied that if Mr. Hernandez could provide contact addresses the City would add them to the Notice of Preparation list, and would appreciate such valuable input.

An unidentified voice said that he wanted to explain why people were so apprehensive and hostile toward Mr. Cook and Impact Sciences. He said that the community was relieved when they learned an EIR was being prepared; and that a group of people in the area had joined the Foothill Conservancy to get their support and experience in dealing with similar issues. He continued to report, that though it may be hearsay, a neighbor had spoken with Councilman Templeman about the project and was told that the project "was a done deal" and the City is simply going through the legal motions. This has highly upset the community and the people want assurances that Impact Sciences and Mr. Cook will not be influenced by Sunrise Christian School or the City in their preparation of the document.

This man also expressed a belief that the study of the area needed to scope almost an entire year to account for the plants that are apparent during each season. He hoped that the City and the City Council allowed that thorough of a study to be performed.

Dr. John Choma spoke again and verified, as he had assumed there was no economic component to the Environmental Impact Report. Because the City will be managing Impact Sciences, and representing the community, he wanted to reiterate that a clear economic impact was present with this project. He gave examples of locations in which property values were either boosted by being adjacent to open space areas or decreased by being adjacent to development. He proposed that it was the City's obligation, in managing the preparation of the EIR, to represent the people of this community and protect their land values.

Dr. Choma said that he would like to see information on the economic impact of this development. Particularly whether or not the current tax base would be sufficient to support the infrastructure services required by this development.

**Ray McCormick**  
**1741 Hampshire Court**  
**San Dimas, California**

Mr. McCormick said that he would like to have in the Environmental Impact Report the information that differentiates this 19 acres from the surrounding areas that were all allowed to develop. He said that if people were concerned about impacting the Walnut Creek area with pollutants and noise then they would not have purchased homes in the area in the first place. Mr. McCormick said this was not a question of ecology, but one of ambiance and economics.

He said he believes that if the owner can create a project that is consistent with City of San Dimas codes and all the same constraints that were placed on the previous surrounding developers then it is within their right to be able to develop their property. He said he would hate to see the owner's right of ownership surpassed by the desire of the surrounding owners to maintain their property's economic value under the guise of being concerned about the ecology.

Mr. McCormick said that it would be wise to address issues of fire access and drainage .

**Ann Edler**  
**1490 Stonehenge Drive**  
**San Dimas, California**

Ms. Edler said she had spent 25 years working for the LA County Sheriff, 8 of those years patrolling San Dimas including this specific area. Her main concerns consisted of:

- location of emergency service access roads;
- time required by emergency services to serve the 19 proposed homes; and
- impact of construction equipment on the area.

Ms. Edler also reported that a farmhouse and swimming pool existed on the land that is currently developed into Gainsborough and Edinburgh. The area currently in question has never been developed.

**Donna Wong**  
**1402 Martingale Court**  
**San Dimas, California**

Ms. Wong said she believed that water pollution was an issue that should be examined, upstream in the Tiburon area and on the project site. She also said that she was concerned with safety in the area, she has heard numerous commotions in the park area and had encounters with undesirable people. Left empty Ms. Wong believes the property is a safety and fire hazard; if developed it would help deter some of these problems.

Mr. Marc-Anthony Hernandez spoke again, and said he had concerns with the effects of the development on the water in the environment and the amount of water that the proposed 19 houses would consume. He suggested that the neighbors in the area create a volunteer patrol or neighborhood watch to help with the safety concerns. Assistant Director Hensley said he thought the water issue could be examined.

Al Hermann said he wanted to respond to Mr. McCormick's comments. He said it was in the best interest of society to be consistent on matters that are detrimental to the community. Progress requires change, and these changes should be consistent with the latest scientific, economical and ecological information available. Secondly he asked for the City Staff's response to the suggestion that the Planning Commission work with an oversight committee that would represent the conservancy and other interested parties to alleviate community concerns of incompetence and objectivity in the management of the EIR. Assistant Director Hensley said it would be taken into consideration and discussed with the City Attorney.

An unidentified person also spoke in rebuttal to Mr. McCormick's comments. He said that had he been in the area when his home was constructed he would have opposed that development also, and that increasing the amount of development and pollution in the canyon does not make any of it right. He said that the City had let down this community by allowing so much development in the area already. It is society's responsibility to learn from past mistakes and not repeat them. He also said that he thought the study should include the impacts that the current homes in the area have on the area and the creek.

**Patrick Smith**  
**313 Termino Avenue, #2**  
**Long Beach, California**

Mr. Smith said that he grew up at 915 Wellington Road where his parents still reside. He said that the only topic he had heard mentioned in evaluating the Proposals submitted was how economical the proposal was. Assistant Director Hensley said that other factors were included. Mr. Smith asked if the City could obtain from Impact Sciences detail information on the credentials of everyone who would be working on the project to be provided to the public. Mr. Hensley said that information was not secret and could be provided.

Assistant Director Hensley went on to say that Impact Sciences was the more economical between the two received. But that the City also chose them because of their understanding of the issues, their experience particularly with the biological issues, their ability to provide a legally defensible document and their in-house biological services. Mr. Smith agreed that it was important for the document to be legally defensible. Assistant Director Hensley explained that it

was important for the document to be legally defensible from at least two sides. He explained that an entitlement does exist in the zoning for 19 lots and that the area should not be construed as open space, the developer purchased the property with the understanding that it was zoned for development.

Mr. Smith said that another issue he would like examined was the impact of three Waste Management trucks traversing the neighborhood to service the houses in this development. He would also like included the safety issue associated with the number and type of people entering the area whether the property is left in a natural state or developed. Finally he asked that displacement of the wildlife into an existing community be included as well.

**Lorraine Choma**  
**1106 Edinburgh Road**  
**San Dimas, California**

Ms. Choma said that when they purchased their home they were told by the builder that the area at the Wilderness Park would stay exactly as it is. She asked if when the property was subdivided for 19 lots, was it based on a proper EIR? Assistant Director Hensley verified that the EIR had been completed in 1980.

Ms. Choma said she did not understand how the subdivision could be valid if it was based on an EIR that was not completed. She said that if a new EIR was being performed then the entire subdivision ought to be reexamined.

Ms. Choma said that they had spent a great deal of money fighting City Hall on this issue, that their open space area was being destroyed and that she was tired of people in City Hall who represented the businesses and not the residents. She said that she was not involved in this process only to protect her property value, she did not want to lose the open space.

Ms. Choma asked that Mr. Cook notify the research teams at the surrounding colleges that their on-going research would be affected by construction at the site.

**Mark Leuzinger**  
**San Dimas Foothills Conservancy**  
**2692 Terrebonne Avenue**  
**San Dimas, California**

Mr. Leuzinger said that the Foothills Conservancy wants to be part of the solution. Any services they can provide were offered to help the City and Impact Sciences in any way possible. He said he appreciated the turn out at the meeting. He also said he thought it would be a shame to turn the area into a

subdivision, houses can always be built, but it's much more difficult to recover natural habitat; and bulldozers would do irreparable damage.

Assistant Director Hensley verified that everyone who wanted to speak had an opportunity to do so. He thanked the audience for their participation. He said the Draft EIR would be completed within 3-6 months at the earliest, and that a status update would not be available for at least 2-3 months. The Notice of Preparation period has begun, there are 30 more days to submit comments, much like has happened at this meeting. When the Public Hearing process begins the City wants to make sure everybody feels they were provided the opportunity to provide as much input as they wanted. He thanked the audience for coming and said that they could call him, Craig Hensley, with questions or input.

Specific Plan 4 Scoping Meeting  
Sign-In Sheet

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>City</u>
Danny Haberern	1506 Middleton Road	San Dimas
John Choma	1106 Edinburgh Road	San Dimas
Caroline Brown	680 Alta Vista Drive	Sierra Madre, 91024
Sean Hart	1278 Stonehenge Drive	San Dimas
Stephen Dreaer	1400 N. Amherst	Claremont
Kathleen Hermann	958 Wellington Road	San Dimas
Al Hermann	958 Wellington Road	San Dimas
Dan Cross	1324 Stonehenge Drive	San Dimas
Victoria Cross	1324 Stonehenge Drive	San Dimas
Lee Cromer	237 W. Baseline Road	San Dimas
Mike Moghadam	1136 Edinburgh Road	San Dimas
Pam Stevens	1451 Windsor Drive	San Dimas
Marc Hernandez	1245 E. Orange Grove Blvd.	Pasadena, 91104
Ray McCormick	1741 Hampshire Court	San Dimas
Ann Edler	1490 Stonehenge Drive	San Dimas
Donna Wong	1402 Martingale Court	San Dimas
Patrick Smith	313 Termino Ave, #2	Long Beach
Lorraine Choma	1106 Edinburgh Road	San Dimas
Mark Leuzinger	2692 Terrebonne Avenue	San Dimas

