

**NOSSAMAN** LLP**Facsimile**

Attorneys at Law  
18101 Von Karman Avenue  
Suite 1800  
Irvine, CA 92612  
T 949.833.7800 | F 949.833.7878  
nossaman.com

Date: 3/23/09 Time: 11:50 a.m. Pages: 14 [including cover page]

---

To: **Supervisor Jeff Stone**  
**Supervisor Marion Ashley**  
**Supervisor Bob Buster**  
**Supervisor John F. Tavaglione**  
**Supervisor Roy Wilson**  
**Clerk of the Board – Nancy Romero**

Company: **County Administrative Center**

Fax: **951.955.1071**

Phone: **951.955.1060**

---

From: **K. Erik Friess**  
e-mail: **kfriess@nossaman.com**

Phone: **949.833.7800**

Client#: **290683**  
Matter#: **0001**

Message:

Original Will Be Sent Via U.S. Certified Mail.

---

**IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE THE NUMBER OF PAGES INDICATED ABOVE, PLEASE CALL  
Nancy Neptune @ 949.833.7800**

**ATTENTION:** This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone, and return this original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

9.7

2009-03-090256





VIA FACSIMILE & CERTIFIED MAIL  
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

18101 Von Karman Avenue  
Suite 1800  
Irvine, CA 92612  
T 949.833.7800  
F 949.833.7878

K. Erik Friess  
kfrless@nossaman.com

Refer To File #: 290683-0001

March 23, 2009

Supervisor Jeff Stone, Chairman  
Supervisor Marion Ashley, Vice Chairman  
Supervisor Bob Buster  
Supervisor John F. Tavaglione  
Supervisor Roy Wilson  
Nancy Romero, Clerk, Board of Supervisors  
County Administrative Office, County of Riverside  
Post Office Box 1147  
4080 Lemon Street, 1st Floor  
Riverside, CA 92501

Re: **Opposition of Anheuser Busch to the County's Adoption of a Resolution of Necessity for the Acquisition of an Interest in Anheuser Busch's Property Designated as APN: 392-340-028**

Dear Supervisors and Ms. Romero:

This firm represents Anheuser Busch, the owner of the property designated as Riverside County Assessor's Parcel Number 392-340-028, in the County of Riverside, California. This parcel is one of four parcels that make up Anheuser Busch's Warm Springs Ranch ("Property"). This submittal responds to the County of Riverside's ("County") March 4, 2009, letter notifying Anheuser Busch that the County intends to adopt a Resolution of Necessity to acquire portions of Anheuser Busch's Property as part of the Clinton Keith Road widening and extension project.

The County has noticed that hearing for March 24, 2009. However, County Counsel, Pamela Walls, has notified us that the Board will be asked to continue that hearing in light of the conflict-of-interest issues raised by Anheuser Busch in a letter from this firm to County Counsel dated March 18, 2009. Based on this, Anheuser Busch understands that it will not be necessary for it to appear at the hearing (as it requested that it be allowed in a letter dated March 16, 2009).

This shall constitute Anheuser Busch's request to appear at any continued hearing and to be notified by the County of any such hearing.

Although the hearing will be continued, Anheuser Busch also intends this letter to constitute its objections to the County's adoption of the proposed resolution of necessity. We request that copies of this objection letter be distributed to each of the County's Supervisors prior

Supervisors and Ms. Romero  
March 23, 2009  
Page 2



to their considering the adoption of the proposed resolution of necessity. Anheuser Busch also incorporates (1) the objections raised in its March 18, 2009, letter to the County regarding potential conflicts of interest with respect to the County's retention of the Luce Forward law firm (to the extent they are not fully addressed prior to the hearing), and (2) all information Anheuser Busch has previously provided to the County and its staff. Anheuser Busch reserves the right to make further and different objections before and at the continued hearing.

### OBJECTIONS

Anheuser Busch objects to the hearing regarding the intention of the County to adopt a resolution of necessity, and to the Board of Supervisor's adoption of such a resolution, on the following grounds:

1. The Board of Supervisor's Adoption of a Resolution of Necessity Will Violate CEQA: The Board of Supervisor's adoption of a resolution of necessity is, of course, a discretionary approval. According to the staff report recommending approval of the adoption of a resolution of necessity to acquire portions of Anheuser Busch's Property, the County is relying for its environmental review on a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("Supplemental EIR") for the Clinton Keith Road Extension project that was approved in February 2006.

Since February 2006, many changes have taken place in the past three years, many new studies have been completed, and many new potential impacts have come to light. Additionally, due to the mobility of certain species and other changes that occur with the passage of time, much of the biological data/surveys on which the County is relying could now be stale. The Supplemental EIR therefore relies on outdated and potentially inaccurate information; the new information must be studied and considered in an updated EIR before the County can proceed with its project. Without adequate consideration of these changes, the County will violate the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").

One of the most obvious changes since the approval of the Supplemental EIR over three years ago is the massive amount of development that has occurred throughout the County, including development of properties surrounding Anheuser Busch's Property and in the "Core 2" area of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan ("MSHCP"). For example, in the Core 2 Refinement Workshop Report prepared by the Center for Conservation Biology at the University of California, Riverside, the experts recognized that the Core 2 area has been "disturbed" by development, and that this area -- an area being impacted by the Clinton Keith Road extension project -- is particularly valuable and important for the survival of sensitive species and plant habitat. The experts recommended against a criteria refinement of the Core 2 area even though it was one of the fastest growing suburban areas and even though acquisition costs were much higher than in other core areas. These findings were made by experts impaneled by the County's own Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority ("RCA"), and the findings were made after the County approved the Supplemental EIR for the Clinton Keith Road project. These changes and new findings must be analyzed under CEQA before the County may move forward with this project.

Supervisors and Ms. Romero  
March 23, 2009  
Page 3



Many other investigations and studies have taken place that may also impact the County's project. All this new information is in the County's possession and post-dates the Supplemental EIR prepared by the County -- and it indicates the proposed alignment for Clinton Keith Road is likely to have different and potentially significant and more severe impacts that all need to be studied in a new or supplemental EIR. The County is required to analyze these studies and other information before proceeding with the project. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14 ["CEQA Guidelines"], § 15162.)

In addition, the Supplemental EIR must be revised and supplemented to address the changes that have occurred over the past three years in areas such as air quality, aesthetics, traffic circulation, land use and planning, noise, climate change, and public services. Due to the massive development in Riverside County, all these spheres have changed and must be critically and thoroughly re-analyzed before the County moves forward. The CEQA Guidelines mandate that a subsequent EIR should be prepared where there is "[n]ew information of substantial importance, which was not known . . . at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete," especially where that new information shows:

- The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
- Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR; or
- Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

(See CEQA Guidelines, § 15162.) The changes discussed above likely require at least the preparation of a supplemental EIR; at a minimum, the County is required to prepare an addendum to the Supplemental EIR to address these issues before proceeding. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15164.)

After these changes are addressed, the County is required to re-circulate the Supplemental EIR. (See Quail Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc. v. City of Encinitas (1994) 29 Cal.App.4th 1597, 1605, fn. 4.)

Because of the flaws identified in this objection letter, the County's stale Supplemental EIR fails to perform its most basic and necessary function of providing "public agencies and the public in general with detailed information about the effect which a proposed project is likely to have on the environment; to list ways in which the significant effects of such a project might be minimized; and to indicate alternatives to such a project." (Pub. Res. Code, § 21061.) The County is required to study and analyze significant amounts of new information to correct these flaws, and the Supplemental EIR should therefore be re-circulated with the appropriate analysis and information. The opportunity for meaningful public review of significant new information is

Supervisors and Ms. Romero  
March 23, 2009  
Page 4



essential "to test, assess, and evaluate the data and make an informed judgment as to the validity of the conclusions to be drawn therefrom." (Sutter Sensible Planning, Inc. v. Sutter County Board of Supervisors, *supra*, 122 Cal.App.3d 813, 822; City of San Jose v. Great Oaks Water Co. (1987) 192 Cal.App.3d 1005, 1017.)

2. **The Proposed Alignment of the Clinton Keith Road Extension Project is Not Planned or Located in the Manner that Will be Most Compatible with the Greatest Public Good and the Least Private Injury:** A public agency may not exercise the power of eminent domain for a proposed project unless it establishes that "the project is planned or located in a manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury." (Code Civ. Proc., § 1240.030, subd. (b).) The County's proposed alignment of the Clinton Keith Road Extension project does not satisfy this requirement.

Specifically, the County had initially planned for Clinton Keith Road to extend on a straight-line to the I-215. After receiving opposition, the County then shifted the alignment to undertake a more lengthy, obscure route that crosses onto Anheuser Busch's Property. This new proposed route is not a practical alternative, as it extends the length of the road, adds additional right-of-way acquisition requirements, crosses and disturbs potential habitat, and severely impacts Anheuser Busch's ability to develop its Property (and dramatically reduces the fair market value of Anheuser Busch's Property). Had the County kept Clinton Keith Road in its original configuration, these project impacts could have been minimized. By passing this resolution of necessity, the County would be selecting an alternative route for Clinton Keith Road that is not compatible with the greatest public good and least private injury, in direct contravention of Eminent Domain law.

As further support for the conclusion that the proposed alignment does not meet this requirement, Anheuser Busch has retained a transportation engineer, Jeff Anderson, P.E., to evaluate the proposed alignment of Clinton Keith Road through Anheuser Busch's Property. (A copy of Mr. Anderson's qualifications is enclosed.) In short, Mr. Anderson has completed a preliminary analysis from which he has concluded that the abandoned southern alignment for Clinton Keith Road is a far better option, as the proposed northern alignment for Clinton Keith Road has far greater impacts and is a less-safe alternative. Mr. Anderson's preliminary conclusions include the following:

- The proposed northern alignment requires a more horizontal curvature and covers significant vertical terrain, resulting in a complicated combination of sight-distance issues. These challenging designs and heavy turning movements at the new Leon Road occur in a dense residential neighborhood, raising serious public-safety concerns. The abandoned southern alignment avoids this entire potential safety hazard, as it largely covers more rural areas with less access.

Supervisors and Ms. Romero  
March 23, 2009  
Page 5



- The proposed northern alignment cuts across natural habitat, disturbs more wildlife, and necessitates an additional wildlife crossing. The abandoned southern alignment would mostly be through disturbed area, reducing the environmental impacts and eliminating the need for an additional crossing structure (saving considerable costs on the project, likely amounting to several million dollars).
- The proposed northern route is considerably longer and therefore impacts a far greater amount of private property. This route also requires the acquisition and disturbance of medium-density residential and commercial property, thereby increasing the project-acquisition costs. The abandoned southern route is less expensive (from a construction perspective) due the shortened length, and it would also impact lower-density rural and non-active agricultural land, again saving the County considerable amounts in acquisition costs.

All these factors evidence that the project, as proposed to traverse Anheuser Busch's Property, cannot result in the greatest public good and least private injury.

Additionally, upon review of the 1999 Hybrid Report for the project, there is no discussion validating the northern alignment as being the best alternative. The report only proposed mitigation measures necessary to implement the route. There is also no discussion that there will be a traffic-related benefit with respect to utilizing the northern alignment. In fact, the data appears to indicate that it makes more sense for the Clinton Keith extension to connect at Thompson, as opposed to Benton, since more traffic (a two-to-one margin) comes from South Bound SR 79 rather than North Bound SR 79.

At a minimum, the County cannot know whether the project satisfies this requirement of greatest public good and least private injury without considering all the additional available information that post-dates the Supplemental EIR. How can the County accurately make a determination that this alignment will result in the least private injury when the County does not have information regarding new potential impacts of the project? How can the County make a determination that the project is achieving the greatest public good when better, alternative new routes may be available? These questions must be answered before the County can adopt a resolution of necessity making these critical findings.

**3. The County Failed to Make an Offer of Just Compensation Based on a Proper Appraisal of the Property:** The County obtained an appraisal that valued Anheuser Busch's Property as of January 2008. The County's long-planned acquisition of Anheuser Busch's Property and the detrimental impacts to that Property suffered because of the County's actions and inactions make this date of value improper. Additionally, the County's appraisal failed to recognize the substantial severance damages and pre-condemnation damages that Anheuser Busch has suffered as a result of the County's actions to date. Because of this

Supervisors and Ms. Romero  
March 23, 2009  
Page 6



oversight in the County's appraisal, the County's offer -- which is based on that appraisal -- is no offer at all.

For years, the County (in concert with the RCA) has frozen Anheuser Busch's ability to develop its Property due to the County's planned extension of Clinton Keith Road and the RCA's plans to conserve substantially all, if not all, of Anheuser Busch's Property as part of the MSHCP. It was years ago -- no later than sometime in 2006 -- when the County's and RCA's actions resulted in a de facto taking of Anheuser Busch's Property. As a result, the County's appraiser was required to evaluate these impacts and appraise Anheuser Busch's Property based on a much earlier date of value.

Likewise, California law requires that appraisers take great care in ensuring that the project for which the property is being acquired does not taint the fair market value award. Code of Civil Procedure section 1263.330 requires that appraisers eliminate any such "project induced impacts" from their analysis. The County's appraisal fails this test: the appraisal contains no analysis addressing the fact that Anheuser Busch's Property would have had development entitlements or would have even been developed but for the County's and the RCA's actions and the multiple years Anheuser Busch was forced to lose in attempts to negotiate with these entities. The Court of Appeal applied this rule in City of San Diego v. Rancho Penasquitos Partnership (2003) 105 Cal.App.4th 1013, 1029-1037. There, a zoning ordinance enacted by the City of San Diego limited development of property pending acquisition of right of way for a highway. The Court held that "zoning restrictions on property to be condemned that are enacted to freeze or depress land values of property to be condemned should not be considered in the valuation of that property." (Id. at p. 1034.) The Court then went on to analyze out-of-state and secondary authorities and noted that all "are in agreement . . . that a zoning restriction that seeks to minimize the condemning entities' costs in condemning property is improper and confiscatory." (Id. at p. 1037.)

A similar result was reached in People ex rel. Dept. of Public Works v. Graziadio (1964) 231 Cal.App.2d 525, 527-31, in which the Court of Appeal concluded that it was an error for the trial court to have excluded from evidence a letter sent by the State's Department of Public Works to the City of Fullerton in which the State asked the City to reject a rezoning application that, if granted, would have increased the value of the property so that the State would be able to pay less for the property in a condemnation proceeding.

Here, as a direct result of the County's plans for the Clinton Keith Road extension project, and the County's and RCA's planned acquisition of Anheuser Busch's Property as part of the MSHCP, Anheuser Busch was denied the opportunity and ability to obtain entitlements for its Property. This negative impact of the County's and RCA's actions must be disregarded when valuing the Property. The County's appraisal failed to recognize this important piece of the valuation puzzle.

Further, the County's proposed condemnation will cut diagonally across Anheuser Busch's Property, splitting it in two and leaving one large piece that is irregularly shaped and

Supervisors and Ms. Romero  
March 23, 2009  
Page 7



more difficult to develop and a smaller piece that will be an orphaned, irregularly shaped remnant. The County's appraisal identifies no severance damages because the County's appraiser failed to properly consider the obviously detrimental impact that this severance will have on the ability of the remaining properties to be developed.

The County is required to go back and re-do its appraisal to analyze these impacts. The law requires that "[p]rior to the commencement of an eminent domain proceeding, if the evidence presented by an owner or a material change in the character or condition of the property indicates the need for a new appraisal . . . , the public entity shall have its appraisal updated." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 25, § 6182, subd. (i)(2), emphasis added.) The County's appraisal is inaccurate and insufficient, and the County is therefore required to re-appraise the property before it can adopt a resolution of necessity. (See Johnston v. Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation & Open Space Dist. (2002) 100 Cal.App.4th 973, 988 [explaining that "a good faith offer based on a fair appraisal [is] a prerequisite to adopting the resolution of necessity."].)

Because the County's appraisal of the Property (1) applies an improper date of value, and (2) fails to consider the substantial pre-condemnation damages and severance damages resulting from the County's actions, the County's appraisal is deficient, and the Board cannot take any action toward condemning the Property until the County has had a corrected appraisal completed and made a new offer to Anheuser Busch.

**4. Anheuser Busch's Property is Not Necessary for the Project:** A public agency may not exercise the power of eminent domain for a proposed project unless it establishes that "the property sought to be acquired is necessary for the project." (Code Civ. Proc., § 1240.030, subd. (c).) As noted, the condemnation of Anheuser Busch's Property clearly flunks this test: the County had previously selected a more convenient, less-intrusive, safer, and less-destructive route for the Clinton Keith Road extension, but ultimately changed its mind. This new proposed route -- and its resulting condemnation of Anheuser Busch's Property -- is therefore not "necessary for the project."

**5. The County's Adoption of a Resolution of Necessity Appears to be an Effort to Coerce an Agreement From Anheuser Busch on the Price of the Acquisition:** It is unlawful for the County to "take any . . . action coercive in nature, in order to compel an agreement on the price to be paid for the property." (See Gov. Code, § 7267.5.) The County and RCA previously entered into negotiations with Anheuser Busch to take part in a "land swap" to address the County's and RCA's needs. When that transaction was challenged, the County backed out of it, and the County instead has decided to condemn Anheuser Busch's Property in order to coerce Anheuser Busch into selling its property at a hugely reduced price or to donate it to the County or RCA at no cost. The County cannot do this.

**6. The County is Prohibited from Rubber-Stamping a Resolution of Necessity:** The County must arrive at any decision to take Anheuser Busch's Property by engaging in a "good faith and judicious consideration of the pros and cons of the issue." (Redevelopment Agency v. Norm's Slauson (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 1121, 1125.) The County's Board of

Supervisors and Ms. Romero  
March 23, 2009  
Page 8



Supervisors cannot simply "rubber-stamp" a predetermined result. (*Id.* at p. 1127.) Yet, rubber-stamping appears to be the County's plan.

The County has, by virtue of its previous actions, irrevocably committed itself to take Anheuser Busch's Property, regardless of any evidence that might be presented at this hearing. (See *Norm's Slauson, supra*, 173 Cal.App.3d at p. 1127.) For example, the County has already moved forward with acquiring numerous properties for the Clinton Keith Road extension project based on the alignment that transverses Anheuser Busch's Property. It has also approved of a Supplemental EIR for the project that calls for the necessary acquisition of Anheuser Busch's Property, and the County has threatened to use the power of eminent domain should Anheuser Busch fail to agree to settle the matter for the proposed offer of compensation for the Property. These facts demonstrate that the County's hearing is nothing more than a sham. The County's hearing on the resolution of necessity will therefore be affected by the prior elimination of any discretion whatsoever, which will deprive any approved resolution of validity. (*Ibid.*)

#### CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth in this letter, the Board of Supervisors cannot validly adopt a resolution of necessity to acquire Anheuser Busch's Property. Therefore, Anheuser Busch requests that the Board of Supervisors not proceed with any hearing on that resolution or, if it proceeds, that the Supervisors vote to reject the defective resolution.

Very truly yours,

K. Erik Friess  
of Nossaman LLP

KEF/bbk

Enclosure

cc: Pamela Walls, County Counsel  
(Via Facsimile & U.S. Mail)

## ANDERSON CONSULTING ENGINEERS

### Qualification Statement

**Jeff A. Anderson, P.E.**  
Senior Consultant

#### Overview

Providing expert management and design oversight services with significant experience in transportation, development, general civil, and water resources fields. My vision is that Clients will leverage high-level expertise within an attractive pricing framework.

#### New Business Model

Many executives and senior managers are at a perplexing crossroads. Capturing top-level management experience requires a fiscal commitment which is complicated in this current environment. Yet, projects continue to move forward in need of competent management to ensure quality work and reasonable budgets. Looking forward, having high-quality talent is a must, not just a need, anymore.

Are you concerned that you have the available staff to ensure the success of your projects? Do you also need to reduce your full time financial obligation, but could still need high-quality management for all of your projects? Welcome to the new ultra-premium business service model that will change the way consulting performed. We combine strong civil design and with extensive program management, to provide a "big picture" approach to managing projects. And by adding this top-end leadership, part-time, you will significantly upgrade your team without all of the associated expenses.

We understand that oversight requires special attention to many details and is not just about reporting progress; proper management involves transitioning issues through to solutions. Most "in house" staff members lack the know-how or proper experience to make the accurate and necessary decisions; yet companies entrust millions to this approach. Why take needless risk when you have a superior option. We are breaking this outdated mode of operation and providing first-rate management, at a very reasonable expense, so our Clients can have it all.

There are multiple ways to add talent to your team with our platform. You might be looking for engineering expertise or design oversight for value engineering and quality control on a project by project basis. Maybe you're looking for help with due diligence and strategy on a critical project. Or you need senior manager to handle key projects, manage the consultant team, and ensure budget containment. Regardless, you will benefit from a comprehensive resume with over 20+ years of local, Southern California experience. Most projects typically do not require full time attention, so only pay for what you need and have first-class talent working for you. We are looking for Clients with a strong business approach and desire for success.

#### List of Services

- Design Management and Contract Oversight
- Contract Negotiations
- Engineering Design and Consultation
- Project Strategy Development and Implementation
- Cost Estimation and Budgeting
- Value Engineering
- Site Selection
- Research and Due Diligence
- Agency Coordination & Negotiation

## ANDERSON CONSULTING ENGINEERS

### Background

21-year career working on major public and private projects throughout Southern California, especially the Inland Empire and high desert areas; and a California Registered Civil Engineer. Expertise in project management and design oversight in the transportation, real estate development, infrastructure, and water resources fields. Also includes extensive background in front line business management and business development. My goal is to create a consulting company providing value-added services to a variety of industries.

### Relevant Experience

#### Transportation

Apache Trail/I-10 Interchange -- Project Management and Design of new roundabouts (first of its kind in California) at key interchange with Interstate 10 in Cabazon. Included PS&E under encroachment permit with Caltrans for the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. The very complex design replacing existing unsignalized, and close proximity, ramp to local road intersections. Worked closely with renowned expert Michael Wallwork to set initial layout, but vertical design needed to accommodate an existing 7% grade, preserve an existing railroad crossing, provide ADA compliance with regards to cross-fall, maintain adequate bridge clearance and avoid an existing 30" fuel line. Project also involved preparation of a Report of Conceptual Approval, gained PUC approval and BIA approval, and development of unique right of way mapping work.

State Route 30 (210), segment 3 -- Design Management for 2.5-miles of 6 mixed use lanes, plus 2 HOV new freeway, two interchanges, 7 grade separations, and three canal crossings in Rancho Cucamonga. Efforts included management of right of way engineering consultant for utility locations and base mapping; preparation of Scope of Services, selection and negotiation, and management of design consultant for PS&E; preparation Scope of Services, selection and negotiation, and management of right of way mapping consultant for acquisition. Project involved considerable planning for major utilities, drainage, and historical properties, in this dense area of the City. Also involved redesign of freeway mainline and Army Corps channel to reduce the profile of Sapphire Street; saving the relocation of nearly 20 homeowners.

State Route 30 (210), segment 4 -- Design Management for 2.3-miles of 6 mixed use lanes, plus 2 HOV new freeway, two interchanges, 2 grade separations, and one canal crossing in Rancho Cucamonga. Efforts included coordination with Caltrans design team during preliminary engineering; management of right of way engineering consultant for utility locations and base mapping; and preparation of Scope of Services for the selection and negotiation of design consultant for PS&E. Provided design expertise for the revised mainline, arterial roads, and drainage profiles to switch from elevated to mostly below grade to meet approval of Caltrans and City of Rancho Cucamonga, saving tax payers \$200 million. Also involved participation in 40-hour Value Engineering workshop for the project.

Interstate 215, 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and 5<sup>th</sup> Street Reconstruction -- Design Manager for 1.7-miles of 6 mixed use lanes, plus 2 HOV, modification to existing freeway, 2 new grade separations, and 1 modified grade separation in San Bernardino. Efforts included preliminary design and staging concepts for the reconstruction/relocation of freeway mainline and existing interchanges. Project involved switching from flawed collector-distributor road concept to braided-ramp concept reducing right of way acquisition and therefore resolving local political issues. Project concept lead to the re-assessment of entire corridor, saving considerable right of way acquisition and construction costs.

## ANDERSON CONSULTING ENGINEERS

### General Civil

Chapman Heights, Yucaipa – Client Manager and Project Director for a 1,000-acre, 2,200-unit, golf course master plan community which also included a 25-acre commercial center. Project involved approximately 6 miles of major public roads, including 3 miles of major arterial highway widening or realignments, 3 new water tanks, infrastructure storm drain, infrastructure sewer and water facilities, and preliminary/final plans for 10 planning areas and commercial. This signature project involved complex flood control designs in order to integrate the championship golf course and residential elements.

Oak Valley Greens, Beaumont – Client Manager and Project Manager for 500-unit residential master plan. Project involved approximately 3 miles of arterial highway design, infrastructure storm drain, infrastructure sewer and water facilities, and preliminary/final plans for 6 planning areas and a 10-acre public park. This major project was built around an existing championship golf course.

McSweeney Farms, Hemet – Project Manager for 1,600-unit residential master plan. Project involved Specific Plan, EIR, flood plain design, approximately 3 miles of public roads (including 1.5 miles of arterial highway design), infrastructure storm drain, and infrastructure sewer and water facilities, and preliminary/final plans for 6 residential planning areas. Project involved major flood control measures to maximize the developable area.

Moreno Valley Ranch, Moreno Valley – Client Manager & Project Manager for build out of this major master plan. Efforts included preliminary/final plans for 4 single-family residential planning areas and preliminary/final plans for 2 condominium planning areas. Project involved working closely with City staff to accelerate plan processing to meet critical deadline for the Client on some a key planning.

### Development Management

Mojave Vistas, Victorville – Development Manager for a 1,000-unit mixed-use residential master plan. Project involved preparation of Specific Plan, Parcel Map, Tentative Tract Maps, and infrastructure design. The project included hillside designs which complicated infrastructure and residential planning area designs. Also included coordination with BLM for necessary easements for additional access to the site.

Esplanade, San Jacinto – Development Manager for a 1,000-unit mixed-use master plan. Project involved preparation of a Specific Plan, Development Agreement, Parcel Map, Lot Line Adjustment, and Master Tentative Tract Map. The project included complicated drainage/grading concept to ensure project viability. Included coordination with RCTC regarding future State Route 79 to reduce impacts and maximize developable area.

Antelope Trails, Riverside County – Development Manager for a 286-unit residential project. Project involved Zone Change and Tentative Tract Map. Included close coordination Supervisors Office, Planning Commissioners, and County Staff to gain approval of this extremely difficult project. Also worked closely with the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) to preserve a small portion of the site within the San Jacinto River Flood Plain (included HANS application) and Riverside County Flood Control to resolve complicated drainage conditions.

Pigeon Pass, Moreno Valley – Development Manager for a 78-unit hillside development. Project involved Annexation, Zone Change, and Tentative Tract Map. Included complicated hillside design to maximize unit count and reduce visible grading. Required close coordination with City staff to resolve transitional zoning, drainage, water quality, and impacts jurisdictional streambed. Also included complex design handling geotechnical issues related to close proximity bedrock.

## ANDERSON CONSULTING ENGINEERS

### Water Resources

Caltrans Storm Water Training – Involved training classes for Caltrans field staff throughout the state regarding storm water regulations, compliance and BMPs. Involved topic-intensive 4-hour presentations to assure better compliance to storm water regulations by Caltrans construction personnel.

SWPPPs/WPCPs – Client and Project Manager for the marketing and preparation of Storm Water plans for state and local contractors.

### Employment History

**United Engineering Group – California, Inc** **3/2006 to 2/2009**  
**Ontario, CA & San Diego, CA**  
**President/Director**

Responsible for operational and engineering/entitlement oversight for a Program Management Company handling over 100 real estate developments throughout Southern California for Investors located around the world

**AEI-CASC Consulting** **9/1997 to 3/2006**  
**Colton, CA & San Diego, CA**  
**Engineering Director**

Responsible for all engineering design oversight for major Inland Empire Civil Design Firm handling Private and Public projects.

**Fluor Corporation** **9/1992 to 9/1997**  
**SANBAG**  
**Design Manager**

Manager responsible for Program Management Company handling all aspects of preliminary and PS&E design of major freeway construction.

**The Keith Companies** **3/1988 to 9/1992**  
**Riverside/Moreno Valley**  
**Project Engineer/Assist. Project Manager**

Design team leader for major Inland Empire Civil Design Firm handling major Private projects

### Education:

**California State Polytechnic University, Pomona**  
**Graduated 3/1988; Civil Engineering, General Option**

### Registrations:

**State of California Registered Civil Engineer No. C48750, Exp. 9/30/2010**  
**Currently pursuing LEED AP Certification**

## ANDERSON CONSULTING ENGINEERS

### Fee Rate Schedule

#### Hourly Rates

Senior Consultant: \$140

Lead Consultant: \$115

Assistant Consultant: \$80

#### Reimbursable Expenses

Travel Time: \$100/Hr\*

Reproduction (Copies, plotting, large format scanning, etc) provided by third party vendor will be billed with a 5% mark-up for handling and carry costs.

\* Travel time includes all travel related expenses; Assistance Consultant shall bill normal hourly rate for travel time.