

<i>COMMENTS</i>	<i>RESPONSES</i>
-----------------	------------------

In

Page 1 of 1

To: "Les Evans" <lese@rpv.com>
 "dstern@fulbright.com"
 <dstern@fulbright.com>
 "joelr@rpv.com" <joelr@rpv.com>
 Subject: Land preservation plan too costly-- Ltr to the Editor Daily Breeze (Weds 24 Mar)

Land preservation plan too costly
 Once again, it became quite obvious that the Rancho Palos Verdes City Council does not intend to review all the facts presented at the public hearings against the Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) sub-area plan before making any decisions. At the conclusion of the City Council's public hearing presentation, most of councilmen were falling over themselves applauding the above-mentioned plan, even though it was evident that there was no intent to have any active recreational facilities on these lands. Questions of ongoing costs, city litigation protection, management responsibility and the city fiscal's responsibility were only raised by one councilman -- Steve Wolowicz. Hurrah! I overheard one of the individuals at the meeting say that he was surprised by the comment of Councilman Larry Clark, who said, "One of the top four priorities of this council is the accomplishment of this project." Surely someone in public office should first determine that this is in the best public interest and not a continuing financial burden. It seems like the Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy (PVPLC) gets to make the rules while only RPV has to pay costs, not any of the other Peninsula cities. Councilman Tom Long implied that the money is out there. If we don't get it, someone else will. What will it cost us downstream? Since Proposition 12 and Proposition 40 funds are identified, one presumes that \$870,000 is being set aside for the land purchase scheme. Conditions of Proposition 12 and Proposition 40 funds are that they are to be used for active recreation and parks. To me, it is a stretch of the imagination to consider the PVPLC's plans include active recreation and active parks. Even the horse people expressed concern that they were being aced out. The long-term expense being assumed by the city for maintenance of this preserve has not yet been fully identified and will be a future burden on those living in RPV. Our taxes are high enough without removing the land from the RPV tax base. Let your councilmen know how you feel about spending your taxes on these projects. You will be the ones paying for this downstream.
 -- SANDY FRIEDFELD
 Rancho Palos Verdes

FRIEDFELD 1

Comment 1

Comment noted. In response to questions about the long term costs to the City and funding, Staff Reports discussing the fiscal impacts of the NCCP were presented to the City's Finance Advisory Committee (FAC) on April 28 and May 26, 2004. After a review of the project costs to the City, the FAC concluded that it did not note anything problematic and that the City Council should move forward expeditiously with the completion of the NCCP and the related land acquisition.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Comment 2

The noise impact threshold has been revised to 65 dBA Leq hourly in the Plan. Studies have demonstrated noise masking of songbird vocalizations occurs at about the 60 to 65 dB threshold. Interference with gnatcatcher territorial behavior (vocalizations) is considered harassment and an incidental take of a listed species.

In

Page 1 of 1

Subject: NCCP Question
To: joelr@rpv.com

Question on NCCP Subarea Plan
In section 6, Reserve Management, page 6-3, item 7 calls for a noise impact level of 60db at the edge of the habitat. From the reference, "Data for Radio Engineers", this level is less than average conversational speech at 3.5 ft which is 70db. I think this is not acceptable in an outdoor environment and should be eliminated as a requirement. On what technical basis was 60 db chosen?

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,

Sandy Friedfeld
29418 Quailwood Dr.
RPV, CA 90278

FRIEDFELD 2