

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

April 20, 2004

Mr. Joel Rojas, Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement  
 City of Rancho Palos Verdes  
 30940 Hawthorne Blvd.  
 Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Dear Mr. Rojas,

I am writing to you as a concerned parent from Rancho Palos Verdes. I understand that the City is considering public input on the Natural Communities Conservation Planning Subarea Plan (NCCP) and the associated draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). While I value the existing open land and fields of the Palos Verdes Peninsula, I would like to express my concern to the City Council with the current NCCP and DEIR plan to acquire additional acreage for the purpose of open space.

I believe that the City has the responsibility to provide for the youth of this city by providing a reasonable amount of parks and recreation facilities. Your own staff reports show that the RPV parkland areas slated for active recreation are extraordinarily far below the National Recreation and Parks Association's recommended level. The only category that brings the City acreage within the recommended acreage is the Open Space/Urban Green space. *The neighborhood playgrounds, community playfields, major community parks ALL fall way below the recommended area for cities such as ours.* The category of Neighborhood Park has included 99 acres of Lower and Upper Pointe Vicente though I dare you to find a parent on the Hill that considers that land as a neighborhood park! **The numbers are factual and the information you have received these last four years from the Peninsula Youth Sports Council support the facts that this community needs more recreational facilities.**

This fact relates specifically to the NCCP and the associated DEIR in the fact that the City has not taken care of one of its primary responsibilities, the youth within the City of RPV. The plan to use \$875,000 or more of Proposition 12 & 40 monies to acquire yet more open space, while this state money could be used towards development of youth activities, ball fields etc. is not in the residents of RPV's best interest. Furthermore, the entire financial analysis of the NCCP raises significant questions. The data provided on-line is incomplete as to the City's on-going financial responsibilities for maintenance of the Preserve. **A thorough analysis of these costs, by an impartial body, is called for to assure the public of the legal and fiscal soundness.** As a parent and community leader, I would question the judgment and legal viability of any costs by the city for this open space when basic recreation needs are being neglected.

How can one justify the costs of maintaining the Coastal California Gnatcatcher, the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly or Lyon's pentachaeta over the children and youth of our community?

**Comment 1**

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.

LA MONTE 1