

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

In Page 1 of 2

Subject: NCCP Draft EIR - Public Hearing on March 16, 2004
 To: cc@rpv.com, joelr@rpv.com
 CC: tlong@nossaman.com, ANNDSHAW@aol.com

March 14, 2004

To Mayor Pete Gardiner and City Council Members Larry Clark, Tom Long, Doug Stern, and Steve Wolowicz and Planning Director Joel Rojas

>From Ann Shaw and Dena Friedson

Re the NCCP Draft Environmental Impact Report - Public Hearing on March 16

Since people rely on official reports when making decisions, the facts should be clear and accurate. We would like to offer the following comments about the consistency of numbers and descriptions in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Corrections could be made as an Addendum.

>From the figures shown on Pages 2-1, 2-2, 3-5, 3-7, and 3-8, we can not determine how the Reserve design adds up to 1,514 acres. Clarification is needed.

Table 5.3-1 on Page 5-50 indicates that the Point Vicente Interpretive Center belongs to the City and is designated for "active" use. Although change of ownership is in the works, the County still owns the Lower Point Vicente property. The Quitclaim Deed, the Program of Utilization, and the General Plan show the acreage as "passive."

On Page 3-7, included in "other public/conserved lands" are 10 acres of County-owned Lower Point Vicente Park and the Fishing Access area. Since Lower Point Vicente is approximately 27 acres and the Fishing Access is approximately 11 acres, how are the 10 acres to be apportioned from each of these locations?

There is confusion regarding the acreages of Upper Point Vicente as they are shown on Pages 5-50, 5-54, and 5-58. The Application - with Its Justification and Program of Utilization - was dated March 1, 1976. At that time, it was anticipated that the Coast Guard site of 3.9 acres would be included in the transfer of land. The Justification and Program of Utilization refer to 74.7 acres, of which 6.0 acres were to be used for active recreation. The Quitclaim Deed was actually recorded much later - on December 6, 1979. It indicates that the City was granted 75.53 acres. Parcel 1, now known as Del Cerro Park, was said to contain 4.49 acres. Parcel 2, or Upper Point Vicente, was said to contain "71.04 acres, more or less." The additional 2 acres requested in April of 1978 are included in the 71.04 acres. Specifically not included in determining the amount of acreage were the Coast Guard site of 3.9 acres, 6.0 acres purchased by the City and recorded on March 6, 1979, and the land purchased and recorded on June 5, 1987 shown as 1.66 acres on the Deed and 2.23 acres on its attached map. Thus approximately 65 acres were dedicated to passive recreation.

Since 55 acres are to be part of the Reserve, will any mitigation be required if the 10 acres proposed for active use have native brush or grasslands?

We are pleased that the Coast Guard property will be treated as Reserve and hope that the two small agricultural areas on Upper and Lower Point Vicente will be allowed to remain. They represent an important part of Palos Verdes history and seem passive in their appearance and dry-farming style.

SHAW & FRIEDSON 1

SHAW & FRIEDSON 2

SHAW & FRIEDSON 3

SHAW & FRIEDSON 4

SHAW & FRIEDSON 5

SHAW & FRIEDSON 6

Comment 1

The 1,504 acres is represented in revised Figure 5.1.1 as Reserve lands.

Comment 2

The city now owns Lower Point Vicente, as it was accepted by the City Council on July 6, 2004.

Comment 3

The acreages have been adjusted in the Subarea Plan to reflect the correct portion of the Lower Pt. Vicente property and Fishing access that will be in the Reserve.

Comment 4

The acreages have been corrected in the Subarea Plan.

Comment 5

All project impacts to naturalized vegetation (CSS, grassland, riparian scrub) will be required to provide mitigation per the Subarea Plan.

Comment 6

Existing agricultural activities are a compatible use.

COMMENTS

RESPONSES

Comment 7

The Subarea Plan has been revised and updated with new acreage estimates.

In

Page 1 of 1

Subject: NCCPDEIR Hearing on March 16
To: cc@rpv.com, joelr@rpv.com
CC: tlong@nossaman.com, ANNDSHAW@aol.com

March 15, 2004

To Mayor Peter Gardiner and Council Members Larry Clark, Tom Long, Doug Stern, and Steve Wolowicz and Planning Director Joel Rojas

>From Ann Shaw and Dena Friedson

Re the NCCP Subarea Plan and the Draft EIR

With reference to the e-mail sent to you yesterday, the same corrections and clarifications should be made as an Addendum to the Subarea Plan itself. Also, the Subarea Plan shows 1,507 Reserve acres compared to 1,514 in the DEIR, neither of which seems right, and there are different acreages for the Crestridge Parcel.

SHAW & FRIEDSON 7

The problems with numbers and figures occur on Pages 3-1, 3-5, 3-6, 4-1, and 4-3.

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
----------	-----------

These next two pages of the letter appear to address the differences between the EIR and the Subarea Plan document. The Final Subarea Plan will be consistent with the Final EIR.

3-23-04

Filter Notes
Re DEIR and Subarea Plan

Section 1	Section 3	Section 5
1-4 revisions to the Draft Subarea Plan of March 2003 Was it March or June or were there 2 drafts?	3-5 1,495 acres of agriculture 1,514 acres of agriculture 720 residential avoids for property taking (ie. mitigation still required?)	5-54 74.7 acres to be changed 68.1 acres to be changed 73.4, 4, 97.3 acres to be changed 1476 is wrong 74.2 should be 73.3
Section 2	3-5 1,200 acres of large scrub/shrubland (250 acres) would be transferred in 1997	5-56 discuss? are they compatible in Reserve?
2-1 1,514 acres of Reserve 1,495 acres of agriculture (the same as in watershed analysis)	3-8 720 residential 596.8 acres of dry land + 3,000 acres of reforestation - Reserve to include for 33.7 miles of riparian VEG, 500 acres of non-native grass to City projects?	5-57 did City look at this map? limited to passive? some of it to be in Reserve?
2-3 City would like to self-issue and manage. Would like to take mitigation as long as they are consistent with Subarea Plan. Where? Inside Reserve area or outside? not In pages 1-4 and 1-5 of the Draft Plan, the "central riparian" inside and outside of reserved area and "the surprise" project - no additional compensation to permit holder - use mitigation.	3-11 Is mitigation to occur after plan is approved?	5-58 change 77.3 to 71.04 or 74.2 (71+5). 74.2 is the adjustment.
→ How does work after approval need to be clearly explained.	3-12 Final Plan - what about Mountain bikes?	
2-4 and party beneficiaries (owners) developer of land in Subarea Plan) would be allowed to take covered riparian forest on approval of project permits. Is mitigation required? Should bill and school districts be allowed to be used?	3-16 Would Section 10a permit and 10d sub be used by city?	
2-6 874.5 acres or -177	Section 4	
2-7 1,495 acres (see comments on Appendix worksheet)	4-1 Occupant details for 74 were 67 numbers correct? That's how it was, 74, 67, 8, 54.	
2-9 Compliance with Plan will mention other to allowed in Reserve?	4-3 73 lot subdivision 74 single-family subdivision	
	Section 5	
	5-1 8,246.4 acres in RPV	
	5-1 8,241 acres in RPV	
	5-2 Agriculture as shown	
	5-30 Agriculture as shown at 39.6 acres	
	5-48 Is defining a pasture area?	
	5-50 Historic Res is shown as 90 acres. Should be 70 acres. See notes. Stop Burke as no water. County parcels, park, if good course totaling 194 acres.	

