

**From:** "Faisal Alserri" <Faisal.Alserrri@lacity.org>  
**To:** Aaron.O.Allen@usace.army.mil; NEWHALLRANCH@dfg.ca.gov  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 26, 2009 5:32 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Newhall Ranch

\*\* High Priority \*\*

Mr. Allen,

The City of Los Angeles has provided comments on the draft EIS/EIR and the current permit 404 river and tributary agreements of Newhall Ranch Co. in the form of a Resolution passed by City Council in opposition to any discretionary or administrator action by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Fish & Game to alter the Santa Clara River, and a letter from the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (DOT) stating that the current boundary of the study area is inadequate and additional time is needed to properly review the request.

1

At this time, DOT does not believe that either the Army Corps of Engineers nor the Department of Fish & Game has adequate information regarding the traffic impacts of the request to alter the Santa Clara River to make an informed decision on the permit 404 request.

The intent of the applicant's request before your department is to allow / increase vehicle access to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Area. Therefore in as much as your review is based on the environmental impacts of the river, the Final EIS/EIR must address the impacts that the allowable level and location of alteration of the Santa Clara River set by your department shall have on traffic, as the allowable level and location of acceptable impacts on the River shall directly affect the traffic impacts.

2

Please also note that I have also received a telephone call regarding improper protocol regarding notification and availability of documents for review. Specifically, SCOPE has referred to a document that was cited in the draft EIR however was not released or made available until a staff member of theirs requested it. It is not clear to me that if a document is referenced and cited in the EIS/EIR and is not released or readily available during notification, if that compromises the notification requirements and may need a legal opinion.

3

Thank you,

Faisal Alserri  
Planning Deputy  
Los Angeles Council District Seven  
Office of Councilmember Richard Alarcón  
Faisal.Alserrri@lacity.org  
T. 213-847-7777  
F. 213-847-0707

**024. Letter from Los Angeles Council District Seven, Faisal Alserri, dated August 26, 2009**

---

**Response 1**

Responses to the comments included in the referenced City of Los Angeles Resolution and the letter from the City Department of Transportation (DOT) have been prepared and are included in this Final EIS/EIR. Please see the **Responses** to letter from the City of Los Angeles City Council, dated August 14, 2009 (Letter 022), and letter from the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, dated August 26, 2009 (Letter 023). With regard to the comment that the boundary of the traffic study area is inadequate and should extend into the San Fernando Valley, please see **Response 3** to the letter from the City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation, dated August 26, 2009 (Letter 023), for a discussion of this comment. With respect to the comment regarding additional review time, in response to this and other requests, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) extended the comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR. Please see **Topical Response 1: EIS/EIR Public Review Opportunities**.

**Response 2**

With respect to the comment regarding the lack of adequate information relating to traffic impacts, the Draft EIS/EIR includes meaningful analysis of the impacts of the proposed Project relative to traffic, as discussed in **Response 8** to the letter from the City of Los Angeles City Council, dated August 14, 2009 (Letter 022), and in **Responses 3** and **5** to the letter from the City DOT, dated August 26, 2009 (Letter 023). As to that portion of the comment stating that the Draft EIS/EIR must address the impacts that the allowable level and location of alteration of the Santa Clara River shall have on traffic, the Draft EIS/EIR traffic impacts analysis analyzed the potential impacts of the proposed Project and the alternatives, each of which would facilitate different levels of development dependent on the type and extent of infrastructure that would be provided, including roadways, bridges, and bank stabilization. (Draft EIS/EIR, **Subsection 4.8.6.1**.) For example, under Alternatives 2 and 5, three bridge crossings would be constructed over the Santa Clara River. In comparison, Alternatives 3, 4, and 6 would include two bridges, Alternative 7 would include one bridge, and Alternative 1 would include no bridge crossings. In doing so, the Draft EIS/EIR considered the traffic impacts associated with the alteration of the Santa Clara River that would result under the proposed Project and each of the alternatives due, in part, to the number of bridge crossings associated with each alternative. (Please see Draft EIS/EIR, **Subsection 4.8.8**, Impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternatives, which presents the traffic impacts analysis for each of the Project alternatives.) Please also see revised **Section 4.8** of the Final EIS/EIR.

**Response 3**

The comment states that the City of Los Angeles received a "telephone call regarding improper protocol" in connection with the notification and availability of documents for review. The call apparently was made to the City by a representative of the Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE). This topic has been addressed in **Responses 1 through 3** to the letter from SCOPE, dated August 21, 2009 (Letter 039), and **Topical Response No. 1: EIS/EIR Public Review Opportunities**. As explained in those responses, the document requested by SCOPE (the Landmark Village Revised Water Supply Assessment) was listed and referred to in the Draft EIS/EIR as one of several reference documents used in preparing the stand-alone Draft EIS/EIR. (Draft EIS/EIR **Section 4.3**, Water Resources.) The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not require every document cited in an EIR to be

included in or attached to the EIR. (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15148.) Moreover, the Corps and CDFG provided the commentor with the document upon request. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Project.