

Progressive Democrats
Of The Santa Monica Mountains
5348 Topanga Canyon Blvd. Suite 203
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

www.pdsmm.org

ph 818.226.6100 fx 818.226.6111

June 19, 2009

Dennis Bedford
Newhall Ranch EIS/EIR
c/o California Department of Fish and Game
4949 Viewridge Ave.
San Diego, CA 92123
Newhallranch@dfg.ca.gov
Fax: 858-467-4299

RE: Extension of comment period for Newhall Ranch Management and Development Plan
Pro

Dear Mr. Bedford:

Because the Plan in question proposes to develop over 21,000 homes plus commercial and some industrial buildings, and there are no plans for public transportation, the public needs to participate and comment on this behemoth development.

Because of the location of this development, which is partially in the Santa Clara River floodplain of Los Angeles County, the public needs to review and comment on this plan and because of the massive size of the documents in question, 16,000 pages, it is unreasonable to all to have only 60 days to comment (which ends June 25, 2009).

Because of the scarcity of water and land and the traffic problems mentioned above, we need to be permitted to have ample time to review the EIS and the EIR. Currently it is now only 60 days. **We would like to extended by 120 days, please.**

Too much is at stake in our state and our resources are dwindling. The impact of this development will be huge and we need reasonable due process. Please extend the public comment period on the Newhall Ranch Management and Development Plan.

Thank you,



Dorothy Reik
President

PDSMM

036. Letter from Progressive Democrats of the Santa Monica Mountains (Dorothy Reik), dated June 19, 2009

Response 1

This comment indicates that because the proposed Project would facilitate the development of over 21,000 homes, as well as commercial and industrial development, but would not provide public transportation, the public review is important.

As to the provision of public transportation on the Project site, the Draft EIS/EIR describes the Project's impacts on transit service. For example, on page 4.8-47 of the Draft EIS/EIR, **Section 4.8**, Traffic, the following analysis is provided:

"Development of Alternative 2 would result in the need for additional transit services to serve the newly developed area. As discussed in **Subsection 4.8.4.2**, the study area is served primarily by two major transit carriers, the Santa Clarita Valley Transit System and Metrolink. SCT recently completed a Transportation Development Plan for the years through 2015. (See **Appendix 4.8**, December 2008 Traffic Report.) The Plan identifies the need to provide future services to the Project areas, and includes the following bus route recommendations for the medium-term timeframe, defined as five to 10 years in the future:

Routes 3/7: Extend route west on Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Boulevard; and

Route 11: Establish a potential hybrid route to serve the Newhall Ranch Landmark Village along Henry Mayo Drive/SR-126, Commerce Center Drive, and Magic Mountain Parkway.

As the Project site is developed further over the years, periodic adjustments to the availability of transit service will be required to serve the subsequently developed areas. Alternative 2 would not result in significant impacts relative to the provision of transit service."

As to opportunities for the public to review the Draft EIS/EIR, in response to this and other requests, the Corps and CDFG extended the comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to **Topical Response 1: EIS/EIR Public Review Opportunities**.

Response 2

This comment indicates that because the proposed Project would be partially in the Santa Clara River floodplain in Los Angeles County, public review is important. The comment addresses general floodplain development issues, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR, including **Section 4.1**, Surface Water Hydrology and Flood Control; **Section 4.2**, Geomorphology and Riparian Resources; and **Section 4.6**, Jurisdictional Waters and Streams. The comment does not raise any specific issues regarding the analysis provided in the Draft EIS/EIR; therefore, no additional response is provided. However, 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.

As to opportunities for the public to review the Draft EIS/EIR, please refer to **Topical Response 1: EIS/EIR Public Review Opportunities**.

Response 3

This comment indicates that because of the scarcity of water and land, and traffic impacts of the proposed Project, that public review of the proposed Project is important. The comment addresses general water supply and traffic issues, which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR, including **Section 4.3**, Water Resources, and **Section 4.8**, Traffic. The comment does not raise any specific issues regarding the analysis provided in the Draft EIS/EIR; therefore, no additional response is provided. However, 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.

As to opportunities for the public to review the Draft EIS/EIR, please refer to **Topical Response 1: EIS/EIR Public Review Opportunities**.

Response 4

In response to this and other requests, the Corps and CDFG extended the comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to **Topical Response 1: EIS/EIR Public Review Opportunities**.