

From: Lynne Plambeck <lynneplambeck@access4less.net>
To: Aaron.O.Allen@usace.army.mil; lynneplambeck@access4less.net
Date: 8/24/2009 5:20:43 PM
Subject: RE: Newhall Ranch DEIR/DEIS Missing document

We didn't know it was missing until we began finalizing our comments and looked for it, Aaron. We have spent months trying to work on that horrendous document. It is not acceptable that reference material is either not available or difficult to obtain. We only had a very short period to review this project, while the developer had years to put it together. At least the reference material should be accessible and available when we go to look for it, even if it is the very last day.

We can't very well review this document on the Monday evening before the comments are due, therefore it should be excluded from the record, or we should have more time to review it.

Please be sure that this email and the previous correspondence are in the administrative record.

Lynne Plambeck
SCOPE

-----Original Message-----

>From: "Allen, Aaron O SPL" <Aaron.O.Allen@usace.army.mil>

>Sent: Aug 24, 2009 8:04 PM

>To: Lynne Plambeck <lynneplambeck@access4less.net>

>Cc: Dennis Bedford <DBEDFORD@dfg.ca.gov>

>Subject: RE: Newhall Ranch DEIR/DEIS Missing document

>

>To: Lynne Plambeck

>

>Attached is the requested reference document that you cited in your letter.

>The Corps and the California Department of Fish and Game have made every

>effort to facilitate public review of the Draft Newhall Ranch RMDP EIS/EIR,

>including referenced documents. However, we did not receive your request

>until approximately four days before the close of the comment period and, as

>a result, we do not think a formal extension of the comment period is

>appropriate for the review of a single reference document. As a result, we

>would request that you submit your formal comments for the Newhall Ranch RMDP

>Draft EIS/EIR by August 25, 2009. However, if you would like to supplement

>your formal comments after you have reviewed the attached reference document,

>we will ensure that your supplemental comments are included in the

>administrative record for the Draft EIS/EIR. We appreciate your interest in

>the proposed project and we look forward to receiving your formal comments on

>the Draft EIS/EIR by August 25, 2009.

>

>Thanks,

>Aaron O. Allen, Ph.D.

>Chief, North Coast Branch

>Regulatory Division

>

>

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Lynne Plambeck [mailto:lynneplambeck@access4less.net]

>Sent: Friday, August 21, 2009 3:29 PM

>To: newhallranch@dfg.ca.gov; Allen, Aaron O SPL

>Subject: Newhall Ranch DEIR/DEIS Missing document

>

>Please see attached correspondence requesting that this document be provided

>along with a short extension of the comment period so that it may be
>reviewed.

CC: DBEDFORD@dfg.ca.gov

045. E-mail from Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment, Lynne Plambeck, dated August 24, 2009

Response 1

This comment is a response to an e-mail from Aaron O. Allen, Ph.D., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), to Lynne Plambeck, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE), on August 24, 2009. The e-mail exchange relates to the Landmark Village Water Supply Assessment (Revised WSA), dated April 2009, which was one of the reference documents listed in **Subsection 4.3.2** of the Draft EIS/EIR. As explained in **Responses 1** and **2** to the letter from SCOPE, dated August 21, 2009 (Letter 039), CEQA does not require every document cited in an EIR to be included in or attached to the EIR. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15148.) Nonetheless, in response to the commentor's request for the Revised WSA, that document was placed in the Los Angeles County Library, Valencia branch, and the Corps (Aaron O. Allen, Ph.D.) sent an email to SCOPE, along with an attached copy of the Revised WSA. In that email, Dr. Allen explained that because neither the Corps nor CDFG received SCOPE's request for a copy of the Revised WSA until four days before the close of the 120-day public comment period no formal extension of the public comment period was appropriate for review of a single reference document. For that reason, the Corps, through Dr. Allen, requested that SCOPE submit its comments on the Draft EIS/EIR by August 25, 2009. However, Dr. Allen also stated that if SCOPE would like to supplement its comments after completing its review of the Revised WSA, then both the Corps and CDFG would ensure that SCOPE's supplemental comments on that document be included in the record. SCOPE has not provided any additional comments to the Corps or CDFG since receiving the Revised WSA.

In response to the comment that reference material was not available or difficult to maintain, please note that on Monday, April 27, 2009, the Draft EIS/EIR reference documents were hand-delivered to the Valencia library. The reference documents consisted of eight 5-inch binders containing 82 documents. A table of contents of the reference documents was provided in the first binder. The documents were shelved below the Draft EIS/EIR at the Valencia Library. Only the Revised WSA was omitted from the reference documents at the Valencia Library. As discussed in **Response 1** to the letter from SCOPE, dated August 21, 2009 (Letter 039), the Draft EIS/EIR's water analysis is not dependent upon the Landmark Village Revised WSA. The Revised WSA also is not required for the proposed actions addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR, nor is it necessary to evaluate the adequacy of the water supply information provided in the Draft EIS/EIR. The Revised WSA was provided as one of several reference documents used in preparing the stand-alone Draft EIS/EIR, **Section 4.3**, Water Resources. Moreover, the Revised WSA was provided to the commentor and made available at the Valencia Library as soon as it was requested.

The Corps and CDFG appreciate the commentor's opinions regarding the quality of the document and the public review period. These opinions will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Project.

Complete responses to issues relating to the Revised WSA are provided in **Responses 1 through 5** to the letter from SCOPE, dated August 21, 2009 (Letter 039). For additional information regarding the public review opportunities of the Draft EIS/EIR, please also see **Topical Response 1: EIS/EIR Public Review Opportunities**.