

From: "bertnjudy@earthlink.net" <bertnjudy@earthlink.net>
To: NEWHALLRANCH@dfg.ca.gov; bertnjudy@earthlink.net
Date: Thu, Jun 11, 2009 8:40 AM
Subject: Extension

Dear Sirs:

As a lifelong resident of Southern California (68 years) I have seen countless areas degraded by unwise development. Without fail, in later years, the lack of foresight and poor judgement of those who approved these developments is cited when the negative effects of these developments becomes obvious. A major development that straddles and seriously impacts one of the last free flowing rivers in a drought prone desert region deserves the utmost scrutiny. As a person who has some knowledge of the local water situation I am especially concerned with the water resources the developer proposes to use. Their water availability statistics are predicated on there being sufficient groundwater to supply the project. The actual use such a project will require and the actual water that the developer states they have access to is already in an upside down situation. Developments always use more water than is predicted, and this development will be no exception. The proposed water use will over draw the water available to wildlife and plants just as has happened in other desert areas, and despite the lush green look to much of Southern California today, (due to imported water) it is a desert!

I strongly urge the Department of Fish and Game to extend the period for study of the Newhall Ranch plan for managing the plant and animal resources along the Santa Clara River. This project is massive, it will have a major, and life changing effect on the existing plant and animal communities that depend on the waters and surrounding riparian community for their existence. A development is forever. Your decision will make a permanent impact, for good for for ill upon this river. I sincerely hope you will choose take the prudent, and responsible path by allowing a thorough and thoughtful examination of all the information in the Newhall Ranch documents.

Sincerely,

Judy Reinsma
29750 San Francisquito Canyon Road
Saugus, CA 91390
(661) 296-6869

Judy Reinsma
bertnjudy@earthlink.net
EarthLink Revolves Around You.

102. E-mail from Judy Reinsma, dated June 11, 2009

Response 1

The Corps and CDFG appreciate the comment provided in your letter. Your opinion regarding development in general will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Project. Because the comment does not address the content of the Draft EIS/EIR, no additional response is provided.

Response 2

Potential impacts to the Santa Clara River and water resources were studied extensively in the Draft EIS/EIR. Please refer to the Draft EIS/EIR, **Section 4.1**, Surface Water Hydrology and Flood Control; **Section 4.2**, Geomorphology and Riparian Resources; **Section 4.3**, Water Resources; **Section 4.4**, Water Quality; **Section 4.5**, Biological Resources; and **Section 4.6**, Jurisdictional Waters and Streams. Please also see **Topical Response 5: Water Litigation and Regulatory Action Update**; **Topical Response 8: Groundwater Supplies and Overdraft Claims**; and **Topical Response 9: State Water Project Supply Reliability**. As indicated in the analyses presented in the Draft EIS/EIR and in **Topical Response 8: Groundwater Supplies and Overdraft Claims**, sufficient groundwater exists to meet the needs of the proposed Project; therefore, the applicant's groundwater is not in a state of overdraft as the comment suggests. As stated in the Draft EIS/EIR:

"Work on a number of the GWMP [Groundwater Management Plan] elements has been on-going. An important aspect of this work was completion of the 2005 Basin Yield Report. The primary determinations made in that report are that: (1) both the Alluvial aquifer and the Saugus Formation are sustainable sources at the operational plan yields stated in the 2005 UWMP over the next twenty-five years; (2) the yields are not overstated and will not deplete or "dry up" the groundwater basin; and (3) there is no need to reduce the yields shown in the 2005 UWMP. Additionally, *the 2005 Basin Yield Report concluded that neither the Alluvial aquifer nor the Saugus Formation is in an overdraft condition, or projected to become overdrafted.*" (Emphasis added.) (See, Draft EIS/EIR, pages 4.3-12 and 13.)

In addition, for further responsive information, please see revised **Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6** of the Final EIS/EIR.

Response 3

The Corps and CDFG appreciate the comment provided in your letter. Your opinion regarding water demand will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. The water demands of the proposed Project are addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR, **Section 4.3**, Water Resources (see **Subsection 4.3.6.2.2**). For additional information regarding the proposed Project's water demand, please also see the **Response 64** to letter from Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (Comment Letter 046), dated August 24, 2009.

Regarding the loss of groundwater for plants and animals due to claims of groundwater overdraft, please see **Topical Response 8: Groundwater Supplies and Overdraft Claims**, for further responsive

information. In addition, for further responsive information, please see revised **Sections 4.3** of the Final EIS/EIR.

Response 4

Project-related impacts to plant and animal resources along the Santa Clara River that could be affected by the proposed Project received extensive analysis in the **Section 4.5**, Biological Resources, in the Draft EIS/EIR. As described in that section, studies of resources located on and near the project site and the evaluation of Project-related effects have occurred over a period of many years. Your opinion regarding development in general and its environmental impacts will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Project. Because the comment does not address the content of the Draft EIS/EIR, no additional response is provided. In addition, for further responsive information, please see revised **Section 4.5** of the Final EIS/EIR.