

From: "Theresa Brady" <terrie_brady@peoplepc.com>
To: NEWHALLRANCH@dfg.ca.gov
Date: Wed, Aug 26, 2009 10:53 PM
Subject: Comments on the EIR, Newhall

21721 Septo St. #120
Chatsworth, CA 91311
August 24, 2009

Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game
Newhall Ranch EIR/EIS Comments Attn: Dennis Bedford
4949 Viewridge Ave, San Diego, CA 92123
Newhallranch@dfg.ca.gov fax:858 467-4299

Attn: Dennis Bedford:

The project does harm to the endangered species SFV spineflower, which as you know, was until recently thought to be extinct. Only preserving 77% of its habitat is not enough for a species that is at such risk.

1

Furthermore, there is not sufficient water for the new people. There is a requirement that we in Southern california already cut back severely on water consumption in order for other regions to get their fair share. There should not be new developments that put additional strain on water supplies.

2

Sincerely,

Theresa Brady

128. Email from Theresa Brady, dated August 26, 2009

Response 1

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) appreciate the comment provided regarding potential impacts to San Fernando Valley spineflower. Regarding the preservation of adequate habitat for the spineflower, as described in **Subsection 4.5.5.3** of the Draft EIS/EIR on page 4.5-1741, under the proposed Project, 68.6 percent of the known spineflower cumulative occupied area would be preserved and managed on site. Alternatives 3 through 7 would set aside higher proportions of spineflower cumulative occupied habitat: Alternative 3 would set aside 76.7 percent; Alternative 4 would set aside 81.2 percent; Alternative 5 would set aside 83.3 percent; Alternative 6 would set aside 87.6 percent; and Alternative 7 would set aside 96.9 percent. Please note that these percentages represent known spineflower cumulative occupied area and that the proposed preserves would be larger than these areas. The analysis concluded that the proposed Project's (Alternative 2) impacts to the spineflower would be significant and unavoidable and that impacts to spineflower under Alternatives 3-7 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIS/EIR. For further responsive information, please refer to the revised Spineflower Conservation Plan found in **Appendix F1.0** of the Final EIS/EIR. In addition, please see the Corps' draft 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis found in **Appendix F1.0** of the Final EIS/EIR.

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.

Response 2

The Corps and CDFG appreciate the comment provided regarding the importance of securing adequate water supplies to serve the proposed Project and alternatives. This issue area received extensive analysis in the Draft EIS/EIR, **Section 4.3**, Water Resources. That analysis concluded that adequate water supplies are available to serve the proposed Project and alternatives. The comment does not raise any specific issues regarding the analysis provided in the Draft EIS/EIR and, 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. In addition, please refer to revised **Section 4.3**, Water Resources, of the Final EIS/EIR. Please also see **Topical Response 9: State Water Project Supply Reliability**, for additional information regarding water supplies that would be used to serve the proposed Project and alternatives.