



**PUBLIC HEARING  
REQUEST TO SPEAK/WRITTEN COMMENT FORM**



NAME (Please print):

David MorrowDO YOU WISH TO SPEAK AT THIS MEETING?  YES  NO

ADDRESS (Street and Number):

26920 Monterey Ave.CITY: ValenciaSTATE: CAZIP CODE: 91355

TELEPHONE NO.:

EMAIL ADDRESS:

REGARDLESS OF WHETHER YOU PROVIDE VERBAL COMMENTS TODAY, IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE WRITTEN COMMENTS ON THIS PROJECT, YOU MAY RESPOND BELOW AND SUBMIT THIS SHEET TO A CORPS OR CDFG REPRESENTATIVE OR WRITE TO THE CORPS OR CDFG BY JUNE 26, 2009 AT: U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, LOS ANGELES DISTRICT; REGULATORY BRANCH – VENTURA FIELD OFFICE; ATTN: CESPL-RG-N-2003-01264-AOA; 2151 ALESSANDRO DRIVE, SUITE 110; VENTURA, CA 93001 OR CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME – NEWHALL RANCH EIS/EIR PROJECT COMMENTS; 4949 VIEWRIDGE AVENUE; SAN DIEGO, CA 92123 ALTERNATIVELY, YOU MAY EMAIL COMMENTS TO THE FOLLOWING ADDRESSES: [Aaron.O.Allen@usace.army.mil](mailto:Aaron.O.Allen@usace.army.mil) or [newhallranch@dfg.ca.gov](mailto:newhallranch@dfg.ca.gov) by June 26, 2009.

**COMMENTS**

Water quality needs to be addressed by the Corps. Declining water quality in Santa Clara River watershed is costing taxpayers more and more. Newhall Ranch will only worsen downstream water quality and cost taxpayers more.

Proposed spinetlower protection areas are inadequate. Fragmented, small populations lose genetic viability over time and likely will go extinct

Alternatives 5, 6, 7 are better

**DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT**

**AUTHORITY:** 33 CFR 327

**PRINCIPAL PURPOSE:** Distributed at Public Meetings and Workshops to provide a record of attendees, and to develop a mailing list for future public meetings in keeping with the policy of OCE to conduct Civil Works Program in an atmosphere of public understanding, trust and mutual cooperation. All interested individuals and agencies are to be informed and afforded an opportunity to be heard and their views considered in arriving at conclusions, decisions, and recommendations in the formulation of civil works proposals, plans, projects, and on the proposed uses of navigable waters.

**ROUTINE USES:** Utilized for determining attendance at Public Meetings; determining who desires to speak at Corps Public Meetings and developing mailing lists for various Corps studies.

**DISCLOSURE:** Voluntary. Failure to provide information may result in not being contacted for future public meetings, etc.

**140. Public Hearing Comment Card from David Morrow**

---

**Response 1**

This comment expresses general concerns regarding potential down stream water quality impacts. Potential Project-related water quality impacts received extensive analysis in **Section 4.4**, Water Quality, of the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, water quality impacts related to perchlorate contamination were also evaluated in **Section 4.3**, Water Resources, and additional information is provided in **Topical Response 7: Perchlorate Treatment Update**. That analysis concluded that the water quality impacts of the proposed Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures. In addition, for further responsive information, please see revised **Sections 4.3** and **4.4** of the Final EIS/EIR. 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.

**Response 2**

This comment expresses general concerns regarding potential impacts to the San Fernando Valley spineflower. Potential Project-related impacts to the spineflower were analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR, **Section 4.5**, Biological Resources, including potential effects related to fragmentation. 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. Additionally, the Adaptive Management Program in the revised Spineflower Conservation Plan (SCP) focuses on addressing specific threats, including loss of genetic diversity. In addition, for further responsive information, please see revised **Section 4.5** of the Final EIS/EIR. A copy of the revised Spineflower Conservation Plan is found in **Appendix F1.0** of the Final EIS/EIR. 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.

**Response 3**

This comment expresses opinions and indicates that Alternatives 5, 6, and 7 are better than the other alternatives evaluated in the Draft 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. However, because the comment does not address the content of the Draft EIS/EIR, no additional response is provided.