

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE RANCHO PALOS VERDES NCCP/HCP

Between October 31, 2018, and December 31, 2018, the Draft City of Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Communities Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP) and the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) were published in the Federal Register for a 60-day public comment period. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) received 89 public comments. The Service re-circulated the Draft NCCP/HCP and EA in the Federal Register for an additional 30-day public comment period between April 4, 2019, and May 6, 2019, and received 24 public comments. Two additional comments were received between the two comment periods and four were received after the public comment period closed on May 6, 2019. The majority of the public comments addressed similar issues regarding the NCCP/HCP. The following are responses to the general public comments and are summarized in the “Master Responses” section of this document. This is followed by responses to the individual comments of each correspondence in the “Specific Responses” section.

MASTER RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

1. The California Environmental Quality Act and how it applies to private property?

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is a California statute passed in 1970, shortly after the United States Federal government passed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to institute a statewide policy of environmental protection. CEQA does not directly regulate land uses, but instead requires state and local agencies within California to follow a protocol of analysis and public disclosure of environmental impacts of proposed projects and adopt all feasible measures to mitigate those impacts. In other words, CEQA generally requires state and local government agencies to inform decision makers and the public about the potential environmental impacts of proposed projects, and to reduce those environmental impacts to the extent feasible. CEQA makes environmental protection a mandatory part of every California state and local agency's decision-making process for projects.

Pursuant to CEQA, a project requires approval by a public agency if it may result in direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect environmental impact. If an action doesn't qualify as a project, then the action is not subject to CEQA. A project under the definition of CEQA may range from a grading permit for a retaining wall to new single-family residence.

A project may be exempt from CEQA. Exemptions can be statutory, such as those granted by the Legislature, or categorical which are classes of projects that have been determined not to have effects on the environment (i.e., room additions, remodels, grading, and most new single-family residences). If not exempt, a project may require the preparation of a Negative Declaration, when there is no substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that the project will have a significant environmental impact; Mitigated Negative Declaration, when the potential impacts can be mitigated to a level of less than significant (i.e., some new single-family residences and minor commercial development); or Environment Impact Report, when there is substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that a project will have a significant environmental impact that cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant (i.e. major commercial or subdivision projects).

2. The Federal and state incidental take permits and how do they apply to private property?

A Federal Incidental Take Permit (ITP) is required for non-Federal activities that will result in take of threatened or endangered species listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA). Private landowners, corporations, state agencies, local agencies, and other non-Federal entities that wish to conduct activities that would result in take of a listed species must first obtain an ITP. A Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) must accompany an application for an ITP to ensure that the effects of the authorized incidental take are adequately minimized and mitigated. HCPs must include information on impacts likely to result from the proposed taking of the species; steps undertaken by the applicant to monitor, minimize, and mitigate such impacts; funding to undertake conservation measures; alternative actions to such taking the applicant considered and the reasons why such alternatives are not being pursued; and procedures to deal with unforeseen and changed circumstances. While an ITP is required only for listed species, HCPs may include conservation measures for candidate, proposed, and other non-listed species. Including non-listed species in a HCP can avoid the requirements of a new HCP and permit application or amendments to the HCP in the event that a species becomes listed during the permit term.

California State ITPs allow a permittee to take a California Endangered Species Act (CESA)-listed species if such taking is incidental to, and not the purpose of, carrying out an otherwise lawful activity. These permits are most commonly issued for construction, utility, transportation, and other infrastructure-related projects. Permittees must implement species-specific minimization and avoidance measures. State ITPs require a plan to minimize and fully mitigate impacts of taking, as well as monitor compliance with and effectiveness of the minimization and mitigation measures. The permittee shall ensure there is adequate funding to implement the minimization and mitigation measures, and all required monitoring.

The CEQA analysis for a project determines whether the project (public or private) results in take of protected species, and will require ITP's from the Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). As noted above, CEQA is a statute that requires the lead agency to identify the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project actions and to avoid or mitigate those impacts, if feasible. In the City of Rancho Palos Verdes (City), CEQA compliance for private development is processed through the Community Development Department's Planning Division, and for public projects, through the Public Works Department. Through CEQA analysis, the project applicant will ascertain whether their project impacts protected species, and if so, ITP's from the Service and the CDFW would be required.

Applicants applying for Federal and state ITP's must apply directly to both the Service and CDFW for permits. These permits require applicants to prepare various studies, plans, and maps related to the take associated with the project, which can be timely and costly.

3. Benefits of the Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) Program?

The early 1990s saw the beginning of a new emphasis on regional habitat conservation planning as an alternative to project-by-project permitting, which was time consuming and costly to applicants. Natural Communities Conservation Planning is a result of the Natural Community

Conservation Planning Act, which was enacted in 1991 and most recently amended in 2011 to provide for the protection of habitat, natural communities, and species diversity on a landscape or ecosystem level through the creation and long-term management of habitat reserves. NCCP promotes coordination between agencies, effectively addresses cumulative impact concerns, promotes conservation of un-fragmented habitat areas, promotes multi-species and multi-habitat management and conservation, and provides an option for identifying and ensuring appropriate mitigation that is roughly proportional to impacts on fish and wildlife. Regional habitat conservation planning is a proactive approach to addressing species conservation, and economic growth and development over a large geographic area. NCCP can apply to listed, non-listed, and fully protected species. NCCP goes beyond project mitigation and calls for conservation of covered species that will reduce the need for listing species under the CESA, enhance species conditions, and restore and manage resources for ecological integrity on a broad scale. This form of proactive planning is in contrast to project-specific permitting that takes place reactive to proposed projects in compliance with the ESA and the CESA, as determined through CEQA.

Projects covered under a NCCP/HCP must comply with CEQA. NCCP minimization measures are sufficient to meet CEQA standards for a NCCP/HCP's covered species and may be sufficient to meet CEQA standards for species not covered by the plan. Additionally, any environmental mitigation required by CEQA, in most cases, is provided through a NCCP/HCP in the form of habitat conservation. Permits issued pursuant to a NCCP/HCP are not intended to satisfy mitigation requirements for any U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit for impacts to wetlands, any requirements pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* of the Fish and Game Code and subsequent Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement between the CDFW and the applicant, or permits required by the California Coastal Commission. However, a NCCP/HCP is largely intended to fulfill the requirements for endangered species consultation relative to wetland permitting and associated incidental take of covered species addressed in a NCCP/HCP. Approval of a NCCP/HCP should streamline the wetland permitting process.

Local, state, and Federal agencies are encouraged to prepare NCCPs to provide comprehensive management and conservation of multiple species and their habitats under a single plan, rather than through preparation of numerous individual plans on a project-by-project basis. There are currently 16 NCCP/HCP subarea plans in either the planning phase or approved in California, and Rancho Palos Verdes would be the only jurisdiction within the Los Angeles County Subregion currently participating in the NCCP Program.

Also, the City's enrollment in the NCCP Program made them eligible to obtain land acquisition grant funding from specific sources of State funding that benefit NCCP regional conservation efforts.

4. Why did the City decide to prepare a NCCP/HCP?

In 1996, the City entered into a planning agreement with the CDFW and the Service, hereafter collectively referred to as the "Wildlife Agencies," to develop a NCCP/HCP that would encompass the entire City. The City chose to pursue NCCP/HCP permits in 1996, because the City had several public infrastructure projects vital to the City's infrastructure and public safety (i.e., storm drain, road repairs, and landflow remediation projects to name a few). These projects were expected to impact relatively high concentrations of coastal sage scrub (CSS) habitat,

which supports listed and sensitive species, found in the City, and 7.5 miles of environmentally protected coastline. Additionally, the City was experiencing the growing intensity of private development pressures on these areas. An important objective of the NCCP/HCP for the City is the ability to streamline the permit process that could otherwise require lengthy and costly permit processes for each public and private project. A NCCP/HCP permit issued to the City would streamline the environmental review (CEQA, CESA, and section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA take authorization) for public and private projects City-wide by granting the City permits from the Wildlife Agencies for projects and activities specifically covered under the NCCP/HCP. Thus, protecting areas of concentrated CSS habitat, the length of coastline, and the number of vital public infrastructure projects planned, are key reasons why the City was the only jurisdiction on the Rancho Palos Verdes Peninsula to pursue a NCCP/HCP.

5. What species are proposed to be covered by the City's NCCP/HCP and their Federal and state protective status?

The proposed NCCP/HCP is intended to provide the justification for take authorizations from the Wildlife Agencies for the proposed covered species identified in the NCCP/HCP and listed below.

Table-1. Proposed Covered Species List for the NCCP/HCP

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status
Aphanisma	<i>Aphanisma blitoides</i>	CNPS List 1B
South Coast Saltscale	<i>Atriplex pacifica</i>	CNPS List 1B
Catalina Crossosoma	<i>Crossosoma californicum</i>	CNPS List 1B
Island Green Dudleya	<i>Dudleya virens ssp. insularis</i>	CNPS List 1B
Santa Catalina Island Desert-thorn	<i>Lycium brevipes var. hassei</i>	CNPS List 1B
Woolly Seablite	<i>Suaeda taxifolia</i>	CNPS List 4
Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly	<i>Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis</i>	FE
El Segundo Blue Butterfly	<i>Euphilotes battoides allyni</i>	FE
Coastal California Gnatcatcher	<i>Polioptila californica californica</i>	FT, NCCP Focal Species, SSC
Cactus Wren	<i>Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus</i>	NCCP Focal Species

FE = Federally endangered

FT = Federally threatened

SSC = State Species of Concern

CNPS List 1B = Plants, rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere

CNPS List 4 = Plants of limited distribution - a watch list

6. Why is the cactus wren proposed to be covered under the City's NCCP/HCP?

The cactus wren is not a federally or state listed species but has been identified as a sensitive or at-risk species, because cactus wrens have greatly declined along coastal Southern California between Ventura to the Mexican border. The cactus wren was also identified as one of three

focal species under the Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Conservation Guidelines in 1993. Once widespread in coastal Southern California, by 1990, cactus wren populations had been reduced to fewer than 3,000 pairs. Both CDFW and the Service issue ITPs for listed species. While ITP's are required only for listed species, NCCP/HCPs may, and commonly do, include conservation measures for candidate, proposed, and other non-listed species (see Master Response #2 and #3 above). In fact, NCCPs are intended to address the conservation needs of a diversity of species at a regional scale. In doing so, it is anticipated that performing such conservation would prevent the need for future listings of species as threatened or endangered.

As described in Section 1.2.1 of the NCCP/HCP, the Service has the legal authority to issue permits for the incidental take of species under section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA. Section 10 and 16 USC Section 1539(a)(1)(B), expressly authorizes the Service to issue a section 10 permit to allow incidental take of species listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA. The legislative history of section 10(a)(1)(B) clearly indicates that Congress also intended that the Service will approve HCPs that protect unlisted species as if they were listed under the ESA, and that in doing so the Service will provide section 10(a)(1)(B) assurances for protection of such unlisted species (H.R. Rep. No. 97-835, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. 30-31, 1982. Conference Report on 1982 Amendments to the ESA). The Service has approved many HCPs that address both listed and non-listed species. Under Fish and Game Code Section 2835, CDFW may permit the taking, as provided in the code, of any identified species whose conservation management is provided for in a CDFW approved NCCP. This includes non-listed species.

The Service issued a formal regulation known as the "No Surprises" Rule, effective March 25, 1998 (Federal Register 63[35]:8859-8873). The rule provides regulatory assurances to holders of HCP ITPs. These regulatory assurances generally provide that no additional land use restrictions or financial compensation will be required of the permit holder with respect to species covered by the permit beyond the levels provided under the HCP, even if unforeseen circumstances arise after the permit is issued, without the consent of the permittee.

Including non-listed species in a NCCP/HCP can avoid the requirement of a new ITP or burdensome amendments to a NCCP/HCP in the event that a species becomes listed during the NCCP/HCP permit term. Additionally, new conditions regarding the coverage of a non-listed species cannot be added to a NCCP/HCP in the event the species is listed, without the consent of the Permittee. The City, in coordination with the working groups and Wildlife Agencies, chose to include the cactus wren as a proposed covered species in its NCCP/HCP in anticipation that it is likely that it will be listed at some time during the 40-year permit term. Thus, by including the cactus wren as a covered species, the City's NCCP/HCP addresses the permit issuance criteria as if it were a listed species and there would be no need to obtain additional permits from the Wildlife Agencies should the species become listed in the future.

7. What occurred between 1996 and now as it relates to the NCCP/HCP, and why so long?

The City signed a Planning Agreement for the Palos Verdes Peninsula NCCP Subarea in 1996, to begin the preparation of a Natural Communities Conservation Program Plan. From 1996 through 2004, the City, in coordination with the Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy (PVPLC), and their consultants mapped existing vegetation communities, along with sensitive species distributions and their potential habitat, as well as developed alternatives for the configuration of

what is now known as the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve (Preserve). The City and the Wildlife Agencies held public workshops and meetings with stakeholders and interested parties. The NCCP/HCP working group helped develop the NCCP/HCP.

On August 30, 2004, the City Council approved the Draft NCCP/HCP, certified the related Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which pursuant to CEQA analyzed the environmental impacts related to the implementation of the NCCP/HCP; and approved the draft Implementing Agreement, which sets the legal responsibilities of all of the involved parties (City, PVPLC, and Wildlife Agencies) for implementing the NCCP/HCP post adoption of the NCCP/HCP. After the City approved the NCCP/HCP, the City and PVPLC began operating under the guidelines and regulations of the Draft NCCP/HCP.

Since 2004, the City has worked with the Wildlife Agencies and PVPLC to finalize the NCCP/HCP for approval by the City Council. The primary reason for the delay in finalizing the NCCP/HCP is that the City reprioritized projects and activities proposed to be covered by the NCCP/HCP, and the City focused on acquiring land in coordination with the Wildlife Agencies to enhance the Preserve to maximize the baseline of land that was protected within the Preserve. State and Federal grant funding significantly helped to fund the purchase of additional biologically important lands including the Portuguese Bend Reserve (2005), Filiorum Reserve (2010), and most recently the Malaga Canyon Reserve (2014). Additionally, the City changed the Preserve configuration by adding conservation lands, enhancing habitat corridors, and by removing the areas commonly known as the archery range and Gateway Park. The City, PVPLC, and Wildlife Agencies also spent considerable time completing various components required by the NCCP/HCP. The 2018 NCCP/HCP was updated to reflect the City's public project needs and to reflect changes in land acquisition that have occurred since 2004.

On October 2, 2017, the City Council conducted a public workshop to receive a status update on the NCCP/HCP. At that meeting, the City Council reviewed the latest draft of the NCCP/HCP with a comparison of changes and updates since the 2004 adopted Draft NCCP/HCP and was informed that the document would be completed pending some final wordsmith edits and clarifications to represent current conditions. That evening, the City Council directed City staff to finalize the NCCP/HCP for future consideration by the City Council.

On March 29, 2018, the City Council reviewed and approved the Final Draft 2018 NCCP/HCP including the Implementing Agreement and conservation easements; approved Addendum No. 1 to the 2004 City Council-Certified Final Environmental Impact Report; and directed City staff to submit these documents along with the permit application to the Wildlife Agencies to initiate the process for the 60-day public comment period to be noticed in the Federal Register and for the Wildlife Agencies' subsequent permit decisions.

On October 31, 2018, the Draft NCCP/HCP and the Draft Environmental Assessment were published in the Federal Register (83 FR 54769) for a 60-day public comment period, concluding on December 31, 2018. The Service recirculated the documents for an additional 30-day public comment period between April 4, 2019, and May 6, 2019 (84 FR 13308). The Service extended the public comment period, in part, to maximize public review because, while the document provided during the initial 60-day comment period was the document considered by the City Council at their March 29, 2018, meeting, it did not include changes accepted by City Council

via late correspondence at the City Council meeting, nor did it include technical and clarifying edits made after the City Council meeting. The Wildlife Agencies are currently evaluating the City's Draft 2018 NCCP/HCP and associated documents for a determination of permit issuance.

8. What are the NCCP/HCP Findings necessary to issue the City and PVPLC, as the Habitat Manager, a permit by the Wildlife Agencies?

Under the NCCP/HCP, the Service and the CDFW are required to make specific findings before approving a NCCP/HCP and issuing a permit. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), CDFW must make responsible agency findings with respect to the potentially significant environmental effects authorized by CDFW pursuant to the NCCP Permit issued to the City and PVPLC under the NCCP Act (NCCPA). In addition, under the NCCPA, the CDFW must find that:

1. The NCCP addresses wildlife conservation on a regional or area-wide scale;
2. The NCCP protects and perpetuates wildlife diversity;
3. The NCCP allows for compatible and appropriate development and growth;
4. The NCCP is consistent with the NCCP Enrollment Agreement signed by the City, and with the Planning Agreement for the Palos Verdes Peninsula NCCP Subarea;
5. The NCCP provides for the conservation and management of all species subject to the take authorization provided as part of this NCCP Permit;
6. The NCCP substantially adheres to the scope and configuration of regional and subregional planning areas as described in the CSS NCCP Guidelines;
7. The NCCP substantially adheres to the conservation standards, guidelines, and objectives for the Regional Coastal Sage Scrub Planning Area prescribed in the CSS NCCP Guidelines;
8. The NCCP substantially adhered to the CSS NCCP Guidelines' provisions regarding the appointment and use of advisory committees, coordination with local, state and federal agencies, and public participation;
9. The NCCP substantially adheres to the CSS NCCP Guidelines' provisions for ensuring compatibility and compliance with the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA);
10. The approval process employed for the NCCP substantially adheres to the process requirements in the CSS NCCP Guidelines;
11. The mechanism for implementing the NCCP substantially adheres to the CSS NCCP Guidelines;
12. That the NCCP substantially adheres to the CSS NCCP Guidelines' provisions concerning monitoring and reporting on NCCP implementation;

13. The Implementing Agreement contains provisions allowing for amendments to the NCCP that are consistent with the initial intent of the plan; and
14. The City's development of the NCCP substantially adhered to the CSS NCCP Guidelines provisions concerning the loss of CSS habitat prior to approval and implementation of the NCCP.

Similarly, the Service must find for the HCP:

1. The taking will be incidental;
2. The Applicant will, to the maximum extent practicable, minimize and mitigate the impacts of such taking of listed species and the effects to other covered species;
3. The Applicant will ensure that adequate funding for the plan and procedures to deal with unforeseen circumstances will be provided;
4. The taking will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of the species in the wild;
5. Other measures, if any, required by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(iv), as necessary or appropriate for the purposes of the plan will be met;
6. The Secretary has received the necessary assurances that the plan will be implemented.

Findings of consistency with a NCCP/HCP are required for public and private projects requesting issuance of Federal and state take authorizations during the City's CEQA and development review/approval process. This is a very important characteristic of the NCCP/HCP permit. Without the NCCP/HCP, applicants (both public and private property owners) whose projects include take of federally or state listed species, would need to submit individual ITP requests to both the Service and/or the CDFW. The NCCP/HCP allows the City to convey the take authorization to private property owners conducting discretionary actions that follow the terms of the NCCP/HCP; thereby, greatly reducing permit processing time and saving private landowners significant costs from preparing conservation plans and documents. The Wildlife Agencies will receive notification of public and private projects in the City through the CEQA notification process, and projects processed by the City will document their consistency with the NCCP/HCP during the appropriate CEQA review and will be summarized each year in the annual report.

9. How is the NCCP/HCP implemented?

Implementation of the NCCP/HCP will rely on the City's land-use authority provided through General Plan policies, Local Coastal Program, and the City's Municipal Code ordinances. Implementation will also rely on the City's compliance with state and Federal environmental land use laws (e.g., CEQA/NEPA), CESA permit, section 10(a)(1)(B) permit, and the Implementing Agreement between the City, PVPLC, and the Wildlife Agencies.

10. What public projects are covered by the City's NCCP/HCCP?

As described in Section 5.2 of the NCCP/HCP, the City's is seeking Federal and state permits to address covered projects/activities, including 17 City projects/activities (Table 5-1 below). Addressing the City's proposed projects and activities anticipated over the next 40 years in one NCCP/HCP permit application will significantly reduce the processing time associated with individual permits and expense for the City. It will also streamline compliance with CEQA as described in Master Response #4 above and provide certainty and assurances to the City and private landowners. The main differences between a project and an activity are that activities are not expected to result in the permanent loss of habitat. Table 5-1 in the NCCP/HCP (below) lists the City projects and activities covered under the NCCP/HCP. The activities covered by the NCCP/HCP also include Operations and Maintenance, Public Use, and Preserve Management.

Table-2. Total Loss of Habitat by Covered City Projects and Activities

City Project Name	Total Habitat Loss (Acres)	Total Habitat Loss (Acres)	Habitat Loss In Preserve (Acres)	Habitat Loss In Preserve (Acres)
	CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland
1. Altamira Canyon Drainage Project	2.5	3	0.0	0.0
2. Dewatering Wells	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
3. Landslide Abatement Measures	5.0	15.0	3.3	9.9
4. Misc. Drainage Repair in Landslide Areas	10.0	15.0	6.6	9.9
5. PVDE Drainage Improvement Project	5.0	15.0	0.0	0.0
6. Misc. Drainage Improvements	20.0	60.0	6.6	20.0
7. Abalone Cove Beach Project	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0
8. *RPV Trails Plan Implementation	4.0	10.0	2.0	5.0
9. Lower San Ramon Canyon Repair	0.0	0.0	0.34	0.0
10. Lower Point Vicente	1.5	11.2	0.0	0.0
11. Palos Verdes Drive South Road Repair	5.0	15.0	5.0	15.0
12. Upper Point Vicente	2.0	22.0	1.0	11.0
13. Preserve Fuel Modification	12.0	18	12.0	18

City Project Name	Total Habitat Loss (Acres)	Total Habitat Loss (Acres)	Habitat Loss In Preserve (Acres)	Habitat Loss In Preserve (Acres)
	CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland
14. Utility Maintenance and Repair	10.0	20.0	5.0	10.0
15. Unimproved City Park Projects	10.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
16. Malaga Canyon Drainage Improvements	5.0	15.0	5.0	15.0
17. Other Miscellaneous City projects	20.0	60.0	10.0	30.0
**Total Acreage of Habitat Loss	115.5	303.7	60.3	148.3

* Part of the PUMP, a Covered City Project (see Section 9.2 of this Plan)

** Total habitat loss (CSS and Grassland) is 419.2 acres, of which 208.6 acres (50%) would occur in the Preserve. Included in the CSS loss are losses associated with southern cactus scrub, saltbush scrub, and coastal bluff scrub which are expected to be minimal. No more than 5.0 acres of southern cactus scrub, 2.0 acres of coastal bluff scrub, and 2.0 acres of saltbush scrub could be lost within the Preserve associated with Covered City Projects and Activities.

11. What private projects are covered by the City's NCCP/HCP?

As described in Section 5.3 of the NCCP/HCP, the City is seeking Federal and state permits to address 5 covered private projects/activities (Table 5-2 below). In the absence of this NCCP/HCP, a private property owner would apply for Federal and state ITPs and comply with CEQA requirements during the City's local CEQA and development (building or grading) review/approval process. The City's NCCP/HCP reduces the applicants' permit processing time and application costs since the City has taken on these costs with the development of the NCCP/HCP. The adoption of the NCCP/HCP by the City provides individual landowners certainty about the conservation necessary for private projects within the City as well as assurances. The specified mitigation ratios identified in the NCCP/HCP ensure appropriate mitigation that is roughly proportional to impacts on covered species and natural vegetation communities. Conversely, in the absence of the City-wide NCCP/HCP permit, mitigation ratios for private projects would likely be higher for individual projects. Likewise, the applicant would have to prepare costly surveys, studies, and supporting documents for individual permits (i.e., ITPs) that would take time to complete in support of permits. Under the proposed NCCP/HCP, private applicants' projects would be required to adhere to the City's development review process and fixed mitigation ratio established in the NCCP/HCP.

Table-3. Total Loss of Habitat by Privately Covered Projects and Activities

Covered Private Project	Habitat Loss (acres)	Habitat Loss (acres)
	CSS	Grassland
1. Lower Filiorum Development	11.9	70.0
2. Portuguese Bend Club Remedial Grading	3.0	10.0
3. Fuel Modification for Private Projects	10.0	20.0
4. Miscellaneous Private Projects throughout the City	71.8	143.1
5. Plumtree Development	2.8	19.7
<i>Total Acreage of Habitat Loss</i>	<i>99.5</i>	<i>262.8</i>

12. Why are some private project impacts to habitat mitigated at a 2:1 ratio?

This question refers to the requirement to offset impacts to CSS outside of the Preserve at a 2:1 conservation to impact ratio. This requirement applies to most private projects with anticipated impacts to CSS, including impacts from new development and landscaping. This conservation ratio is consistent with mitigation requirements for CSS vegetation occupied by sensitive species throughout southern California in areas with approved NCCP/HCPs and provides the necessary conservation for the extension of take authorization. As a reminder, because of the substantial losses of CSS to urbanization, further losses of CSS are commonly considered to be significant under CEQA; therefore, impacts to CSS typically require habitat mitigation even outside of regional NCCP/HCP areas in southern California (see Master Response #2). Outside of NCCP/HCP Plan Areas, mitigation required for impacts to CSS habitat can often exceed a 2:1 conservation to impact ratio depending on, among other things, the quality of habitat impacted and the area's importance to the functioning of the surrounding landscape, and the species present. To provide flexibility for private projects, the NCCP/HCP allows payment of a fee of \$50,000 per acre of conservation required (see Section 5.3 of the NCCP/HCP). The \$50,000 Mitigation Fee will be reviewed periodically, no less than every three years, by the City and, if necessary, adjusted to account for inflation and/or higher than expected restoration and management costs. The PVPLC and the City have determined that \$50,000 (in 2013 dollars) is the cost to restore and maintain 1 acre of native habitat. This fee will be held in the City's Habitat Restoration Fund.

Of the approximately 15,500 private properties in the City, approximately 986 properties contain CSS. The majority of these private properties that support CSS are located on neutral land. Neutral land has existing development constraints pursuant to the City's Municipal Code or other restrictions. The City estimates that there are approximately 43 private properties that are not designated as neutral lands that would be eligible to apply for ITP's through the NCCP/HCP.

The NCCP/HCP is expected to streamline permitting for private landowners who propose to impact CSS habitat.

13. Is the NCCP/HCP more restrictive to private property owners than the development process, absent a NCCP/HCP?

We received numerous comments regarding whether the NCCP/HCP is more onerous or imposes more restrictions than the CEQA process. The NCCP/HCP does not impose restrictions that are more restrictive than CEQA. The intent of regional plans is to streamline permit processes for applicants and develop landscape scale plans that result in preserves that are more functional for plants and wildlife than would be assembled from individual permits. Typically, this level of planning allows for smaller mitigation ratios because thoughtful preserve design optimizes the function of the preserve for a given area. Additionally, this streamlined approach provides applicants with certainty and saves time and money.

In absence of a NCCP/HCP, all private development projects would be processed for CEQA compliance by the City's Community Development Department pursuant to the Zoning Code (Title 17 of the Rancho Palos Verdes Municipal Code). During the CEQA review process, the level of environmental impacts is analyzed and mitigation measures to avoid or substantially reduce any significant environmental effects are identified and incorporated as part of project approvals. If the project involves take of protected species or loss of suitable habitat, the Community Development Department informs the applicant that they are required to apply to the Service and CDFW for ITP permits. Timelines for CEQA processing by the Community Development Department can take one week to a year depending on the breadth and scope of the project. ITP permit processing by the Wildlife Agencies can take 1-2 years depending on the complexity of the project, amount of listed species present, time it takes to prepare the necessary documents, including applicable CEQA and NEPA public review, and permit decision processing time. For Federal ITPs, individual habitat conservation plans must be prepared and submitted by the project applicant along with their permit application requests to the Wildlife Agencies. Habitat conservation plans require detailed information (see Master Response #8 above) and often require an outside consultant for their preparation. Both state and Federal permits will require the applicant to minimize and mitigate for the losses of covered species/habitat by setting aside land, paying a mitigation fee (only for HCPs) or restoring habitat of equivalent value often times at a certain ratio; monitoring for compliance and effectiveness of the mitigation; and ensuring there is adequate funding to implement the required mitigation. The mitigation ratio and/or mitigation strategy is based on anticipated impacts to species and their habitat and comprehensive impacts to surrounding natural resources.

Several comments raised concerns about coverage for species that are not currently protected by Federal or state regulations. We note that the plant species covered in the City's 2018 NCCP/HCP are only known from the Preserve, and we do not anticipate restrictions for private projects. By covering these species and protecting them within the Preserve, the City and PVPLC are addressing any future conservation requirements that may otherwise be imposed if these species become listed.

The benefit of the NCCP/HCP is that the Community Development Department will be permitted to extend their take authorization to an applicant, subject to the City's discretion, on

behalf of the Wildlife Agencies pursuant to the NCCP/HCP. The NCCP/HCP addresses the covered projects/activities contemplated in the City and replaces the need for an individual property owner to prepare individual ITP applications. The City-wide NCCP/HCP greatly reduces permit processing time and cost to individual landowners or applicants. As noted above, the NCCP/HCP provides certainty to the City and local landowners by establishing mitigation requirements (i.e., fixed ratio for habitat mitigation) and minimization requirements. Pursuant to the NCCP/HCP, the City is also provided assurances that no further mitigation will be necessary when the NCCP/HCP is properly implemented.

14. What purpose does the Preserve serve for the NCCP/HCP?

The Preserve benefits the City because it serves as the baseline conservation for the proposed covered species and a proportion of the Preserve provides mitigation necessary for the NCCP/HCP and associated permits. The NCCP/HCP includes 17 City-covered projects/activities (see Section 5.2) and 5 private-covered projects/activities (see Section 5.3) estimated to result in a loss of 781.5 acres of combined CSS and grassland habitat. The City's primary conservation strategy is to dedicate 1,402.4 acres of habitat for the establishment of a Preserve that conserves un-fragmented habitat and provides comprehensive management and conservation for multiple species and their habitats. Of the 1,402.4 acres, 499.9 acres that was previously owned or partially purchased by the City will be dedicated to mitigate for all covered City projects/activities. An additional 623 acres of land was acquired largely by the City through Federal and state grant funding and by PVPLC community contributions. An additional 20.7 acres is owned and will be dedicated by the PVPLC. Finally, 258.7 acres of City-owned land, or land that will eventually be owned by the City, was previously dedicated for conservation as mitigation for the Trump National/Ocean Trails HCP and the Oceanfront Estates projects. The 499.9 acres of mitigation land, including previously conserved land and new land that will be dedicated to the Preserve by the City, in addition to the 250 acres of disturbed land that PVPLC proposed for restoration over the life of the permits, serves as the City's mitigation for the NCCP/HCP permits. Mitigation ratios for environmentally sensitive areas that includes CSS habitat are often higher. The Wildlife Agencies and the City negotiated that the amount of habitat being dedicated to the Preserve, in conjunction with the configuration of the Preserve lands, the restoration of an additional 250 acres, and perpetual management of those lands would support the issuance criteria necessary for the permits associated with NCCP/HCP.

While developing the NCCP/HCP, the working groups and many residents supported the concept of an NCCP/HCP because it established a 1,402.4-acre Preserve that will be perpetually conserved. Lands within the Preserve will be encumbered by conservation easements to ensure that their resource values are perpetually maintained. This will result in 17% of the City's land protected from development while preserving the City's semi-rural character and providing opportunities for passive recreation consistent with the City's General Plan, Local Coastal Program, Municipal Code, and NCCP/HCP. In addition, the NCCP/HCP provides a framework and dedicated funding source for acquiring additional private lands from willing sellers. The City and/or PVPLC, in coordination with the Wildlife Agencies, may apply for Federal section 6 Habitat Conservation Plan Land Acquisition grants that would complement the NCCP/HCP.

15. Are there any other mitigation measures required for habitat impacts?

The habitat avoidance and minimization measures found in Section 5.5 and 5.6 (Appendix B also provides additional details for covered species) of the NCCP/HCP apply to the 17 covered City projects/activities and 5 covered private projects/activities, and any private projects receiving permits through the City's NCCP/HCP. The habitat avoidance and minimization measures apply to projects/activities within and outside of the Preserve. These measures are similar to measures that would be required in individual HCPs and NCCPs. Their purpose is to minimize impacts to covered species and their habitats. The City will coordinate with PVPLC to ensure implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures as enforceable conditions in all permits, operations, and authorizations to proceed with the covered projects and activities covered by the NCCP/HCP. There are also specific avoidance and minimization measures required for new development abutting the Preserve, which are outlined in Master Response #16 below. These measures are required to maintain permit coverage for covered species.

16. Does the Preserve create restrictions for adjacent private properties and equestrian facilities?

Properties owners who develop within the City currently have obligations under CEQA. Consistent with CEQA, property owners adjacent to the Preserve will have reasonable avoidance and minimization measures to implement to ensure that proposed activities minimize the effects to covered species and the Preserve. Property owners within the City will also be subject to CEQA to ensure that activities avoid and minimize impacts to covered species. The NCCP/HCP provides a standardized approach to these avoidance and minimization measures that is expected to streamline approvals from the City and the Wildlife Agencies.

Additionally, CEQA requires applicants to address potential impacts to sensitive species, and if a project has the potential to increase the impact of cowbirds on sensitive species, then measures are commonly implemented to address these impacts, including surveys and potentially cowbird trapping.

The NCCP/HCP identifies avoidance and minimization measures to be incorporated in new development projects on lots or new structures on developed lots adjacent to the Preserve. As part of the development review process (including CEQA), the Community Development Department will consider the locations of access and staging areas, fire and fuel modification zones, predator and exotic species control, fencing, signage, lighting, increased stormwater and urban runoff, increased erosion, increased noise levels, and public access to habitats supporting covered species and ensure appropriate avoidance and minimization measures are implemented for new development projects. Projects that abut the Preserve and impact covered species and their habitats will implement measures to avoid or minimize impacts to biological resources. Specifically, the measures identified in Section 5.7 of the NCCP/HCP will apply to new development projects (and new structures) on lots abutting the Preserve and shall be incorporated as conditions of approval and/or mitigation measures in City-issued permits, operations, and authorizations to proceed with work.

17. Does the City's NCCP/HCP require existing equestrian facilities to trap cowbirds?

Brown-headed cowbirds, commonly referred to as cowbirds, are a parasitic, non-native species in California that contribute to the decline of many native bird species and can adversely affect native songbird breeding (e.g., gnatcatcher), if populations are not adequately monitored/managed. This transient bird species originally followed bison herds and has adapted to follow domestic European livestock. As a result, the NCCP/HCP requires that any new corral or equestrian facility located within 500 feet of the Preserve seeking the City's approval of a Conditional Use Permit or Large Domestic Animal Permit, must have a qualified biologist monitor for cowbirds for three years, and every third year thereafter, to determine their presence. If cowbirds are present, a cowbird trapping program and/or other effective measures must be implemented by the applicant at their cost. This expense is borne by the applicant rather than the City, because it is part of the Conditional Use Permit for an equestrian facility. Existing equestrian facilities adjacent to the Preserve are not prohibited or regulated by the NCCP/HCP; however, the NCCP/HCP defines procedures for new equestrian facilities that include monitoring for the presence of the cowbird. This requirement does not apply to existing facilities.

18. Why is the Lower Filiorum Property held to different habitat mitigation requirements?

To address the particular public comments requesting information regarding what would constitute a viable corridor in the lower Filiorum area, we acknowledge that habitat connectivity has been compromised by previous development throughout the City; however, recent surveys suggest that the remaining open space can support substantial populations of sensitive species, including coastal California gnatcatchers and cactus wrens. Though species vary, both flying and non-flying species are capable of crossing non-habitat features, including roads. However, greater connectivity of preserves increases movement among populations, which increases demographic and genetic exchange. Maintenance of live-in habitat within corridors is especially important for connectivity. The intent of the 40-acre dedication and 300-foot-wide minimum wildlife corridor required for this project is to maintain a viable wildlife corridor as well as live-in habitat. Furthermore, many flying species are more likely to fly over native habitat and undeveloped open space areas than developed areas.

In the process of designing the NCCP/HCP, the Lower Filiorum Property was included in the NCCP/HCP to function as a wildlife corridor that provides live-in habitat due to its location within the plan area. The property supports a functional connection important for the Preserve design necessary to support the NCCP/HCP. The Lower Filiorum property is not being held to a different mitigation standard. The conservation strategy for this property was established in coordination with the landowner and identified in the 2004 adopted NCCP/HCP. The mitigation identified is consistent with the mitigation requirement for projects/parcels within this NCCP/HCP and other comparable projects in other regional conservation plans. In fact, the basis for creating the Preserve design included evaluations of potential development on the largest properties supporting natural vegetation, including the Lower Filiorum Property, and a commitment to conserve the linkage between coastal and inland areas centrally within it.

In analyzing the mitigation requirements for the Lower Filiorum Property established in the draft NCCP/HCP, it is important to understand the history of the wildlife corridor. The 2004 NCCP/HCP states that if a project is proposed for the Lower Filiorum parcel, approximately 40

to 45 acres of the 94-acre parcel would be dedicated to the Preserve with a width of no less than 300 feet. The purpose of this requirement was to mitigate the project's impacts to surveyed species on the property at the time and to provide a viable wildlife (bird and butterfly) corridor to Abalone Cove. According to the maps in the 2004 NCCP/HCP, the portion of the Lower Filiorum property comprising the 40-acre corridor was within the City's landslide moratorium area, thus leaving the wildlife corridor outside the area most likely to be developed. Since then, the City issued a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) allowing a portion of the area originally identified to serve as the wildlife corridor to be improved with the Event Garden and agricultural uses. The 2004 NCCP/HCP was not applied in the context of the CUP process because it was the City's understanding that the remaining portion of the property would remain undeveloped and would serve as the wildlife corridor. The 2018 NCCP/HCP is consistent with the 2004 NCCP/HCP citing the 40-acre mitigation but identifies a more general location of the wildlife corridor. This is intended to provide flexibility and, again, to offset impacts to covered species that were originally surveyed on the property. The mitigation will only be triggered if a development project is pursued by the property owner and approved by the City. The property owner may seek an individual ITP directly from the Wildlife Agencies to mitigate for impacts to listed species and natural communities associated with a proposed development project; however, mitigation similar to the NCCP/HCP would likely be required. Furthermore, any proposed individual permit will need to be consistent with the NCCP/HCP.

19. How is public use and maintenance managed in the Preserve?

Public access in the Preserve is conditionally allowed per the NCCP/HCP for passive use consistent with the conservation of biological resources. Prior to the acquisition and conservation of the properties that make up the Preserve, the public historically accessed many of these private properties for recreational purposes. This resulted in unauthorized use and duplicative trails that did not consider the sensitive resources within the Preserve.

In 2008, the City developed a Preserve Trails Plan (PTP) that provides protection to biological resources while balancing passive recreational activity. The City Council also formed a 17-member Public Use Master Plan (PUMP) Committee. The PUMP Committee met 33 times over a three-year period (2006-2008), and formulated recommendations to the City Council for trail names, routes, and uses among other things. The PUMP Committee included comprehensive public vetting and input through numerous public workshops and meetings.

On September 2, 2008, the City Council adopted the PTP. On October 2, 2012, the PTP was amended to include the Filiorum Reserve which was acquired by the City in 2009, as well as to adopt some minor amendments. Trails identified in the PTP include existing trail routes that have been identified based primarily on historical usage and popularity. Impact to the environment was minimized by using existing trails. In development of the PTP, consideration was also given to line-of-site, slope, and safety factors, as well as minimizing potential for erosion. Furthermore, the PTP's approved trail routes take into consideration the natural topography, and the intent to provide access to open areas and vistas while avoiding impacts to sensitive natural areas. Finally, the public uses and trail routes/configurations are designed to be compatible with the Preserve and avoid disturbance to native vegetation, habitat, or covered species identified in the NCCP/HCP. Where habitat impacts, user conflicts, or safety concerns arise on a trail, change of

trail use designation may be considered, and must be approved by the City Council and the Wildlife Agencies.

The PUMP Committee also made recommendations to the City Council on the PUMP, which establishes public access to the Preserve, and amenities and maintenance supporting public use. The City Council approved the PUMP document April 2, 2013, and it includes public access elements such as permissible and prohibited Preserve uses, trail use determinations, trail maintenance guidelines, and supporting amenities. The public uses and activities in the PUMP are considered conditionally compatible uses under the NCCP/HCP provided they are consistent with the guidelines described in Section 9.2.2.1 of the NCCP/HCP. Not all trail standards commonly accepted in open space areas elsewhere are included within the Preserve, because the Preserve's primary purpose is habitat conservation and covered species protection rather than public use. Trail guidelines are established on Page 6 of the PUMP and NCCP/HCP Section 9.2.2.2. Per the PUMP, trails are to be maintained or designed for minimum impact on existing and potential habitat. Section 9.2.2.2 of the NCCP/HCP describes how baseline surveys will be conducted to assess and document trail widths, and identify unauthorized trails through the Preserve. The City, PVPLC, and the Wildlife Agencies will meet to determine and finalize appropriate widths for all trails consistent with Section 9.2.2.2 of the NCCP/HCP. The PVPLC and City will cooperatively maintain and manage public uses within the Preserve consistent with the NCCP/HCP.

20. Why is public access to the Preserve conditionally allowed per the NCCP/HCP?

To understand why public access to the Preserve is conditionally allowed per the City's NCCP/HCP, it is important to understand the purpose of the NCCP/HCP. The NCCP/HCP identifies and provides for the regional protection of plants, animals, and their habitats, while allowing compatible uses. Because there is overwhelming public support in the City (and surrounding areas) to provide for public access to the Preserve, the City has included passive recreation as a conditionally compatible use in the Preserve. Public access within the Preserve must conform to the Preserve's PUMP and the NCCP/HCP (see Sections 5.4.2, 5.2.8, and 9.2.2 of the NCCP/HCP). More specifically, the public uses and activities in the Preserve's PUMP are considered conditionally compatible uses under the City's NCCP/HCP, provided they are consistent with the guidelines described in Section 9.2.2.1 of the NCCP/HCP. Public access is subject to the same habitat impact avoidance and minimization measures as all other projects/activities covered by the NCCP/HCP (see Section 5.5 of the NCCP/HCP). Moreover, it is a priority for the City, Wildlife Agencies, and PVPLC to work together to manage public access in a way that is consistent with the protection and enhancement of the biological resources identified in the NCCP/HCP. The passive recreational activities allowed within the Preserve through the NCCP/HCP and the PUMP are designed to connect to the recreational facilities located outside the Preserve.

21. How does the City's NCCP/HCP address fuel modification within and adjacent to the Preserve?

At no time will the NCCP/HCP provisions take precedence over requirements of public health, safety, and welfare as determined by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. The City has consulted with the Los Angeles County Fire Department and Los Angeles County Department of

Agricultural Commissioner/Weights and Measures to ensure that fuel modification zone widths and defensible space methods within and adjacent to the Preserve are adequate to meet Fire Department requirements.

Fuel modification is a covered activity in the NCCP/HCP. The City's required fuel modification is expected to result in the loss of 12 acres of CSS and 18 acres of non-native grassland within the Preserve. As defined in the Management Agreement between the City and the PVPLC, the City is responsible for conducting fuel modification on City-owned Preserve land and the PVPLC is responsible for conducting fuel modification on PVPLC owned-land. The City owns all 12 areas within the Preserve, with the exception of an approximately 25-acre portion of the Agua Amarga Reserve. The City coordinates fuel modification annually with the Los Angeles County Department of Agricultural Commissioner/Weights and Measures (formally known as the Weed Abatement Division) and the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and conducts fuel modification in coordination with their staff. While fire safety measures and fuel modification will be carried out with a priority for human safety, the City and PVPLC also minimize impacts to biological resources including covered species and their habitat to the extent possible. Preserve fuel modification requirements and prescribed methods are further outlined in Sections 5.2.13 and 9.2.3 and Figure 5-1 and Table 5-1 of the NCCP/HCP.

For new private development projects on vacant lots adjacent to the Preserve, all fuel modification required as a result of the new projects must occur outside of the Preserve, unless the Los Angeles County Department of Agricultural Commissioner/Weights and Measures or Los Angeles County Fire Department agree that no other options exist. In situations where fuel modification for new development must occur in the Preserve, impacts are already addressed by the NCCP/HCP. For private projects to be covered under the NCCP/HCP, impacts to vegetation to be cleared for fuel modification will be offset by the project applicant with a mitigation fee to the City's Habitat Restoration Fund using a 2:1 mitigation ratio for impacted CSS, a 0.5:1 mitigation ratio for impacted non-native grassland, and a 3:1 mitigation ratio for impacted native grassland occurring in areas greater than 0.3 acre. The anticipated loss from fuel modification resulting from covered private projects/activities outside of the Preserve is not expected to exceed 10 acres of CSS and 20 acres of grassland. Any loss of CSS beyond 10 acres and 20 acres of grassland is not a NCCP/HCP covered project/activity. For more information on fuel modification for new private development, refer to Section 5.3.3 and Table 5-2 of NCCP/HCP.

22. Does the NCCP/HCP allow vehicular access in the Preserve?

There are 33 miles of trails within the Preserve of which approximately 21 trails can accommodate authorized vehicular access. These trails were historically used as roads prior to creation of the Preserve by utility companies for infrastructure maintenance, public safety, and vehicle access by then-private owners. The NCCP/HCP recognizes that there is a need for limited vehicular access in the Preserve by authorized agencies (public safety, utilities, City, PVPLC, etc.). Vehicle access in the Preserve will be conducted consistent with Section 5.5 of the NCCP/HCP. Pursuant to the NCCP/HCP, the City and PVPLC will work with the Wildlife Agencies to develop a Preserve Access Protocol (PAP) within 90 days of NCCP/HCP adoption (see Section 6.5.2 of the NCCP/HCP). When accessing the Preserve, authorized vehicle operators must take measures to avoid and minimize, to the maximum extent possible, environmental damage, including direct and indirect impacts to habitat and covered species. The

PAP will create a protocol for vehicular access in the Preserve in a way that provides authorized entities the vehicle access they require, while minimizing impacts to covered species and their habitat. The City will be working directly with public safety agencies, including the Los Angeles County Fire Department (including Los Angeles County Lifeguards) and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department to provide their vehicular access and maintenance needs. The City currently communicates with the Fire Department and maintains trails for emergency/fire/public safety at their request and in compliance with the NCCP/HCP. The PAP will be discussed at quarterly Preserve Public Forums, and will be brought to City Council for consideration.

23. How does the City's NCCP/HCP address coyotes?

As detailed in Section 7 of the NCCP/HCP, general biological monitoring in the Preserve will be conducted to evaluate whether the Preserve is meeting the conservation goals for covered plants and animal species and their habitats. The NCCP/HCP does not regulate management of coyotes as safety threats to humans. However, the City has a Coyote Management Plan administered by the City's Code Enforcement Division that supports coexistence with coyotes and uses education, behavior modification, and development of a tiered responses to aggressive coyote behavior. The City also utilizes the Wildlife Watch program, administered by the CDFW, to keep coyotes out of residential neighborhoods and in the canyons and open space areas of the Peninsula. Here is the [Management Plan](#).

24. What role does the PVPLC have in the City's NCCP/HCP?

The PVPLC was founded in 1988 by a group of concerned residents to preserve open space on the Peninsula. The organization is a private 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation. The PVPLC consists of a Board of Directors and a staff that includes qualified biologists. In 2006, the City entered into an interim management agreement with PVPLC to manage and monitor conserved habitat in the Preserve. A formal long-term management agreement was entered into by the City and PVPLC in 2011. As the habitat manager of the Preserve, PVPLC has also applied to be a Permittee under the NCCP/HCP for management related activities. As discussed in the NCCP/HCP, PVPLC will hold conservation easements for Preserve lands in perpetuity. PVPLC and the City are responsible for stewardship of the Preserve during the 40-year life of the permit. The PVPLC and the City will also be responsible for enforcement of conservation easement requirements in perpetuity once the permit decision on the NCCP/HCP has been finalized. Post-permit, PVPLC will have responsibilities for perpetual stewardship and conservation easement enforcement for the Preserve.

25. How does the PVPLC contribute to the financial support of the Preserve?

PVPLC, as the habitat manager of the Preserve, will provide in-kind services and funding for management and monitoring obligations as described in the NCCP/HCP. This commitment also supports the NCCP/HCP permit application by contributing to the necessary funding that will assist the Wildlife Agencies in making their required findings associated with the permit decisions. The City's partnership with PVPLC will enable the PVPLC to manage the non-wasting endowment to fund the conservation management of the Preserve during the permit term, and post-permit conservation in perpetuity (see Section 8.2 of the NCCP/HCP). Per the Management Agreement between the City and PVPLC, the PVPLC provides annual financial

support to the Preserve consisting of at least \$50,000 (2006 baseline payment/subject to inflation) in cash expenditures, and in-kind services to perform or support its performance of the obligations set forth in Exhibit B-1 and C of the Management Agreement. Additionally, the PVPLC organizes and provides for volunteer services valued at not less than \$50,000/year to perform or support the PVPLC's performance of its responsibilities under the NCCP/HCP (see Exhibit B-1 of the Management Agreement and Appendix C of the NCCP/HCP). Finally, PVPLC has been successful at obtaining many grants for habitat restoration, invasive-plant management, interpretive signage, trail maintenance, and environmental education, all of which contribute to the overall management of the Preserve.

26. What is the PVPLC's role as Preserve Habitat Manager?

While the City is the lead applicant for the NCCP/HCP, both the PVPLC and City are anticipated to be Permittees under the NCCP/HCP. The City is expected to be issued permits for covered projects/activities identified in the NCCP/HCP that require local land use authority; whereas, PVPLC, as the designated Preserve habitat manager, is expected to be issued permits related to implementation of Preserve management and monitoring activities as agreed to by the City and PVPLC in the Management Agreement and the NCCP/HCP. The Management Agreement between the City and PVPLC is required by the NCCP/HCP and shall expire on the same date as the expiration of the NCCP/HCP. The Preserve habitat manager is responsible for implementation of the biological objectives and methodologies described in Section 7 of the NCCP/HCP. As Preserve habitat manager, PVPLC is tasked with restoring 250 acres of habitat for the City over the total life of the NCCP/HCP permit and conducting all biological monitoring and reporting for the Preserve. A minimum of 5 acres of native habitat shall be restored each year, or a total of 15 acres every three years if exigencies prevent restoration of 5 acres each year. PVPLC engages in permissive activities which will be carried out as determined necessary by PVPLC, some of which include trail maintenance and sign replacement. Additionally, PVPLC will coordinate with the City to ensure implementation of the habitat impact avoidance and minimization measures identified in the NCCP/HCP for covered projects/activities within and outside of the Preserve.

27. Does the City's NCCP/HCP requires Conservation Easements and what is the PVPLC's role in permit and post-permit responsibilities?

Within 90 days of permit issuance, and as a condition of the NCCP/HCP, the City and PVPLC will place Wildlife Agency-approved conservation easements following the template in Exhibit E of the Implementing Agreement on all proposed City-owned Preserve lands described in Section 4.2 of the NCCP/HCP. PVPLC will hold conservation easements for City-owned lands within the Preserve, and the City will hold conservation easements for PVPLC-owned lands within the Preserve. During the 40-year permit term and post-permit term, the PVPLC, as the Preserve habitat manager, will be responsible for protection of the conservation value of the Preserve by enforcing the conservation easements and conducting basic land stewardship activities, such as biological monitoring and invasive species control.

28. What is the permit term of the City's NCCP/HCP?

The City is requesting a 40-year permit term for the NCCP/HCP that would enable the City to carry out the proposed covered projects and activities addressed in the NCCP/HCP.

29. Why is the City operating under the NCCP/HCP though it hasn't been formally approved by the Wildlife Agencies?

Although the NCCP/HCP was drafted and approved by the City Council in 2004, it has not been formally approved and permitted by the Wildlife Agencies. The City Council opted to begin implementing the tenets of the draft 2004 NCCP/HCP, while reevaluating the City's need for public and private projects to be covered under the NCCP/HCP. The permit term was originally proposed as 50 years; however, the City began operating consistent with the NCCP/HCP in 2004. Covered projects/activities that would have resulted in loss of habitat or take of listed species did not move forward during that time. The City began implementing the NCCP/HCP in 2004; however, covered projects/activities that would have resulted in loss of habitat or take of listed species did not move forward during that time. The 2018 NCCP/HCP has been updated to reflect the City's public project needs, changes in land acquisition that have occurred since 2004, and updated to acknowledge areas within the NCCP/HCP plan area that were removed.

30. What happens in the event the City and the PVPLC come to a disagreement with the implementation of the NCCP/HCP?

The PVPLC, as the Preserve habitat manager, will implement their responsibilities identified in the NCCP/HCP. This includes managing and monitoring the Preserve and protecting the conservation values of the Preserve through enforcement of conservation easements over the land that PVPLC will hold in perpetuity. If the City and PVPLC disagree on matters related to implementation of the NCCP/HCP and associated agreements and documents, a conflict resolution process is outlined in the Management Agreement to address the resolution process. The conflict resolution process is as follows: If the PVPLC has concerns with any City activities that affect the Preserve and/or NCCP/HCP, the PVPLC Executive Director shall transmit its concerns directly to the City Manager. Likewise, if the City has concerns with any PVPLC activities that affect the Preserve and/or NCCP/HCP, the City Manager shall transmit said concerns directly to the PVPLC Executive Director. If differences of opinion cannot be resolved by the Executive Director and the City Manager, the concerns shall be discussed by one or more representatives of the PVPLC Board and one or more representatives of the City Council (but not by way of a public meeting in which a quorum of Council members are present). If the PVPLC Board and members of the City Council cannot resolve the concerns, either party may request that the Wildlife Agencies mediate the concerns. The Wildlife Agencies' direction shall be final and binding on the parties.

31. How much does the NCCP/HCP Cost?

The City and PVPLC have financial obligations to the NCCP/HCP as described in Section 8 in the NCCP/HCP. Annual financial obligations are broken into two categories, as shown in Appendix C: (1) funding required for the conservation requirements of the NCCP/HCP, and (2) costs associated directly with land ownership and public access/passive recreation. Annual

funding obligations have also been identified for the 40-year permit term and post-permit. The table below summarizes the City and PVPLC annual funding obligations during the permit term and post-permit.

A significant portion of the management and maintenance costs result from public access to the Preserve, and the resulting necessary enforcement and supporting maintenance and amenities. In response, the City has increased costs related to management, enforcement, public safety, maintenance, signage, parking solutions, and public education. Public access of the Preserve is being requested by the City and is not a requirement of the NCCP/HCP; therefore, these costs related to management of public access, etc. is a cost that is in excess of just managing and monitoring the Preserve for the covered species and their habitat.

Table-4. Annual Preserve Management Costs

Annual Preserve Management Costs During Permit Term	
Fulfilling Conservation Requirements (City)	\$249,210
Fulfilling Conservation Requirements (PVPLC)	\$230,559
Costs related to land ownership and public access (City)	\$1,286,209
Costs related to land ownership and public access (PVPLC)	\$19,460
Total Annual Preserve Management Costs	\$1,785,438
Annual Preserve Management Costs Post Permit Term	
Fulfilling Conservation Requirements (City)	\$94,910
Fulfilling Conservation Requirements (PVPLC)	\$22,030
Costs related to land ownership and public access (City)	\$1,286,209
Costs related to land ownership and public access (PVPLC)	\$5,000
Total Annual Preserve Management Costs	\$1,408,149

In addition to annual management costs, as a post-permit requirement to ensure the continued conservation and management of the Preserve in perpetuity the City will provide funding to the PVPLC for a non-wasting endowment in the amount of \$10,000 annually and continuing for the permit term. The funds will be adjusted annually by the CPI-U for inflation. The PVPLC's investment strategy of the fund is anticipated to generate at least \$863,000 (adjusted for CPI-U) by the end of the 40 year-permit term which will assure sufficient funding for the perpetual stewardship of the Preserve and management of the conservation easements. Post-permit, the PVPLC will be responsible for conservation management of the Preserve in perpetuity, thereby removing any financial obligations related to conservation management by the City post-permit.

The City will remain responsible for maintenance and repair of City-owned infrastructure and staff costs.

The City will maintain a dedicated Habitat Restoration Fund of at least \$50,000 (adjusted annually by the CPI-U) during the 40-year permit term that may be used to fund a variety of habitat restoration purposes including payment to the PVPLC for their habitat management defined in the City-PVPLC Management Agreement, as a contribution toward the non-wasting endowment fund discussed above, or as a contribution to the PVPLC to perform habitat conservation activities beyond the requirements of the NCCP/HCP. A detailed discussion on the financial obligations can be found in Section 8 of the NCCP/HCP, and Appendix C of the NCCP/HCP.

32. What is the Special 4(d) rule and interim habitat loss permit?

The City signed a Planning Agreement to begin the preparation of the Palos Verdes Peninsula NCCP Subarea in 1996, which afforded the City interim take exemptions under 4(d) of the ESA. The City was allocated and has exhausted about 63 acres of coastal sage scrub loss while the NCCP/HCP was being developed. Several projects were authorized to move forward with interim Special 4(d) rule habitat loss permits (i.e., Subregion 1, Kajima) which streamlined project approvals in advance of permit decisions on the NCCP/HCP. To date, NCCP/HCP permits have not been issued to the City since the NCCP/HCP is not currently approved by the Wildlife Agencies. Over the past several years, approximately eight public projects are waiting to be authorized under the NCCP/HCP permits. Thus, individual projects that will result in take of listed species and their habitat, beyond what was allowed under the interim Special 4(d) rule, have not moved forward under the NCCP/HCP. NCCP/HCP permits are expected to be issued by the Wildlife Agencies for losses of habitat and take of listed species which will expedite pending projects within the City.

33. What is the NCCP/HCP document versus the Implementing Agreement?

The NCCP/HCP document is necessary as part of the permit application package for the issuance of a section 10 ITP under the ESA and issuance of a NCCP permit authorizing take under the state NCCPA. The NCCP/HCP describes, in detail, what roles and implementation responsibilities (e.g., funding, management, reporting) the City and PVPLC have over the life of the permit as well as post permit. The Implementing Agreement is a joint document between the applicant (City and PVPLC) and the Wildlife Agencies that clarifies the provisions of a habitat conservation plan and specifies how those provisions will be carried out.

SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1	11/18/18	Sunshine	<p>I. It appears to me that this draft NCCP is not compliant with the City of Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan. In many ways, it dilutes the Goals of preserving and enhancing: infrastructure, recreational open space, the Peninsula Wheel Trails Network, agricultural activities and the keeping of large domestic animals. The draft NCCP places restrictions on these activities in deference to native plants as does the PUMP.</p> <p>II. For several years, the RPV Staff has been recommending actions to the City Council as though the NCCP was approved and to be enforced. This has caused great harm to the quality of the facilities which the City is to maintain in the interest of the residents' health safety and welfare. To quote the Maintenance Superintendent, "The PVP Land Conservancy is interfering with my ability to apply best business practices."</p> <p>III. I will be asking the RPV City Council <u>not</u> to adopt this Plan unless all of the references to <u>avoiding</u> otherwise appropriate designs and engineering be removed. Management to "remedy the degradation" should be sufficient.</p> <p>IV. Since the NCCP applies to the whole City and even impacts adjacent jurisdictions, I object to the restatement of the Preserve Trails Plan (Sections 5.4.2 and 9.2.1.1) as something to be kept up to date separately from the Trails Network Plan (TNP). In the interest of consistency, continuity, emergency access and evacuation corridors, all trail designs, use rules, signage and maintenance criteria should be governed and implemented by one document, the TNP. The Peninsula Wheel Trails Network (PWTN) should be the guiding priority. (Attached.) FYI. The PWTN was designed by the local Sierra Club to avoid isolating wildlife gene pools.</p>	<p>I. The NCCP/HCP is compliant with the General Plan. Specifically, it supports the goals of the Conservation & Open Space Element and the Land Use Element by preserving 1,402.4 acres of open space in perpetuity. See Master Responses Nos. 14 and 20.</p> <p>II. See Master Response No. 29. The Maintenance Superintendent, as well as City staff works cooperatively with the PVPLC to manage the Preserve pursuant to the Management Agreement between the two entities, and the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>III. Comment noted.</p> <p>IV. See Master Response Nos. 14 and 20. The Peninsula Wheel Network will be considered and included as appropriate in the update to the Trails Network Plan (TNP) currently underway. The Preserve Trails Plan (PTP) will be included within the larger TNP, and the PTP may be updated periodically.</p> <p>V. The NCCP/HCP does not ban Capital Improvement projects</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>V. The direction that the City will cease and desist all of their usual Capital Improvement Plans, repairs and maintenance that might result in the loss of Covered Species and/or their habitat is absurd. The quality of our infrastructure must not be infringed upon.</p> <p>VI. The advantages of human access to open spaces and vista points are universally accepted. Most of those advantages are lost when humans are excluded in favor of “pure habitat”. The NCCP is not a local concept and I am offended by this effort to impose “pure habitat” regulations and penalties upon the residents, private property owners and citizens of this whole region.</p> <p>VII. The California Coastal Trail is a Legislated objective and has been designated as our State’s Millennium Trail by our Former First Lady, Hillary Clinton. I question how any Agencies have the authority to obstruct that endeavor. Please do not approve the RPV Natural Communities Conservation Plan as drafted.</p> <p>Attachment</p>	<p>and is intended to streamline permitting.</p> <p>VI. Comment noted. The NCCP/HCP is not intended to impose “pure habitat” regulations and penalties.</p> <p>VII. We are not aware of any conflict with regional trail projects.</p>
2	12/1/19	Sunshine	<p>I. The draft RPV NCCP/HCP of 2018 as written, is seriously flawed with respect to the design and maintenance of the Peninsula’s trails network as it exists within the City of Rancho Palos Verdes. The Preserve Trails Plan is not a “stand-alone” document. It should be implemented and updated as a “living document” portion of the RPV Trails Network Plan (TNP). The conceptual and the existing trails which are potentially impacted by this draft NCCP are indicated on the attached illustration of the Peninsula Wheel Trails Network. (Approved by RPV City Council in 1990.)</p> <p>II. One page which is not subject to amendment is the TRAILS DEVELOPMENT / MAINTENANCE CRITERIA of July 4, 2012. (Attached.) This document should be included in the</p>	<p>I. See Specific Response to Comment No. 1, IV.</p> <p>II. See Specific Response to Comment No. 1, IV. The July 4, 2012 Trails Development/Maintenance Criteria was not adopted by the City Council.</p> <p>III. See Specific Response to Comment No. 1.</p> <p>IV. Comment regarding typos noted. The reason the PTP is discussed</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>NCCP as a reference for establishing a balance between circulation needs, best engineering practices (erosion control) and foliage maintenance. Each of the conceptual and existing trail segments within the City need to be defined per the Conceptual Trails Plan format. All trails on City owned land and easements are either Category I or Category III. The process for updating a trail's Status: is a mechanism under the TNP, not the NCCP.</p> <p>III. The PUMP needs to be subservient to the TNP and limited to specific regulations which are unique to the deed restrictions imposed by each Reserve's Conservation Easements. The NCCP and the TNP are to be implemented, consistently, City-wide.</p> <p>IV. I am seeing many lines of text which should be deleted from the draft NCCP. Typo alert in Section 5.2.8. There is no Section 9.2.1.1. The PUMP should be covered in one place and all references to the Preserve Trails Plan should be covered by reference to the TNP in Section 5.2.8. Sections 5.4.2 and Sections 9.2.1 are either redundant, unnecessary or, in conflict.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these issues.</p> <p>2 Attachments</p>	<p>in both NCCP/HCP Sections 5 and 9 is that Section 5 addresses covered projects/activities, and Section 9 addresses the PTP within the context of Preserve management.</p>
3	12/1/18 (2)	SUNSHINE	<p>This more closely explains my objection to the draft NCCP as written. I suspect that Joel Rojas and now, Ara Mihranian have been avoiding updating the RPV Trails Network Plan and have been blocking its implementation so that the NCCP can over-ride and supersede the trails, erosion control and emergency circulation related Goals in the RPV General Plan. It is totally in the hands of the current RPV City Council to allow this to continue to happen or to introduce some balance with the pure habitat advocates.</p>	<p>The City's General Plan was updated and approved by the City Council on September 18, 2018. The City is currently working with a consultant to update the Trails Network Plan (TNP). Staff anticipates releasing the draft TNP for public review and public workshops in December 2019, and for the City Council's consideration in Spring 2020.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
4	12/5/18	SUNSHINE	<p>I. Attached is an illustration which was created by Kit Fox (City Manager’s Dept.) in relation to the tax defaulted property at 8 Chaparral Lane. I have added the route of the <u>existing</u> trail connection which is shown as “conceptual” in the original RPV General Plan, described as a <i>point-to-point</i> trail in the RPV Conceptual Trails section of the RPV Trails Network Plan and is the RPV portion of Spoke #2 of the Peninsula Wheel Trails Network.</p> <p>II. The sad thing is that Kit put this together for my information. I know all of what he has pointed out, and more. It is the Public Works Dept, the Community Development Dept, the Rec.& Parks Dept. and the Finance Dept. Staff who need to be aware of the changing circumstances in the area and should become proactive in pursuit of the opportunities to preserve and enhance this historic and desirable trail connection.</p> <p>III. The primary thing that should have been done long ago and now be done ASAP is the budgeting for and the design of the <u>ideal route</u> of the Bronco Trail. Because so many undeveloped lots are involved, Conceptual Trails Plan Section Five, trail F2 should be pre-engineered as a minimum TYPE 5 trail prism. Public Works needs to initiate that via the Finance Dept. and our on-call Engineers.</p> <p>IV. The Planning Division needs access to this design for when any of these lots are presented with Applications for development. We do not need a repeat of the 10 Chaparral Application which included easement requests by Staff where there was no potential for a viable trail of any TYPE.</p> <p>V. The Rec.& Parks Dept. needs to look into why this area is not mentioned in the draft NCCP. Partially because of the active landslide on the site, LA County had designated this area as a potential park site. The original General Plan identified it as a potential “municipal stable”. The PVPLC</p>	<p>I-V. The properties and trails referenced in this comment are not within the City’s Preserve or implemented by the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>VI. Trail easements are being recorded per the Council-adopted conditions of approval for the development project at 10 Chaparral Lane. The City’s Community Development Department is currently working with the property owners of 14 Bronco Drive who have expressed a willingness to voluntarily dedicate trail easements as part of their development proposal. This will likely be a condition of approval if and when the project is deemed complete for processing.</p> <p>VII.-IX. Comments noted.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>now owns the large parcel which contains a very mature riparian habitat. The trail to where Geology students can view the outcropping of Catalina Schist should be designated as a TYPE 7 trail so that it can be maintained without any threat of anyone claiming this public access to be a “taking” of Habitat. If R&P can’t pull together a comprehensive Agenda Report with a recommendation for the future of this area, who should?</p> <p>VI. The Community Development Dept. has received a request for assistance with getting a voluntary, no cost, Irrevocable Offer of Trail Easement across the northwestern side of 14 Bronco Drive. It would be an overlay of an existing sewer easement. Staff has received previous requests to have the new City Attorney review and bless/modify Carol Lynch’s boilerplate form. Members of the public cannot nurture volunteer offers without Staff assistance and we are not getting any. 14 Bronco has sold so, that opportunity has been lost. The public needs the form in order to pursue future offers.</p> <p>VII. The September 18, 2018 Land Use Map shows a preponderance of this area as OPEN SPACE HILLSIDE. My request that the General Plan Update include some specific language to permit trail construction on “Hillsides” was not accommodated.</p> <p>VIII. This is as close to bullet items as I can make it without assuming that anyone at City Hall has a grasp on the whole picture. The City Manager’s Staff is recommending that the purchase of 8 Chaparral be pursued without any clear indication of how the City’s ownership of this parcel will enhance the amenities which the City provides to the public. The City’s ownership/maintenance of the lot which is sometimes referred to as the East Crest Trailhead Park is a waste of tax payer dollars.</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>IX. I continue to urge the Council to create an Infrastructure and Activities Commission. This would force the various departments to get their acts together before they present a recommendation of action to the City Council. This is the epitome of “screening by the public”. Maybe such a body will be able to sort out the conflicts between the RPV General Plan and the NCCP. Please do not adopt the NCCP as drafted.</p> <p>Attachment</p>	
5	12/6/18	Tooley	<p>I. Somehow a serious error has been made and I plead with you to correct it!</p> <p>II The entire city of RPV has been included in the NCCP project! That includes my property and that of all my neighbors. We have no desire or intention to modify the vegetation on our property and the city has no right to impose that upon us.</p> <p>III The mitigation project was originally, and correctly, limited to a specific few acres dedicated for that purpose. It has been expanded to cover all private property in the city without a vote or approval of the citizens.</p> <p>IV Please do not approve the RPV NCCP/HCP project as submitted. Instead send it back to the RPV City Council to correct this serious error and overstepping of authority by removing its applicability to the entire city and returning it to the limited scope as originally proposed.</p>	<p>II. See Master Response Nos. 4, 11, 12, and 13. The NCCP/HCP does not impose any new restrictions on properties that aren’t being developed.</p> <p>III-IV. Since the planning stages of the NCCP/HCP in 1996, the plan area boundary included the entire City. The City-approved 2004 NCCP/HCP plan area boundary encompassed the entire City as well.</p>
6	12/6/18	Teles	<p>My wife and I both object to the NCCP as currently proposed <u><i>because the NCCP / HCP detrimentally encumbers your PROPERTY RIGHTS as an RPV resident.</i></u></p> <p>Please feel free to contact me regarding this issue that did not have any public discussion or vote.</p>	<p>See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
7	12/6/18	Fotion	I <u>STRONGLY</u> object to the NCCP as currently proposed because the NCCP / HCP detrimentally encumbers your PROPERTY RIGHTS as an RPV resident.	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.
8	12/6/18	Chelini	I object to the NCCP as currently proposed, because the NCCP / HCP detrimentally encumbers my PROPERTY RIGHTS as an Rancho Palos Verdes resident.	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.
9	12/7/18	Frka	We object to the NCCP as currently written because the NCCP/HCP detrimentally encumbers our PROPERTY RIGHTS as a RPV resident. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.
10	12/7/18	Friedland	The NCCP as current proposed is not in the best interest of either private property owners or further the purpose of the plan. This is written in highly technical terms, which will generate confusion and lead to unnecessary, expensive litigation. This needs to go back to the drawing boards and most importantly this particular purpose needs to include community feed-back to balance improper impositions of burdens against real benefits.	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13.
11	12/9/18	Lemke	To whom it may concern: As longtime residents of Rancho Palos Verdes my family and I strongly object to the NCCP as currently proposed because the NCCP / HCP detrimentally encumbers our PROPERTY RIGHTS as RPV residents.	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.
12	12/10/18	Phillips	In reference to the above-mentioned subject matter, the proposed Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) and the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), we strongly object to their overreaching and burdensome powers. The NCCP includes <u>ALL</u> properties (city and private) within the City of Rancho Palos Verdes and is and or will be encumbering my private property rights. This may lead to a reduction in our property values, as well as lead to additional negative impacts to homeowners in the City.	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			We object to the NCCP as currently proposed because the NCCP / HCP detrimentally encumbers our private PROPERTY RIGHTS as a Rancho Palos Verdes homeowner and resident.	
13	12/10/18	DeLong	<p>The NCCP includes ALL properties (city and private) within the City of Rancho Palos Verdes and detrimentally impacts our RIGHTS as RPV residents.</p> <p>The RPV Council with Susan Brooks as Mayor voted on March 29, 2018 to approve the NCCP which was then submitted to California / US Wildlife agencies for final approval without having any voter approval. This will be governmental “taking” of private property without just compensation.</p>	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13, and 16. The NCCP/HCP does not impose any new restrictions on properties that are not being developed.
14	12/11/18	Mueller	I object to the NCCP as currently proposed because the NCCP / HCP detrimentally encumbers my PROPERTY RIGHTS AS AN RPV RESIDENT.	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.
15	12/14/18	Ruona	<p>I am a 35-year resident of the city of Rancho Palos Verdes (RPV).</p> <p>The Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) & Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), which you are considering has only recently been brought to my attention. I am quite certain that is the case of many residents in the city. There seems to be a difference of opinion amongst some of the concerned citizens of RPV & city officials on whether these plans effect the entire 13.6 square miles of the city, or only certain segments, i.e., the land in the Palos Verdes Land Conservancy. It seems to me this is an important question that should be resolved & communicated to the public prior to any final decision is rendered. If it does include all private property there appears to be some oppressive governmental overreach & I do not support that. The other residents I have discussed this with agree with me.</p> <p>If someone can clarify this issue I would appreciate it. Thank you.</p>	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights. The NCCP/HCP has been in development since 1996 and was approved by the City Council in 2004.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
16	12/15/18	Pilmar	I object to the NCCP/HCP presently under your review. I do not wish to have my property included in this ruling.	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.
17	12/17/18	Kendel	<p>We object to the NCCP as currently proposed because the NCCP / HCP detrimentally encumbers our PROPERTY RIGHTS as RPV residents.</p> <p>We demand that you limit the boundaries of the NCCP to the Nature Preserve excluding the ~14,000 homes in RPV from inclusion in the NCCP.</p>	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.
18	12/17/18	Tanielian	I object to the NCCP/HCP presently under your review. I do not wish to have my property at (redacted) RPV, 90275 included in this ruling.	See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.
19	12/18/18	Yarber	<p>I. I may be late to the party, but I have now read the Environmental Assessment (the “EA”) and the NCCP and it is clear that we, the public, have been misled. The NCCP is nothing short of a land grab.</p> <p>II. Federal and State environmental laws now protect three of the 10 species sought to be covered by the proposed NCCP. Six of the species to be protected by the NCCP are plants that were identified by the Native Plant Society and one species, the cactus wren, is not a protected animal species under federal or state law.</p> <p>III. It is clear from reading the EA that if the No Action Alternative was selected far less protection would be afforded by enforcement solely of state and federal environmental laws. We have been told that the NCCP is a benefit to private property owners because they would be subject to constraints under federal and state law, which is partially true, but the NCCP gives the City the ability to exact land from private property owners in order to protect</p>	<p>I. Comment noted.</p> <p>II. See Master Responses Nos. 2 and 6. While a Federal ITP is required only for listed species, NCCP/HCPs may include conservation measures for candidate, proposed, and other non-listed species. Including non-listed species in a NCCP/HCP can avoid the requirements of a new HCP and permit application or burdensome amendments to the NCCP/HCP in the event that a species becomes listed prior to completion of the permit holders’ activities.</p> <p>III. and IV. See Master Responses Nos. 11-13. As noted in Master Response No. 11, the</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>habitat that is not otherwise protected. The NCCP, thus, results in greater exactions than would otherwise occur.</p> <p>IV. I cannot find anything in the materials presented to us that disclose what established and inflexible mitigation ratios, if any, exist under state and federal law, so there is no information against which to compare the effect of the mitigation ratios set forth in the NCCP. While staff has suggested that the reduction from a 3:1 ratio under the 2004 draft NCCP to 2:1 under the 2018 draft is a benefit to private property owners, that would certainly not be true if the ratios under federal and/or state law are 1:1. So what are the mitigation ratios under federal and state law with respect to federally and state protected habitat? I don't know, do you? And what are the federal and state ratios with respect to the 7 additional species to be protected by the NCCP? NONE! There are no ratios because there is no such protection. By adding species to the NCCP the document mandates mitigation measures that do not exist under federal or state law.</p> <p>V. There is no "opt out" provision in the NCCP. How dare Council or staff suggest there is. And even if there were an opt out provision for a private property owner, the Wildlife Agencies are bound by the terms of the NCCP and they do not have an opt out provision. Thus any statements by staff or the Council suggesting there is an opt out option available is patently false.</p> <p>VI The NCCP is simply a disguised effort to obtain more land to add to the Preserve and limit to development. While I would prefer not to see more development on the Peninsula, particularly along our beautiful coast, the NCCP is NOT the way to compel private property owners to donate land to increase the size of the Preserve. Further, the NCCP not only exacts land, it also exacts money to pay for the management</p>	<p>NCCP/HCP provides the mitigation for those few private properties that may result in impacts to the covered species caused by development. These property owners will be covered by the City's permit and may pay a mitigation fee to the City to cover the costs to revegetate Preserve land. Alternatively, these property owners may choose to dedicate land to the City as their form of mitigation.</p> <p>V. The NCCP/HCP includes specific properties that have been identified for development since the early 2000 and are covered by the NCCP/HCP based on agreements made at that time. If these property owners do not want to be covered by the City's permit, they can seek to obtain their own permits from the Wildlife Agencies and as part of the CEQA process. However, the mitigation required by the Wildlife Agencies will likely be the same as described in the NCCP/HCP. The City has taken on the cost of the development of the NCCP/HCP which removes the financial burden of developing a plan from the local landowners.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>of the donated land by the Conservancy. That is unfair and unconstitutional.</p> <p>VII Now that I am informed, I vehemently oppose the NCCP and will be writing to the Wildlife Agencies in support of the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>VI. The legality of the NCCP program and as it relates to HCPs is established law.</p> <p>VII. Comment noted.</p>
20	12/18/18	Yarber (2)	<p>I am opposed to the NCCP/HCP as currently drafted for the following reasons:</p> <p>I. I do not think private property should be subjected to the terms of the NCCP/HCP. It is fine to limit the permit sought to projects involving land owned by, or under the control of, the City of RPV or the Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy, but not private property;</p> <p>II. Federal and state laws do not protect 7 of the 10 species/habitat sought to be protected by the NCCP. Broadening of opportunities for exacting land and monies from private property owners to protect species that are not now protected already by Federal and/or State law gives additional power to the City and is an unconscionable opportunity to seize private property;</p> <p>III. Staff and Council have stated in public meetings that private property owners can “opt out” of the NCCP, which statements are not supported by any provisions in the NCCP and further, the Wildlife Agencies would be bound by the terms of the NCCP and thus no “opt out” opportunity really exists. To garner support for, or at least attempt to assuage concerns about, the NCCP based, in part, on false statements cannot be sanctioned;</p> <p>IV. In particular, but not by way of limitation, the Lower Filiorum property owned by Mr. York is subject to a most egregious provision in the NCCP. As revised in 2018, the NCCP now provides that ANY development done on that property necessitates the granting of 40 acres of his land to</p>	<p>I. See Master Responses Nos. 3 and 11-13.</p> <p>II. See Specific Response to Comment No. 19 (II)</p> <p>III. See Specific Response to Comment No. 19 (V)</p> <p>IV. See Master Response No. 18</p> <p>V. See Master Response No. 4</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>the Preserve. This is an unconstitutional and unjust taking by any measure. His prior agreement in 2004 to give 40 acres in exchange for the entitlement to develop some 85 or so homes, is not binding now. That development was not pursued and any future development that is pursued should be reviewed as to its impacts, if any, and appropriate and proportionate mitigation measures imposed. Should a minor addition of a gazebo be done, for example, 40 acres ipso facto needs to be donated. That is preposterous and must be stricken from the NCCP. Demand for such modification to the NCCP by Mr. York was inappropriately rejected by Council.</p> <p>V. I find it compelling that none of the other cities on the Palos Verdes Peninsula are joining in the NCCP. Admittedly they differ in terms of size, population and they are not faced with the number and scope of infrastructure projects that confront the City of RPV. Nevertheless, apparently these cities do not feel compelled to try to exact land and money from their residents in an effort to enlarge the Preserve that the residents of all of the cities enjoy in order to protect species not protected by federal and/or state law. We have enough government control already. We do not need an additional layer of control over private property granted to the City of RPV via the NCCP.</p>	
21	12/20/18	Davidson	<p>This is to document that we support the Rancho Palos Nature Preserve.</p> <p>We are in favor of the Department of Fish and Wildlife approving the NCCP and the preservation of the land set aside in Rancho Palos Verdes for the protection of the plant and wildlife.</p> <p>We all enjoy the beauty of the land and want to continue to protect this land with your help.</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
22	12/20/18	Bioveyda	This is to communicate that we fully support the Rancho Palos Verdes NCCP (Natural Communities Conservation Plan).	Comment noted.
23	12/21/18	Deo	Please know how important this Natural Communities Conservation Plan is for the people of Palos Verdes. I am a Docent with the City of RPV and we utilize the nature preserve all the time for tours with children and adults. There are many crucial threatened species in the preserve as well as Los Angeles County desperately needs open space such as these acres. We have all worked long and hard for this Conservation Plan. As a citizen of Rancho Palos Verdes for twenty years and a professor of environmental studies I know how important it is for the human residents of Palos Verdes and Southern California and for all the living creatures in the area. It is a model of habitat restoration for the whole country as well-- especially in the most populous county in the U.S.	Comment noted.
24	12/21/18	Straub	I'm writing to voice my support for Alternative D of the above mentioned NCCP. I hike there almost weekly and want to see it kept as natural as it is now.	Comment noted.
25	12/21/18	Wright	Please preserve the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve. It is important to protect natural habitat and endangered species, while also having the Nature Preserve open to the public for nature appreciation and hiking.	Comment noted.
26	12/21/18	Kirk	Our wild areas are so few and far between down here in the LA area. We need them desperately. Please support Alt. D.	Comment noted.
27	12/21/18	Herman	The people of Rancho Palos Verdes and surrounding communities have fought for decades to have a space devoted to preserving the rare coastal sage scrub habitat and the endangered and threatened birds and other animals that can survive only there, and to provide open natural spaces for hikers and others to enjoy nature. We thought that when private donors, city, state, county and federal agencies came together to acquire the land and the City of Rancho Palos Verdes approved the draft NCCP in 2004 that we would have	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>such a nature preserve saved for future generations. But it seems that the NCCP has still not be finalized.</p> <p>Please support Alternative D to ensure that the nature preserve endures.</p>	
28	12/21/18	Cornell	<p>I live in Rancho Palos Verdes, CA and support Alternative D, Proposed Action, for the Natural Communities Conservation Plan that is now under review. One of the reasons I moved here is because RPV is one of the few communities in Los Angeles County's South Bay that had the foresight to set aside open space and has continued to maintain its open space and hiking trails. I would be extremely disappointed if the Wildlife Service were to adopt measures that would cause these areas to be degraded.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me at (redacted) if you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further.</p>	Comment noted.
29	12/21/18	Barryte	I concur with the selection of Preserve Alternative D.	Comment noted.
30	12/21/18	Scharfenberger	<p>Finalize the establishment and continuation of the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve.</p> <p>Those who are overseeing its development and preservation are doing a great job. It is a necessary endeavor. Contribute your affirmation of this project.</p>	Comment noted.
31	12/21/18	Benator	Please support the Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Communities Conservation Plan Alternative D. It is important to both protect the natural habitat and endangered species while also having the Nature Preserve open to the public for nature appreciation and hiking. I am one of many who hike in Palos Verdes and enjoy the natural surroundings while also trying to protect the natural habitat.	Comment noted.
32	12/21/18	Iacopucci	Protection of the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve is very important to me, my family & friends!	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			Please protect the natural habitat and endangered species, while also having the Nature Preserve open to the public for nature appreciation and hiking.	
33	12/22/18	Good	I'm writing to say there are some beautiful areas left on the Palos Verdes Peninsula that I hope will stay that way. There are native plants growing and many volunteer opportunities for all ages. Talks given by knowledgeable naturalists and opportunities for students of all ages to learn about nature or become environmental scientists. White Point Preserve has native plants growing and volunteer opportunities for students and now has native plants covering the hill side; people can come to see birds and butterflies. I hope there will be as much open land as possible and I thank the Palos Verdes Land Conservancy for the fine way they are preserving the land	Comment noted.
34	12/22/18	Seaver	Please help us to preserve the last bit of natural habitat in our area. It would be a sad day for our community to see our natural environment become history instead of an enriching reality.	Comment noted.
35	12/22/18	Wilson	<p>I am a long-time resident of the South Bay and have seen the negative impact of population growth and loss of public lands to development. The Palos Verdes Nature Preserve provides much needed respite from urban intrusion as well as important protection for wildlife. Protection of natural habitat and endangered species is essential if citizens are to have access to healthy, open spaces, The Nature Preserve is open to the public and is critical for nature appreciation, education and hiking. Once lost, this precious public resource will be gone forever.</p> <p>I am voicing my Support for Alternative D of the NCCP; the compromise between protection of endangered species and development. Please, please do not destroy the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve by fragmenting it into an uncertain future.</p>	Comment noted.
36	12/22/18	Schlichting	<p>You MUST support the City of RPV NCCP/HCP, as it is:</p> <p>1) OUR COMMUNITY wanting to preserve</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>wildlife habitat IN OUR OWN COMMUNITY</p> <p>2) OUR COMMUNITY standing up AGAINST MONIED INTERESTS from OUTSIDE our community that want to profit AT OUR COMMUNITT'S AND OUR WILDLIFE'S EXPENSE</p> <p>3) It is consistent with SELF- DETERMINATION and LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY ASSUMED for caring for our own community</p> <p>4) IT IS CONSISTENT WITH the MISSION STATEMENT: "The mission of the agency is 'working with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish, wildlife, plants and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people.' "</p> <p>5) ANY CAPITULATION TO DEVELOPMENT/DEVELOPERS is NOT consistent with the above Mission.</p> <p>6) ANY CAPITULATION TO DEVELOPMENT/DEVELOPERS is ACTUALLY WORKING CONTRARY to the stated mission of THE AGENCY, and, in fact, might be considered ABUSE of power and authority by those entrusted and paid by the People of The United States.</p> <p>It is beyond time for the federal government to work for the people's best interest over well-heeled, profit-goaled special interests.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and for listening.</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
37	12/22/18	Lino	The PV nature preserve is a valued wilderness region that's accessible to the urban south bay area. I support NCCP alternative D to preserve this area.	Comment noted.
38	12/22/18	North	I live on the Palos Verdes Peninsula and frequently hike in the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve. I support Alternative D of the NCCP to protect this natural habitat and endangered species, while maintaining the Nature Preserve being open to the public for nature appreciation and hiking. Please promote and vote for Alternative D.	Comment noted.
39	12/22/18	Summers	I am writing to express my support for Alternative D of the NCCP. It is very important to protect natural habitat and endangered species, while also having the Nature Preserve open to the public for nature appreciation and hiking. The compromise that Alternative D of this draft lays out is the best one for this area. Please safeguard both natural and human communities by ensuring that Alternative D of the NCCP is adopted.	Comment noted.
40	12/22/18	Kilroy	<p>This message is written in support of final approval of the NCCP, specifically Alternative D.</p> <p>For more than two decades, now, the City of Rancho Palos Verdes has shown great leadership in advancing the cause of both the Palos Verdes Preserve and the NCCP which both protects it and enables residents of Rancho Palos Verdes to benefit from its many provisions. It has also, in the process, helped lead the creation of the largest natural coastal open space area between Malibu and Laguna Beach <i>while at the same time protecting and enhancing property rights and values in the City of Rancho Palos Verdes.</i></p> <p>Please be the council which carries this ball over the goal line.</p>	Comment noted.
41	12/22/18	McLaughlin	My husband and I are residents of Rancho Palos Verdes and approve the Natural Communities Conservation Plan for the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve. We enjoy staying in shape by hiking the trails and de-stress in the natural beauty of this area. It's a gem that needs to remain for future generations to enjoy. Thank you.	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
42	12/22/18	Jordan	I am in favor of Alternative D of the NCCP. I grew up in the incredibly beautiful Palos Verdes Peninsula. It is extremely important to me and my family and friends that we protect natural habitat and endangered species while having the Nature Preserve open to the public to enjoy and appreciate.	Comment noted.
43	12/22/18	Hunter	We are writing in favor of the NCCP including D.	Comment noted.
44	12/22/18	Davis	<p>I am writing to express my strong support of the NCCP and Alternative D in particular.</p> <p>My family has been enjoying the unique environment of the Palos Verdes Peninsula for decades. My husbands grandfather was instrumental in developing the peninsula back in the 1920s. He was drawn to this area for its beauty and realized early on how special it was, truly a rare jewel. My husband grew up in Rancho Palos Verdes, and has wonderful stories to tell of his unique childhood here on the peninsula. The conservation plan is so important to help maintain this natural area for generations to come.</p> <p>There is no doubt in my mind that urban expansion and development will continue to plod along, progress is inevitable. However, progress without destruction of the wonder we have around us is within easy grasp. I believe the NCCP is the conservation plan for the City of Rancho Palos Verdes that will help maintain the delicate balance of beauty and progress in this area. Indeed, this balance has already provided the area with stunning preservation of preserve lands that supports wildlife unique to this area of the world. The peninsula is a showplace because of the work of the land conservancy along with all those who have helped to work toward balance and access for the public.</p> <p>Providing the public with recreational opportunities AND protecting our natural resources that make this community special is vital. Nature cannot speak for itself, one only has to look around Los Angeles to observe opportunities lost, areas where wonderful natural beauty suffered needlessly or was destroyed</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>completely. 1400 acres is a pittance in the greater scope of this vast state, but it is a treasure trove to Rancho Palos Verdes, it makes this community stand out, there are few other places quite like it.</p> <p>My family has enjoyed the 30 + miles of hiking trails - trails that are world-class, stunning views, and wildlife all within walking distance of our home. Not a day goes by that I am not amazed at the joy this slice of heavens brings to us. On the trails I observe others partake of this extraordinary area, and realize the value of having access to this lovely land. I do not want to take for granted the privilege of having the preserve at our fingertips - nor should the city ever lose sight of the importance of protecting this area for future generations to explore and love.</p> <p>I encourage and implore you to approve the NCCP and Alternative D.</p>	
45	12/22/18	Harwood	As a long time Palos Verdes Peninsula resident, I wish to encourage you to finally adopt the RPV City NCCP (Alternative D).	Comment noted.
46	12/22/18	Doty	The Palos Verdes Nature Preserve must be protected. It is of immeasurable importance to protect natural habitat and endangered species, while also having the Nature Preserve open to the public for nature appreciation and hiking.	Comment noted.
47	12/22/18	Fredrick	<p>I support Alternative D of the NCCP.</p> <p>Protecting the natural habitat and endangered species in the Palos Verdes Nature preserve is very important to me. The area is a phenomenal asset to all - people, animals, and plants. In an area as dense as the greater Los Angeles area, the open space and natural habitat is essential.</p> <p>Thank you for your support in preserving the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve.</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
48	12/22/18	Martin	Please let us have this nature area! It is so important for my children to have a place to both see what our area used to look like, and to give plants and animals a place to thrive.	Comment noted.
49	12/22/18	Marcelo	<p>As an active Volunteer in support of Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy (PVPLC), I am in strong support of the PVP Land Conservancy and Alternative D of the Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP). It is vitally critical to the city of Rancho Palos Verdes, of which I have been a resident for the past 34 years, that the NCCP be approved, specifically Alternative D.</p> <p>The NCCP represents a common sense approach the city of Rancho Palos Verdes will have at its disposal to support development and infrastructure projects that will seamlessly blend with the PVPLC's primary mission in support of Federal and State protected plants and wildlife.</p> <p>Further, the NCCP Alternative D will provide balance of the public's recreational interests as well as protection of natural resources within the Preserve. All Volunteer efforts by the PLPLC enhance not just the land within the Preserve, but contribute to the symbiotic features and attributes of residential areas bordering the Preserve.</p>	Comment noted.
50	12/22/18	Mah	Please continue to protect our natural habitat and endangered species. The Palos Verdes Nature Preserve is where my family and I enjoy our hikes. There are so few places such as this left to enjoy.	Comment noted.
51	12/22/18	Jones	<p>At long last the Natural Community Conservation Plan for the City of Rancho Palos Verdes is up for final approval. This has been a long, very thoughtful process and I, as a resident of Rancho Palos Verdes, fully support its final approval in its highest and best iteration, that of Alternative D.</p> <p>The reasons for support are innumerable, not the least of which are the very reasons it was created in the first place. Very rare and valuable habitat is retained, maintained and restored. Plants and animals that are endangered or threatened are provided</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>for. Development in a sensitive area is given over to thoughtful, local control. The quality of our lives and enrichment of our environment is, to say the least, enhanced.</p> <p>Please help us continue to balance the recreational needs with the natural and development needs of the area. This program has effectively been in place close to 15 years, time to finalize it.</p>	
52	12/23/18	Campbell	<p>Greetings! I am a Rancho Palos Verdes resident. I strongly support the implementation of the Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP). This preserve is a wonderful asset in our community and a source of great pride for me. I am so happy to live in an area that is concerned with our environment and the preservation of native plants and animals. Where else in this vast metropolis can you find such open space and solitude! We have a great treasure here in our back yard and I hope the people of Rancho Palos Verdes and you are aware of this gift and strive to protect it from any encroachment. We will be a better community if we value our open spaces. Once these areas are compromised, there is no going back. Let's appreciate the gift of open space and the gifts it has to share with us while we still have it. Thank you for your kind attention.</p>	Comment noted.
53	12/23/18	Fadich	<p>I am writing to ask you to please save the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve. My friends and I have been hiking the trails there for 12 years. It is a wilderness in the middle of city, a haven for many animals, and a place that brings people back to nature. So please finalize the Rancho Palos Verdes NCCP and save it for future generations.</p>	Comment noted.
54	12/23/18	Fives	<p>My name is J. Timothy Fives. I have been coming to Palos Verdes for decades, exploring the many trails, canyons, coves, wildlife, and enclaves of natural habitat. I have led groups of Boy Scouts from Troop 476 on land navigation exercises in the Portuguese Bend Nature Reserve and have accompanied visitors from Italy and Germany on hikes during which I explained the area's natural history in Italian or German. I have run the Palos Verdes Marathon</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>or Half Marathon multiple times since 1980 and bicycled around the Peninsula.</p> <p>Since January of this year, I have put in many hours with the Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy Volunteer Trail Watch program. On these missions I have assisted lost hikers, guided visitors, and admonished people walking dogs off leash, and documented graffiti and damage to the trails. During this year I have been greatly impressed by the many interpretive signs and other improvements installed by the PVPLC and city of Rancho Palos Verdes. I have joined several docent-led trips with well-informed naturalists and seen crews planting native plants in the hillsides once dominated by invasive species. The Palos Verdes Peninsula is an urban wilderness, a refuge for plants, animals, and people seeking a bit of nature surrounded by a massive urban region.</p> <p>I am writing to urge support of Alternative D of the Natural Communities Conservation Plan. Palos Verdes is too valuable to lose to further development or neglect of its natural treasures.</p>	
55	12/23/18	Baer	<p>I would like to express importance of the PVP Preserve. I have been running hiking, bird and whale watching in this area for over 30 years. During that time, I have many people of variety of ages doing the same. It is a perfect area for escaping the city life. It is a great place to expose children and teens to the wonders of nature. My family has been enjoying the area since their respective births. Whether it's the off chance to see an orca pod, rescue a barn owl, or just breathe the fresh air, it has been a family staple for us. One daughter uses it for cross-country training and both have used the area for soccer training as well. I feel it is very important to maintain the area and protect it for the future generations.</p>	Comment noted.
56	12/23/18	Yarber	<p>I have additional comments to make on the NCCP and look forward to the responses to these comments.</p>	<p>I. Grassland (including non-native) may provide valuable forage habitat for raptors and support other sensitive wildlife species.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>I. I do not think any mitigation should be exacted for the removal of non-native grassland. The removal is a benefit and goal of the PVPLC. Mitigation for such removal is an inappropriate punishment for desired conduct. Furthermore, I do not support the imposition of mitigation measures for removal of native grassland, as they are not protected by federal or state law. If mitigation for native grassland remains part of the NCCP, the ratio should not be greater than it is for CSS. It should be 0.5:1 at most, not 3:1.</p> <p>II. Paragraph 4.2 of the NCCP says that the PVPLC will “perpetually” manage the Preserve. As you know, the PVPLC currently manages the Preserve pursuant to a written management agreement with the City which has a term of 50 years. Under the agreement the City does have the right, under certain circumstances, to terminate the agreement and select a replacement manager. Thus, the NCCP is in direct conflict with the agreement. 4.2 should be revised to provide that the PVPLC will continue to manage the Preserve in accordance with, and pursuant to the terms and provisions of, the management agreement.</p> <p>III. The NCCP draft includes picnic tables as permitted improvements. I do not support picnic tables in the Preserve and request that the reference to picnic tables be deleted. The Preserve is a nature preserve, not a park.</p> <p>IV. It is anticipated that development of Grandview Park and Hesse Park will disturb cumulatively an estimated 20 acres of native grassland. Since native grassland is not protected under federal or state law, it is only the NCCP that would require mitigation for such disturbance. If I understand the NCCP correctly, any development of the parks will necessitate placing additional lands into the Preserve or else the City would have to pay mitigation fees with taxpayer dollars should the parks ultimately be developed. As stated</p>	<p>When contiguous with larger areas of biological open space they contribute to a habitat mosaic that can be used by sensitive species. Therefore, conservation of grassland (including non-native) contributes toward NCCP planning goals. The Preserve design includes mitigation for potential impacts of City projects to grasslands (including non-native). Mitigation for grassland is not specific to NCCP Planning. Moreover, the majority of private projects are covered by the Miscellaneous Private Projects category and are not required to mitigate for impacts to non-native grassland.</p> <p>II. See Master Response Nos. 24, 26, and 27. The perpetual management is requirement for the NCCP/HCP. The covered activities will result in permanent loss, thus the expectation is that the mitigation be perpetual as well.</p> <p>III. Picnic tables were removed in the recirculated NCCP/HCP, and they will be removed from the PUMP at its next update.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>above I do not believe there should be mitigation for native grassland, but if there is, it should be at a reduced ratio.</p> <p>V. The Barkentine Property was acquired with a Parks and Open Space grant for a passive recreation PARK. 98.4 acres of parkland was placed into the Preserve using the ratios under the NCCP to mitigate for other City projects resulting in taking. The question is, what was taken that necessitated the mitigation under the NCCP? Was it protected by federal or state law or just the NCCP? What mitigation ratios were applied to the taking? Might the mitigation have been significantly less had the NCCP not be in place? Placing a park into the Preserve deprives the public of a park. Uses in a passive park allow for picnics, grass on which to lay a blanket, playing frisbee, etc. 98 acres of land acquired for a park is now not available to be used as a park, and there is no explanation as to what would have been required had the NCCP not been applied to the taking that caused this transfer to the Preserve.</p> <p>VI. 50.9 acres of Upper Point Vicente, which is now parkland, is slated to go into the Preserve, as is 16.8 acres of parkland at Crenshaw and Crestridge Road. Again, what would be required if there was no NCCP?</p> <p>VII. Obviously, the more land that is placed in the Preserve the greater the number of properties that are adjacent to the Preserve and therefore fall under the purview of Section 5.7.3. This creep affects an ever growing number of private properties, does it not? As stated in my prior email, I do not think any private properties should be covered by the NCCP.</p> <p>VIII. If I understand the NCCP correctly, HOAs may have to dedicate an easement or pay mitigation fees if their privately owned open space land is re-landscaped and habitat that is protected under the NCCP, but not federal or state law, is disturbed. If that is the case then this constitutes an</p>	<p>IV. Improvements to Grandview or Hesse Park could be covered under “Unimproved City Park Projects,” for which the NCCP/HCP allows the loss of 10 acres of coastal sage scrub and 20 acres of grassland. Land would not need to be added to the Preserve. Unimproved City Park Projects is a project covered in the NCCP/HCP. The City would not be required to add additional land to the Preserve or to pay mitigation fees. See Specific Response to Comment No. 56 (I) above.</p> <p>V. Barkentine (now known as Three Sisters Reserve) was added to the Nature Preserve in preparation and planning for the City’s Nature Preserve, and as mitigation to offset the multitude impacts of projects covered by the NCCP/HCP. The property was not purchased to mitigate for any one particular project. Moreover, Barkentine was purchased with grant funding available because of the City’s commitment to making it part of the Nature Preserve. The City updated its Parks Master Plan in 2015, and conducted robust public input. Moreover, the most</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>unconstitutional taking of private property and cannot be sanctioned. I do not support mitigation for species not protected by federal or state law being imposed on the open space privately owned by the HOAs.</p> <p>IX. I am concerned about the impact to private property owners when they are required to provide mitigation because they have been required to perform fuel modification for fire/life safety and such modification adversely affects protected resources. Does this only apply to vacant lots where there is a proposed development? Several provisions in the NCCP appear to impose constraints that apply to “vacant lots” abutting the Preserve. Nowhere did I find a definition of a “vacant lot”. Is a vacant lot one on which there has never been any development of any kind, or is a vacant lot one on which improvements have been demolished for new construction? This should be clarified.</p> <p>X. As an equestrian I am concerned about the provisions of the NCCP that mandate monitoring for brown-headed cowbirds should someone want to have a horse on a property the boundary of which is within 500 feet of the Preserve. This largely affects homes in Portuguese Bend, one of only three areas in RPV zoned for horse keeping (the “Q” Overlay Zone). The NCCP says the cowbird is parasitic to many native bird species, but does not identify clearly which species and whether they are protected by any laws. There is reference to the gnatcatcher but is the gnatcatcher, in fact, prey for the cowbird? The applicant must engage a biologist, monitor for three years and then every third year thereafter, and if cowbirds are found a trapping program, or “other effective measures” will be taken. Has anyone taken a survey of the Peninsula to see if there are any of these cowbirds (Wildlife Agencies – please help with this question) in the areas densely populated by horses, e.g. Rolling Hills Estates and Westfield? If there is no problem in those areas why</p>	<p>heavily supported recreational amenity in the City was open space/nature trails.</p> <p>VI. See Master Response No. 14. The Preserve acreage and configuration was designed partly to provide adequate habitat mitigation for the 17 City-covered projects/activities and 5 private-covered projects/activities addressed by the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>VII. See Master Response No. 16.</p> <p>VIII. See Specific Response to Comment No. 56 (I).</p> <p>IX. Vacant lots are lots on which there are no improvements. See Master Response No. 16.</p> <p>X. See Master Response No. 17. The concern is cowbirds parasitizing native bird nests. The Cooper Biological survey conducted in 2018 monitored for presence of cowbirds along with coastal California gnatcatchers and cactus wren within the Preserve. Their survey did not cover any City or private properties outside of the Preserve. In their reported results, the biologists did not observe any presence of</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>would properties adjacent to the Preserve be targeted for this additional measure, and might an “other effective measure” include compelled removal of the horse(s) from the private property? At a minimum, if the concern about cowbirds is real, and they attack species protected by federal or state law, or even for those protected by the NCCP, then the cost of engaging such biologist and performing the monitoring should be at the expense of the City or the Preserve Manager, not the applicant, and it should be made clear that removal of the horse(s) or withdrawal of any permit for large animals will NOT be a measure that can be employed. Further, the cost of trapping or “other effective measures” should also be at the expense of the City or the Preserve Manager, not the applicant who is entitled by zoning to have horses.</p> <p>XI. As an equestrian I am also concerned about the constraints placed on trails within the Preserve (and there should be no constraints whatsoever regarding trails on property outside of the Preserve). As it is, under the PUMP and via Council Action, a number of trails have been designated “multi-use” which do not qualify as such because they lack the width, grades and lines of sight necessary to be so designated. Almost every trail designated as multi-use has become a de facto bike trail. Equestrians should be able to persuade the City to widen some multi-use trails to make them safe, or create a few additional trails for equestrian/pedestrian use only, so that equestrians can, as a practical matter, enjoy use of the Preserve safely. As now implemented, the Preserve Trails Plan results in equestrians having lost the ability to safely ride in the vast majority of the Preserve. Limiting trail widths to 5 feet would be fine for any trail that is not designated multi-use, but multi-use trails should definitely be allowed to be wider than 5 feet. Further, by limiting all new trails to a maximum width of 5 feet it should be a proviso that any new trail is for equestrian and pedestrian use only.</p>	<p>cowbirds within the Preserve during that survey.</p> <p>XI. See Master Response No. 19.</p> <p>XII. See Master Response No. 20.</p> <p>XIII. Comment noted.</p> <p>XIV. See Master Response Nos. 8 and 9. The NCCP/HCP allows the City to convey incidental take to private property owners, greatly reducing permit processing time and significant cost borne by landowners from preparing associated plans and documents. The Wildlife Agencies will receive notification of public and private projects in the City through the CEQA notification process, and projects processed by the City will document their consistency with the NCCP/HCP during the appropriate CEQA review. These projects will be summarized each year in the Annual Report.</p> <p>XV. See Master Responses Nos. 9 and 13.</p> <p>XVI. See Master Responses Nos. 14, 16, 19, and 20, and Specific Response to Comment No. 56 (I).</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>XII. I am concerned about the ability of the City to “seasonally restrict access, if recommended by PVPLC, to certain trails to prevent disturbance of breeding activities” under 9.2.2.2 (7) (j). This could result in closure of an untold number of trails for months on end.</p> <p>XIII. I do not understand 9.2.3 which says “Cactus should be avoided and retained to the maximum extent possible.” How does one avoid and retain at the same time? This needs to be clarified.</p> <p>XIV. Ultimately what the NCCP does is create a City and PVPLC environmental protection agency and is tantamount to a new body of environmental laws created by the City when the City has no lawful power, acting alone, to enact ordinances that protect habitat. Only the federal and state governments have such legislative powers.</p> <p>XV. The NCCP makes it clear that if there was no NCCP (the No Action Alternative) there would be more disturbance and less mitigation. It is clear that the NCCP can be used as a vehicle to enable the City to prevent development that it does not want under the guise of enforcement of the NCCP’s provisions.</p> <p>XVI. The bottom line for me is that (i) private properties should not have any additional burdens placed on them beyond those that exist under state and federal law; (ii) mitigation measures imposed with respect to city projects should be equivalent to what would be required under federal and state laws so that excessive amounts of public property that can be used for parkland are not added to the Preserve; (iii) no mitigation should be required for non-native grasslands and if there is to be mitigation for native grasslands, the ratio should be lower; (iv) the provisions that I have pointed out</p>	<p>XVII. Staff has coordinated with the Wildlife Agencies on the response to public comment document, and will be available for questions at the October 29, 2019 City Council Meeting.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>that need to be corrected or clarified should be addressed, and (v) the use and width of trails should not be so restricted.</p> <p>XVII. Finally, I request that meetings between the staffs of the City and the Wildlife Agencies to fashion responses to comments received be held in public at open forums so that the residents can understand how the responses are developed and the thought processes behind them.</p>	
57	12/23/18	Jansen	<p>I am writing in support of the Natural Communities Conservation Plan under which the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve is established and maintained.</p> <p>As a resident of Palos Verdes Estates, frequent local hiker and environmental supporter, I urge you to support and pass the NCCP.</p>	Comment noted.
58	12/23/18	Yang	<p>It is important to me to protect the natural habitat and endangered species while also having the Nature Preserve open to the public for nature appreciation and hiking.</p>	Comment noted.
59	12/23/18	Cellier	<p>We support Alternative D of the NCCP.</p> <p>We believe that it is important to protect natural habitat and endangered species, while also having the Nature Preserve open to the public for nature appreciation and hiking.</p>	Comment noted.
60	12/23/18	Bain	<p>As a resident of Palos Verdes and a long-time supporter of environmentally sustainable public open space, it is extremely important to me that our government protect natural habitat and endangered species in the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve.</p> <p>Please support Alternative D.</p>	Comment noted.
61	12/23/18	Treherne	<p>I am a volunteer with the Land Conservancy and have been on and off for 28 years. I am in full support of the final approval of NCCP especially Alternative D. One of the main enjoyments living in PV for my family is the many hours we have all spent hiking and enjoying nature in the Preserve. I am currently a trail watch</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			volunteer. We would not enjoy living here so much if conditions changed in the Preserve. Everyone should be able to enjoy open space and nature. Unfortunately access to open space is disappearing, especially in Southern California. Most of my friends and neighbors also agree that having open space to enjoy nature has a positive effect on property prices, and so far we have all appreciated having access to it. Please approve NCCP so all of us and future generations will be able to enjoy the Preserve as we do today.	
62	12/25/18	Nicholls	As a local resident in Redondo, I have had a lifetime of enjoying the semi-rural nature of the PV peninsula. I have hiked it extensively and continue that pursuit to this day. Open area is unique and important and deserves to be protected. It is slipping away constantly bit by bit and is a true escape and outdoor resource needed in the time of urbanization. We need to leave something for those who follow. Please stop further development. We have also lost 60 % of animal species on the planet since the 60's. It's time think on a bigger scale then just further development	Comment noted.
63	12/26/18	Bjerke	The City of Rancho Palos Verdes and the Palos Verdes Land Conservancy have done a marvelous job of conserving a vast expanse of PV Peninsula to protect not only open space but also native plant and animal life. Many people in the Los Angeles area use the area daily for recreation and a breath of fresh air. Please protect this area.	Comment noted.
64	12/26/18	PVPFA	Please find attached a letter containing comments on the Rancho Palos Verdes NCCP/HCP. Attachment	See Master Response Nos. 14, 17, 19 and 20.
65	12/27/18	Snyder	I support the plan as proposed, due to the lengthy input of the pvplc.	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
66	12/27/18	Park	<p>I strongly support the City of Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Community Conservation Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan. I encourage you to approve and adopt it forthwith.</p> <p>I have lived in Rancho Palos Verdes for 12 years, but I joined the Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy long before I moved here, and contributed as much as I could to the land purchase and restoration efforts. I did so because I recognized that the benefits extended to communities far beyond Rancho Palos Verdes.</p> <p>When natural communities and wildlife are preserved and restored, everyone's quality of life is improved. I firmly believe that the preservation of rare, threatened and endangered species will, in the end, have a direct bearing on the survivability of the human species.</p> <p>The regional impact of the Nature Preserve is probably most obviously illustrated by its recreational use. Simple observation of the users makes it clear that they come from all over Southern California. While this use presents challenges around parking and habitat protection, it also makes it clear that the taxpayers are receiving a benefit from their investment.</p> <p>The establishment of the Nature Preserve reflects tremendous credit upon the State and Federal wildlife agencies, the City of Rancho Palos Verdes and the farsighted private citizens who have contributed so much to its establishment. Words fail me to adequately thank the State and Federal agencies involved for making this great accomplishment possible.</p> <p>Clearly, we in Rancho Palos Verdes are blessed to have this beautiful open space and its wildlife inhabitants in our community. But I try to be ever mindful of the contribution that our neighbors have made, and that it is good public policy to preserve these assets for the benefit of our large urban region.</p> <p>Thank you so much for all of your efforts over the years to make this spectacular achievement possible. Once again, I devoutly hope</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			that you will give final approval to the NCCP-HCP at your earliest convenience so that our restoration efforts may continue apace.	
67	12/27/18	Birkey	<p>On behalf of York Point View Properties, LLC, attached are comments on the Draft City of Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Community Conservation Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan and the Draft Environmental Assessment for the NCCP/HCP. Also included in these comments are comments on the Implementation Agreement for the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>Attachment</p>	<p>See Master Response Nos. 18, 19, and 21.</p> <p>The dedicated funding sources for the City's implementation of the NCCP/HCP are located in Section 8 of the NCCP/HCP and the associated Appendix C.</p> <p>The City and/or PVPLC, in coordination with the Wildlife Agencies, may apply for Federal section 6 Habitat Conservation Plan Land Acquisition grants that would complement the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>The PUMP is incorporated into the NCCP/HCP as Appendix H.</p> <p>The City, PVPLC, and the NCCP/HCP Working group, in coordination with the Wildlife Agencies, have worked to create a Preserve design that is robust and provides connectivity to extent possible within the City in support of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>Although the vegetation data are dated, they are the most recent comprehensive data available and represent the best available information for the City and Wildlife Agencies to analyze the NCCP/HCP.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
				The Draft NCCP/HCP, Draft Environmental Assessment, and associated documents were published in the Federal Register for two public comment periods in late 2018 and early 2019. See Master Response No. 7.
68	12/27/18	Chadwick	I have been gently hiking the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve with my husband since 1975. It is imperative that we preserve our major local resource for hike outings, and maybe more importantly, to protect what little remaining habitat we have along the coast. Our local preserve is home to many endangered species, including those of birds, butterflies, mammals, lizards, and Coastal Sage Scrub which I have taught Palos Verdes 3 rd graders about for 16 years as part of the PVPLC 3 rd Grade Nature Program. Without protection, the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve will become fragmented and uncertain. <u>Alternative D</u> , the Proposed Action, seems to be the most viable option and best compromise available at this time.	Comment noted.
69	12/27/18	Ryan	<p>I. I support efforts to preserve and conserve the plant life and wildlife that are recognized by the ESA, and I commend the PVP Land Conservancy in their tireless efforts to ensure that the existing plant and wildlife species in the 1550 plus acres under their control continue to survive and thrive.</p> <p>II. What I do oppose is the NCCP/HCP draft submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services by the City of RPV. I also oppose empowering the City of RPV and the PVP Land Conservancy by issuing an ITP which could impact private property development and result in the 'taking' of private property. There are many properties, especially larger ones in Portuguese Bend, that border the PVPLC preserve, and probably house many of the covered species. But many of us throughout RPV have incorporated California Natives in our</p>	<p>I. Comment noted.</p> <p>II. See Master Response Nos. 11-13 and 16. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.</p> <p>III. See Master Response Nos. 9 and 29.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>landscaping and enjoy the fauna that visit. Does that make us vulnerable to a 'taking'? This is very worrisome.</p> <p>III. Please consider Alternative (1) No Action Alternative. Return the City of Rancho Palos Verdes' draft of NCCP/HCP and request that the City work with a public panel, along with PVPLC and City RPV management to devise a draft that would continue to maintain and ensure protection, conservation and mitigation of the federally endangered/threatened species of plants and wildlife within the preserve, but not empower the City or management, in this case, PVP Land Conservancy, with an ITP, a blank check. Let's also curtail any enforcement of the City of RPV's current draft of the NCCP/HCP that has yet to be ratified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>	
70	12/28/18	Ailor	<p>In the late 1980s there were few places in the South Bay where a family could take a quiet walk in tranquil open space. Large areas of undeveloped natural open space were only available in the Santa Monica Mountains—an hour or more away through heavy traffic; the only large blocks of open space remaining locally were on the Palos Verdes Peninsula. The land was owned by developers, so development seemed inevitable.</p> <p>Residents of the Palos Verdes Peninsula, the South Bay and Los Angeles recognized that Peninsula open space resources were critical to their quality of life and to the preservation of rare plants and animals that found homes on this former Channel Island. They donated their time and talents to create a plan to acquire critical open space areas via voluntary transactions with willing sellers. With strong support from local cities, funds from local donors, and funds approved by voters for preservation of “critical natural habitat and open space,” over 1600 acres were preserved on the Palos Verdes Peninsula; 1400 of these acres are in the City of Rancho Palos Verdes.</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>Approval of the Natural Communities Conservation Plan will help assure the maximum protection of these areas and the coastal sage scrub habitat that the endangered coastal California gnatcatcher and other species use for food and shelter. The NCCP will also help assure that the trails and outdoor experiences offered by these areas will remain in perpetuity.</p> <p>We urge support for final approval of the NCCP/Habitat Conservation Plan for the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve and in particular, for Alternative D. Please help us complete the effort we initiated 30 years ago to preserve these special areas.</p> <p>Many thanks for your consideration.</p>	
71	12/28/18	Wilkinson	<p>The attached letter is in support of the NCCP for your immediate attention. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.</p> <p>Attachment</p>	Comment noted.
72	12/28/18	Baker	<p>As a 70 year resident of Rancho Palos Verdes, I strongly urge the final approval of the NCCP Alternative D.</p> <p>My family and I have, over the years, contributed to the acquisition of the Preserve and have enjoyed volunteering toward its restoration and hiking the trails of this precious gem of natural open space that enhances our special community. By protecting the coastal sage habitat and the wildlife that call it home (including threatened and rare species) the lives of our human inhabitants are enriched. To be able to take a hike and see red tail hawks circling overhead, hear the call of a California gnatcatcher and smell the sweet scent of purple sage is an experience to be savored.</p> <p>Our family looks forward to the NCCP finally becoming a reality.</p>	Comment noted.
73	12/28/18	Popoff	<p>I am writing to express my strong support for the final approval of the Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP), in particular, Alternative D. As a long-time resident in the vicinity of the Palos Verdes Peninsula, I have first hand experience of the</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>overwhelming benefits to not only the flora and fauna of our beautiful region, but also to the many people whose physical, mental, and emotional well-being have enhanced by the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve. Please vote in favor of final approval of the NCCP.</p> <p>Thank you for your serious consideration of this matter. I look forward to approval of the plan.</p>	
74	12/28/18	McLeod	<p>To relevant staff of the Fish and Wildlife Service-I am a resident of Palos Verdes Estates writing in support of final approval of the NCCP, in particular, Alternative D. As a former volunteer for the PVP Land Conservancy and participant in their guided hikes, I can speak personally to the beneficial effects of this wonderful preserve in multiple ways. It has been used to educate children and adults to the intricate network that binds all living things together. Far from favoring plants over humans as some have claimed, it is a place that allows humans, plants and animals to thrive as participants in the natural cycles of weather, geology and biology. Imagine if those hills were covered with roads, houses and shopping malls!</p> <p>Many people have worked for many years in many different ways to make the Conservancy into a place of refuge, renewal, recreation, research, education and involvement. The Conservancy represents partial compensation for the ways humans have appropriated natural areas for their own uses, especially economic benefit, eradicating all sorts of living populations repeatedly and without pause. We humans here have the chance to repay this debt in a small way by offering permanent protection to the land and species that so often we willfully ignore.</p> <p>I hope you will give this precious piece of land and the plants, animals and people who have benefitted from it the final approval as part of the Natural Communities Conservation Plan. Thank you for your attention.</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
75	12/28/18	Monks	<p>We object to the NCCP as currently drafted because the control and impact on private property suggested in the document is confusing. We mistrust the interpretation that there will only be benefits to private landowners as there doesn't seem to be any written protections for private property.</p>	<p>See Master Response Nos. 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.</p>
76	12/28/18	Sala	<p>I am writing in support of final approval of the NCCP, in particular, Alternative D.</p> <p>The Palos Verdes land Conservancy has been a part of my life ever since we moved to Rancho Palos Verdes over 24 years ago. Just this morning I was taking a hike along one of the many pathways, enjoying a magnificent view, thinking all the while what a gift it is to have access to nature so close to our homes. Truly, it is something worth saving – for ourselves, for each other, and for our children.</p> <p>Please finalize the NCCP for the City of Rancho Palos Verdes. It is a treasure not only to us, but to the entire Los Angeles Basin.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
77	12/28/18	Funk	<p>It appears to me that this draft NCCP is not compliant with the City of Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan. In many ways, it dilutes the Goals of preserving and enhancing: infrastructure, recreational open space, the Peninsula Wheel Trails Network, agricultural activities and the keeping of large domestic animals. The draft NCCP places restrictions on these activities in deference to native plants as does the PUMP.</p> <p>For several years, the RPV Staff has been recommending actions to the City Council as though the NCCP was approved and to be enforced. This has caused great harm to the quality of the facilities which the City is to maintain in the interest of the residents' health safety and welfare. To quote the Maintenance Superintendent, "The PVP Land Conservancy is interfering with my ability to apply best business practices."</p> <p>I will be asking the RPV City Council <u>not</u> to adopt this Plan unless all of the references to <u>avoiding</u> otherwise appropriate designs and</p>	<p>See Specific Response to Comment No. 1.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>engineering be removed. Management to “remedy the degradation” should be sufficient.</p> <p>Since the NCCP applies to the whole City and even impacts adjacent jurisdictions, I object to the restatement of the Preserve Trails Plan (Sections 5.4.2 and 9.2.1.1) as something to be kept up to date separately from the Trails Network Plan (TNP). In the interest of consistency, continuity, emergency access and evacuation corridors, all trail designs, use rules, signage and maintenance criteria should be governed and implemented by one document, the TNP. The Peninsula Wheel Trails Network (PWTN) should be the guiding priority. (Attached.) FYI. The PWTN was designed by the local Sierra Club to avoid isolating wildlife gene pools.</p> <p>The direction that the City will cease and desist all of their usual Capital Improvement Plans, repairs and maintenance that might result in the loss of Covered Species and/or their habitat is absurd. The quality of our infrastructure must not be infringed upon.</p> <p>The advantages of human access to open spaces and vista points are universally accepted. Most of those advantages are lost when humans are excluded in favor of “pure habitat”. The NCCP is not a local concept and I am offended by this effort to impose “pure habitat” regulations and penalties upon the residents, private property owners and citizens of this whole region.</p> <p>The California Coastal Trail is a Legislated objective and has been designated as our State’s Millennium Trail by our Former First Lady, Hillary Clinton. I question how any Agencies have the authority to obstruct that endeavor. Please do not approve the RPV Natural Communities Conservation Plan as drafted.</p>	
78	12/29/18	Warren	<p>About the Natural Communities Conservation Plan by the City of Rancho Palos Verdes now under consideration, as a conservationist I strongly believe the Nature Preserve should be designed to give full attention to preserving the natural environment with various</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>habitats which support the numerous endangered species, all of which should be protected.</p> <p>The Preserve should be open to the public for enjoying nature and hiking, which has minimum effect of the environment.</p>	
79	12/29/18	Cicoria	<p>I. I'm writing to you to urge final approval and adoption of the Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) and Habitat Conservation Plan for the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve. In particular, I support Alternative D. It's hard to believe that although we have been protecting and restoring habitat in the PV Nature Preserve as well as enjoying the trails therein for more than a decade as if it is "a done deal", it is only now in the stage of final approval.</p> <p>II. I support the NCCP for myriad reasons: the efficiencies of the NCCP program for the city of RPV (where I reside) to accomplish needed infrastructure projects; protection of open space for public enjoyment; and the conservation and restoration of critical habitat for at risk and endangered species on a broad scale rather than piecemeal.</p> <p>III. We have relied on the NCCP as if it was finalized and RPV City Councils over two decades have supported it. It is time to move forward with final approval and adoption. Rancho Palos Verdes has already accepted millions of dollars from donors, as well as from government agencies, to acquire for the PV Nature Preserve acreage that would otherwise have been developed, and more recently to support habitat restoration. Over more than a decade, RPV has benefited from more than two hundred thousand hours of volunteer time in furtherance of the NCCP goals. RPV has also relied upon the permitting aspects of the NCCP program for several public improvement projects, using the NCCP area as mitigation for project impacts.</p>	<p>IV. Between 2004 and 2019 the City reassessed the breadth and scope of projects covered under the NCCP/HCP permit. Losses of habitat was increased as a result of this assessment to allow the City flexibility and ability to optimally plan projects over the 40-year permit term. It is important to note that even though the City has the opportunity to utilize all of the habitat losses proposed in the NCCP/HCP, this total use may not be necessary to implement the covered projects/activities.</p> <p>X. Picnic tables were removed from the recirculated NCCP/HCP, and they will be removed from the PUMP at its next update.</p> <p>XI. See Master Response No. 22.</p> <p>XII. Cut and fill slopes will be evaluated per Section 5 of the NCCP/HCP and managed in accordance with the Habitat Impact Avoidance and Minimization Measures in NCCP/HCP Sections 5.5 and</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>IV. I should say that I was not pleased that in the past couple of years the City’s take authorization was increased from that set forth in the 2004 City Council-approved draft to what appears in this final draft. I understand that more acreage was enrolled into the NCCP than had been enrolled in 2004, but it was always the goal to enroll those additional acres in the NCCP. People who have contributed money and time to acquiring more land and to protecting and restoring the native habitat on the land since 2004 did not know that their efforts would lead to a larger take allowance (which translates to greater habitat destruction). We thought we were building upon what had been started. That said, my hope is that there will be ever-increasing awareness of the habitat impact minimization protocols in the NCCP as well as respect and appreciation for what has gone into the success of the ecological goals, such that much of the take allowance will never be drawn from.</p> <p>V. Nature needs a helping hand and we have an opportunity to lend that hand. Every day we hear of the awful impacts on nature wrought by one thing after another—filling in of wetlands or scraping of habitat to build homes, roads, infrastructure, agriculture, etc.; plastic and other debris filling the bellies of sea life; toxins decimating species; impacts of climate change—the list goes on and on. Here on the Palos Verdes Peninsula, we have some of the last remaining coastal sage scrub (CSS) habitat in the world. We have an opportunity to not only protect the habitat, but to enhance it, through implementation of the NCCP.</p> <p>VI. My family and I have contributed thousands—of dollars and volunteer hours—to protect these Preserve lands and, in particular, the essential balance of the NCCP that seeks to facilitate plant and animal species’ success while affording</p>	<p>5.6. It is important to note the difference between a covered project and activity. Projects are well-defined actions that occur once in a discrete location whereas activities are actions/operations that occur repeatedly in one location or throughout the NCCP/HCP plan area. Activities are not expected to result in permanent loss of habitat.</p> <p>XIII. The speed limit for construction vehicles was reduced from 20 mph to 10 mph in the recirculated NCCP/HCP as decided at the March 2018 City Council Meeting.</p> <p>XIV., XV., and XVI. The PUMP does not contain specific language that states trails should not be widened for multiuse trails. The PUMP states, “Generally, trails are to be maintained or designed for minimum impact on existing and potential habitat. Finally, the public uses and trail routes/configurations are situated to be compatible with the Preserve, avoid disruption of any native vegetation (including an emphasis on avoiding or minimizing impacts to coastal sage scrub), habitat, or wildlife</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>compatible public access to the Preserve trails. We believe strongly in this goal.</p> <p>VII. We humans need this. The PV Nature Preserve enhances our community and enriches our lives by affording us access to a bit of nature next door. The Preserve Trails Plan includes over 30 miles of trails for our enjoyment. Repeated studies have shown both physical and psychological benefits of natural open space and our personal experiences bear this out. Simply put, we feel better having spent time in the Preserve. Indeed, the Preserve trails have become very popular. Crowds, particularly at certain entrances and particularly on holidays and weekends, have presented some challenges for the City, but nothing that can't be worked out. And the vast majority of residents bordering the Preserve continue to support the passive recreational opportunities it affords us all.</p> <p>VIII. There are people whose focus is solely on the recreational opportunities the Preserve lands might afford and they are concerned that implementation of the NCCP might deprive them of those opportunities. They'd like to have unfettered access to the Preserve lands. For the most part, though, people understand that public recreational pursuits without some limitations would destroy the place. We've seen it.</p> <p>IX. My experience on the ground in the PV Nature Preserve tells me that there are actually particular provisions in the NCCP that are more permissive of recreational interests and other uses than they ought to be to advance the conservation, stewardship and ecosystem goals of the NCCP. I realize that others will disagree on this, but I want to take this last opportunity to reiterate some comments previously submitted that reflect some of my concerns.</p> <p>X. Allowing picnic tables in the Preserve (Section 5.4.2, bullet 5) is a very bad idea. It's not enough to consider whether or</p>	<p>as identified in the Natural Conservation Communities Plan (NCCP).”</p> <p>The measurement of trails for the baseline survey takes into account the 3 widest points, as well as 3 “control points,” that characterize the overall trail width. The control points will be recorded and used for monitoring purposes.</p> <p>XVII. The archery range was removed in the recirculated NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>XVIII. Comment noted.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>not the table placement disturbs habitat. The people using the tables will. And their litter will. We already see that small benches at the few overlooks we have in the PV Nature Preserve show concentrations of cigarette butts and other litter. Removing the litter that migrates into the nearby habitat then leads to further impacts.</p> <p>XI. Vehicle trips through the Preserve undoubtedly have impacts on wildlife. Therefore, it's not enough to require that authorized vehicles remain on particular trails that can accommodate them (Section 5.5, item 2). <u>Vehicle trips should be minimized</u>, just as other habitat and wildlife impacts should be minimized. Doing so will contribute to the overall success of the NCCP goals.</p> <p>XII. Cut/fill from slopes within the Preserve should be limited to major Covered Projects and not be permitted as a part of maintenance activities. (Section 5.5, item 8) We have seen Public Works and City contractor machinery dig into slopes in the course of maintenance activities, such as digging for soil to fill trenches created by rain runoff, disturbing habitat and leaving scars on the landscape.</p> <p>XIII. Setting a speed limit for construction vehicles (or any vehicles) at 20 mph within the Preserve (Section 5.5, item 9) makes no sense—not for habitat protection, not for species protection, nor for public safety. The speed limit should be much lower.</p> <p>XIV. Regarding trail widths (Section 9.2.2.2), during the two years that the public weighed in on development of the Public Use Master Plan (PUMP), we heard many, many opinions on trail width. It was very clear that there was a nexus between the goals of the NCCP (minimize habitat impacts) and the public in general (do not widen trails). Thus, before decisions were made regarding which user groups would be permitted on</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>particular trails, a commitment was made that trails would not be widened regardless of the use designation.</p> <p>XV. I previously made the following suggestions for Section 9.2.2.2, item 1 regarding trail widths: Under Baseline Trail Surveys, consider changing “3 feet” to “2 feet”, since some of our trails, particularly in densely CSS inhabited Forrestral Reserve, the trail bed is indeed that narrow and widening will impact the base of plants growing close to the trail bed, killing whole plants and leaving large, bare spots. And consider modifying the sentence to add the phrase in bold to the sentence “The final width determinations will take into consideration the current trail widths as documented by the baseline surveys, trail topography, nearby sensitive species and their habitats, trail prism, public use, the commitment during PUMP proceedings to not widen trails to accommodate use, and other factors.</p> <p>XVI. Also, in Section 9.2.2.2 item 2c, consider limiting the width of new trails to 3 feet. Even that is quite wide for the two areas where new trails are possible per the Preserve Trails Plan (between Three Sisters and Filiorum and off of Quarry Trail in Forrestral).</p> <p>XVII. As a clean-up item, the archery range is no longer within the Preserve, so bullet 7 of Section 5.4.2 should be deleted.</p> <p>XVIII. I believe that the best chance of ensuring long-term public access to the Preserve lands, while enhancing special species’ conditions and achieving ecological integrity on a broad scale within the PV Nature Preserve is to get all—land owner, management, and users—to focus on habitat impact avoidance and minimization day in and day out, lest the pendulum swing dramatically in one direction—degradation accompanied by failure to achieve species conservation goals—and then the other—minimizing public access in perhaps a last ditch effort to achieve those conservation</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			goals. On its face, the NCCP seeks to avoid those dramatic swings and if it takes a leap of faith to believe that is how the NCCP will be implemented, then let's take that leap and then work toward making it so.	
80	12/30/18	Sattler	Attached please find our comments on the RPV NCCP/HCP. Attachment	<p>See Specific Response to Comment No. 79 (IV).</p> <p>All landslide reduction measures within the Preserve or as projects covered in the NCCP/HCP will be completed in compliance with the NCCP/HCP and in coordination with the Wildlife Agencies and Preserve Habitat Manager, PVPLC.</p> <p>Clarifying language has been added to Sections 7.5.3 and 5.2.3. Temporary impacts refer to impacts that will not result in the permanent loss of the plant. Transplanted plants are considered successful mitigation when they meet the restoration site success goal described in 7.5.6 of the NCCP/HCP (e.g., percent cover over a certain timeframe).</p>
81	12/30/18	Nelson (1)	<p>I. The ITPs will be issued over time (as above, NCCP assumes 40 years). How many, items that would have been NCCP ITP items have been issued over the past year (2018), the past 5 years (2014-2018) by year? My assumption is a very small number.</p> <p>II. Cost effectiveness question. The NCCP /HCP will be a new 40-year daily management/maintenance effort covering our entire city. Additional manpower and costs are estimated to be?</p>	<p>I. See Master Response Nos. 4 and 32. The City signed a Planning Agreement for the Palos Verdes Peninsula NCCP Subarea in 1996, which afforded the City interim take exemptions under 4(d) of the ESA. Several projects have been authorized to move forward with interim habitat loss permits. Over the past several</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>III. The NCCP specifically focuses on only 3 species Federally listed in the EA. (2 butterflies, 1 bird) They don't walk across land, they fly across!!! Why is a significant 'land' corridor for their benefit being considered? Again, these species don't walk across land, they fly! There is nothing special about habitat in the area. These species are found throughout the preserve and provide plentiful food sources. For years there was no corridor, it suddenly appeared and now removes significant, valuable land, from the owner(s) enjoying its use. Again, the 3 Federally listed species fly, they don't walk! Remove the corridor! Restore it to what it was.</p> <p>IV. The inability for private parties to 'opt out.' Why? Until just recently (a March 2018 Council Video I'm told) it has been understood that they could. Now the NCCP" includes the entire boundary of the City of Rancho Palos Verdes" and private parties are forced into the NCCP. [Intro, pg. SJ Why was 'opt out' option removed?</p> <p>V. Affordability - cost question. Ties to #2 above. The city owns "Open Space Preserve" land and the PVPLC maintains it. What is the projected additional PVPLC total NCCP maintenance expense (RPV probably will budget these or be told to budget them)? PVPLC NCCP maintenance will be considerable and I feel citizens of RPV deserve to know what is that number.</p> <p>VI. Cost follow on question: Fuel modification. RPV and the PVPLC may say NCCP maintenance cost will be negligible but - consider fire danger. Open space maintained by PVPLC is 1,559 acres constituting a tinderbox ready to burn. During our years of drought PVPLC has made practically no effort at fuel modification by reducing plant growth in the Preserve. Instead PVPLC concentrates on annually restoring 5 acres to native plants (that also burn). So, of the forecasted NCCP additional cost, how much is being devoted to fuel</p>	<p>years significant public projects (about eight) are pending and are expected to be authorized by the City under the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>II. See Master Response No. 31. Because the City has been implementing the NCCP since 2004, there will be no new costs when the permits are issued.</p> <p>III. See Master Response No. 18. In addition to the three federally listed species. The NCCP/HCP working group also decided to include unlisted, sensitive species that could become listed during the permit term. Under CEQA, impacts to many of these sensitive species should be minimized or avoided. The corridor described in the comment has been in place from initial planning and is included in the 2004 draft NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>IV. See Master Response No. 18. The NCCP/HCP addresses coverage for all of the land within the City boundaries. We had agreements with Mr. York about the disposition of his property and its inclusion in the NCCP/HCP consistent with the 2004 version of the NCCP/HCP.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>modification to reduce /eliminate the well-known extreme fire danger to homes near the Preserve or "Open Space Preserve?" I have attached from RPV's Community Newsletter for Winter 2019 (the latest) the frontpage article on our fire risk, including a Cal Fire map of 'Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones' in RPV. It includes PVPLC's 'Open Space Preserve' land.</p> <p>VII. Enforcement of the NCCP /HCP /EA. We are talking the entire city, not just the preserve. These documents place numerous restrictions on 14,000 lots, thousands of 'Open Space Preserve' acres and public lands. All will need to be enforced (or this NCCP will quickly be forgotten by our public). How is RPV prepared to enforce these restrictions? RPV has two Code Enforcement staff enforcing all of our codes and now the restrictions of the NCCP. So I'll ask- how does RPV ever intend to enforce this NCCP? You, as a Federal Agencies, and our citizens need a concrete answer, not any 'to be addressed in the future' city 'spin.</p> <p>VIII. Opting out of/ cancelling the NCCP. How would RPV's Council go about that? 40 years is a long time. Time changes. City Council's change. Citizen appetite for these types of expenses will change. RPV ability to fund will change. Think of our multi-million dollar active major infrastructure efforts (stopping the landslide, new civic center) and pension growth. Citizen appetite for funding something placing restrictions on use of their property will wane.</p> <p>IX. I doubt our public is aware your 'Notice' clearly states on page 5 'Public use is also identified as a conditionally allowed use.' So we are paying for it but public use can be (and most say will be) denied? See questions 5 and 6. Sentence needs an eraser.</p>	<p>V. See Master Response No. 31.</p> <p>VI. See Master Response No. 21. The City is responsible for fuel modification on City-owned land. Additionally, in 2019, the City Council approved additional funding for fuel modification in response to increased fuel modification orders from the Los Angeles County Agricultural Commissioner/Weights and Measures Department. The City will be looking into appropriately revegetating fuel modification areas to reduce maintenance costs.</p> <p>VII. See Master Response No. 9 regarding how the NCCP/HCP will be implemented. The City's Code Enforcement Division will enforce the NCCP/HCP, and the Division's policy is to be reactive, unless dealing with an issue involving life or safety such as unpermitted construction. Moreover, the City's has enforcement personnel that patrol the Preserve.</p> <p>VIII. Provisions for termination (opting out) of the NCCP/HCP permits are located in Section 21 of the Implementing Agreement</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			Attachment	<p>and are generally as follows: Upon 90 working days written notice to the Wildlife Agencies, the City and/or PVPLC may surrender the permits and unilaterally withdraw from this agreement. The City shall provide written evidence to the Wildlife Agencies that the City has complied with all take minimization and mitigation obligations incurred under the permits in full compliance with the NCCP/HCP up to the date of withdrawal.</p> <p>IX. See Master Response No. 20.</p>
82	12/30/18	Snell (1)	<p>The plan for the City of RPV NCCP/HCP is incomplete and needs to address:</p> <p>I. The protection of Indian Well Spring and exclude Spring from “abatement of the slide” work without permit.</p> <p>II. Maintenance of the Fire Road for disaster evacuation and fire truck access to fight fires.</p> <p>III. Dead non-native branches, trees and weeds need annual removal in the Preserve at least 500’ from private properties.</p> <p>IV. Remove all non-native Acacia within the Preserve.</p> <p>V. Change Vanderlip Driveway in the General Plan from OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION to RESIDENTIAL.</p> <p>VI. Allow lot splits in Portuguese Bend Zone 2 so parcels sharing a boundary with the Preserve can build like all other lot owners as “...the purpose of the NCCP/HCP is to preserve</p>	<p>I. Projects and activities implemented under the permit will be in compliance with the Habitat Impact Avoidance and Minimization Measures detailed in NCCP/HCP Sections 5.5 and 5.6.</p> <p>II. See Master Response No. 22.</p> <p>III. See Master Response No. 21.</p> <p>IV. See Master Response No. 21.</p> <p>V. Vehicular access to Vanderlip Drive will be maintained. This issue will be addressed through the Preserve Access Protocol</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>contiguous open space areas for species preservation while allowing compatible economic growth..."</p> <p>VII. The protection of Indian Well Spring and exclude Spring from "abatement of the slide" work without permit. The Indian Well Spring needs to be protected in the Plan and currently it is not. Former City officials have comments on record that they can pump the spring dry by circumventing the permit approval process required by United States Fish and Wildlife Service & California Department of Fish and Wildlife by using the provisions in NCCP for "Landslide Abatement" to drain the over 2,000' long spring. Indian Well Spring has served as a watering hole for the wildlife in what is now known as the Preserve for thousands of years.</p> <p>VIII. Maintenance of the Fire Road for disaster evacuation and fire truck access to fight fires. This Fire Road provided an emergency escape route for those residences on Upper Narcissa east of Sweetbay and Vanderlip Driveway. The Plan is incomplete as it needs to provide maintenance of the Fire Road for use of fire trucks and those in vehicles evacuating when all other routes are blocked by fire or Earthquake damage or catastrophic failure of Portuguese Bend and Klondike slides. This critical Fire Road was properly maintained for years prior to NCCP Preserve. Native habitat near the road can be protected during the maintenance work which can take less than a day to perform, and it should be performed annually.</p> <p>IX. Dead non-native branches, trees and weeds need annual removal in the Preserve. The Plan needs to immediately provide for the removal of dead trees, brush, and weeds annually in the Preserve which is within 500 feet of private property outside of the Preserve for fire protection, especially in Portuguese Bend. The former owners of the land annually removed Acacia and mustard weeds along the boundaries</p>	<p>referenced in Master Response No. 22.</p> <p>VI. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (I).</p> <p>VII. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP. We forwarded the comment to the Community Development Department.</p> <p>VIII. See Master Response No. 22.</p> <p>IX. See Master Response No. 21.</p> <p>X. See Master Response No. 21.</p> <p>XI. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).</p> <p>XII. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP. We forwarded the comment to the Community Development Department.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>that were near homes. When the City purchased the property, the City halted L.A. County from discing weeds and removing trees long before placing the land in a Preserve. Now the City uses goats to eat the weeds in a very limited area which is not adequate.</p> <p>X. Remove all non-native Acacia within the Preserve. This non-native flora is a fire hazard and its allowance and continued growth in the Preserve should be curtailed. There is no immediate provision for the annual removal.</p> <p>XI. Change Vanderlip Driveway in the General Plan from OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION to RESIDENTIAL. Vanderlip Driveway could be easily removed from Nature Preserve designation. Grant deeds and easements allow for the 100 year old Vanderlip Driveway and it should not be considered Nature Preserve -attracting the general public and threatening future use of the Driveway. A mistake was made by the City by not deeding back the 100 year old driveway to the residences. This needs to be corrected.</p> <p>XII. Allow lot splits in Portuguese Bend Zone 2. The City of RPV should allow lot splits in Portuguese Bend Zone 2 “...allowing compatible economic growth...” which the City has no intention of doing. The City of RPV is not allowing lot splits especially for parcels that <i>share property lines with the Preserve</i>. New home building is allowed in Portuguese Bend on already split 1/2 acre lots however lot splits are not allowed for parcels to be split to one acre lots. This practice does not provide for “...allowing compatible economic growth...”</p> <p>XIII. The Draft Plan needs to go back to the City of Rancho Palos Verdes to correct these errors and more.</p> <p>Attachment</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
83	12/30/18	Thordarson	<p>I am writing in support of the NCCP for the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve, alternative D. I am a long-time resident of Rancho Palos Verdes and a supporter of open space in our community. Open space and wide open vistas of the ocean are what makes the palos verdes peninsula a special place. It is an oasis in the sea of suburbia that surrounds us. Human needs this type of space to decompress and get back in touch with nature.</p> <p>Rancho Palos Verdes City Councils have long supported the NCCP. I have contributed volunteer hours and money to restore the native plants of the coastal sage scrub. This is a rapidly disappearing habitat and one that should be protected. I actually thought that the NCCP was already a done deal and am surprised that it is not. Let's make it permanent once and for all.</p> <p>Please approve alternative D of the NCCP for the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve.</p>	Comment noted.
84	12/30/18	Wood	<p>I think it is vitally important to keep native habitat like the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve as open and natural as possible so diverse species of plants and animals can thrive in our urban area. Natural spaces like the Preserve are rare gems that connect people to nature and to the history of our area (as the people who lived here before - the Tongva/Gabrioleno - did not used to have so many housing developments as we do now). Also, the Nature Preserve's habitat benefit not only those that visit, but also those of us that live in the region.</p> <p>As one small example, many years ago, I noticed that the Palos Verdes blue butterfly had disappeared from my backyard. Now that habitat has been restored to it, I have been seeing it again. So even though I live in north Torrance, I still benefit from the Nature Preserve being there.</p> <p>Please opt for Alternative D, The Proposed Plan.</p>	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
85	12/30/18	Wood	I love to visit the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve to walk and enjoy the fresh air, lovely vistas, and see the native plants. Please opt for Plan D and keep this valuable open land for future generations.	Comment noted.
86	12/31/18	Hastings	<p>http://www.rpvca.gov/490/Palos-Verdes-Nature-Preserve-NCCP-PUMP-H</p> <p>Please see the map on middle right side showing green. Vanderlip Drive and the area on Narcissa below our property is green designating the Nature Preserve.</p> <p>The NCCP Draft Plan is before the Federal Wildlife Agencies with the comment period ending 12/31/2018. All announced in RPV newsletter of 2019.</p> <p>I thought the plan was to remove Vanderlip Driveway from Nature Preserve and give everyone more time to review the reports.</p> <p>I am respectfully making the request that this be done.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your attention to this.</p>	See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).
87	12/31/18	Adams	As a resident of Rancho Palos Verdes, I greatly value the PV Nature Preserve. I have hiked in it for more than thirty years. Having this open land is vital to my health and well-being. I have seven grandchildren, ages four to twenty-two. All of them and their parents have enjoyed the opportunity to utilize this beautiful natural feature. Before my late husband's death, he was a docent who led hikes through the preserve for school-age children. Please keep this preserve to maintain the ecological diversity needed in our environment.	Comment noted.
88	12/31/18	Lawson	<p>Please see attached documents pertaining to the RPV NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>Thank you for reviewing and considering my input.</p> <p>2 Attachments</p>	See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).
89	12/31/18	Holchin	I am a 45 year resident of the Palos Verdes Peninsula. I am an avid outdoorsman, hiker, backpacker, conservationist and environmental	Comment noted.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>activist. I would like to see the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve and consequent NCCP be continued in any manner that maximizes habitat preservation in perpetuity, placing recreational activities in a secondary position. Specifically, I believe that mountain biking activity of all forms has shown itself to be in conflict with habitat preservation, given the destruction that I have observed over the last many years from that activity. As I expected from the very beginning, enforcement of the regulations regarding mountain biking has proven to be ineffective and very expensive as well. No amount of effort, whether it be voluntary or paid in nature, is adequate to prevent or deter the destruction of habitat caused by a significant portion of the mountain biking community.</p>	See Master Response No. 19.
90	12/31/18	Mori	<p>I am a resident of Rancho Palos Verdes. Open space preserves and habitat protection are part of what makes RPV special. As such, the NCCP now in draft form is necessary to memorialize and formalize stakeholders' commitments.</p> <p>This email is sent to express my support of the NCCP for myriad reasons: the efficiencies of the NCCP program for the city of RPV to accomplish needed infrastructure projects, protection of open space for public enjoyment; and the conservation and restoration of critical habitat for at risk and endangered species on a broad scale rather than piecemeal.</p> <p>Though I prefer Alternative A, I will accept Alternative D.</p>	Comment noted.
91	12/31/19	Snell (2)	<p>Comments to Wildlife Agencies</p> <p>I would like to submit anonymous comments from people living on the Palos Verdes Peninsula who would like comments and clarification from RPV Staff but the City has been closed for the holidays.</p> <p>I. From Mira Catalina: "Frustrating to hear about this. It sets us up for potential disaster. Maybe too much money is going out of the budget to fight or pay (ridiculous) lawsuits instead. I only took a cursory look. Besides my comment above, i</p>	<p>I. Comments noted. See Master Response Nos. 3, 4, and 23.</p> <p>II. See Master Response No. 4.</p> <p>III. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>IV. See Master Response No. 21.</p> <p>V. See Master Response No. 16. Chapter 17.46 of the City's</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>have to wonder, did they really review this document before putting it out for comment? Seems it needs a good editor. There are references to wrong sections. Also, do they still want to recommend 'belling' of cats? Seems outdated. I'd like to see included in the plan the increasing population of destructive, nuisance coyotes addressed with more aggressive measures used as necessary. This is beyond their education efforts, which are limited in their effect."</p> <p>II. From Los Verdes: "Cheap BS right wing propaganda. The NCCP covers the Nature Preserves only, not the rest of RPV. At the end of the day, preserving nature will be the only thing that will preserve the human race. If indeed it can be preserved."</p> <p>III. From Miraleste: "Some of the same staffers on the ground floor of starting NCCP in RPV are the same staffers who allowed the Green Hill Mausoleum to be built 8 feet from townhomes in Lomita when the set back should have been 80 feet. The homeowners didn't know what the building was until there was a funeral at eye level from their second floor. Joel, Chris, etc."</p> <p>IV. From Rolling Hills: "It is not clear to me how much this is going to impact brush clearance. I am on the trails off Burma road almost 5 days a week. At the bottom of Gary's gulch trail the City did some weed whacking 2 months ago to make the trail wider but left behind massive amounts of dead brush including dead trees. There is easy access via a gated road and the area is adjacent to many homes on the Vanderlip Dr. It is unclear to me why the City did not do more."</p> <p>V. From Portuguese Bend: "A second reading always brings up new 'glitches.' The current RPV Municipal Code does not require a Conditional Use Permit nor a large Domestic Animal Permit to keep up to four horses per parcel within</p>	<p>Municipal Code allows the keeping of up to four large domestic animals without a permit in the Q-district depending on the size of the lot. A Large Domestic Animal Permit or Conditional Large Domestic Animal Permit is required under certain conditions in the City's Q-District. Per the NCCP/HCP, a new facility would be subject to the cowbird trapping program.</p> <p>VI. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP. Crime should be reported to the Lomita Sheriff's Department.</p> <p>VII. Comment noted.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>one of RPV's four 'Q Zone' overly districts. All of Elin Vanderlip's original property is in the PB Equestrian District. New corrals is a whole other issue depending on how Staff chooses to interpret 'new' applications. There used to be and may still be a cowbird trapping program down along the bluff top at Trump. As far as I know, even the Ishibashis never kept any of their mules down there. Everybody switched to tractors by 1948. Cowbirds are a 'fake' problem. That 'condition' should be removed from the 'Wildlife Agencies' approval. If not, our City Council should nix it if they haven't got the guts to nix the whole thing. Like the General Plan update, this version of an NCCP appears to be too complicated for our current City Council Members to pick apart. We all need to find a different way to explain to them the cumulative impacts as opposed to each of our special interests."</p> <p>VI. From Crest: What can be done about the homeless living in the Preserve who come into the Peninsula Center to shoplift?</p> <p>VII. There are many more comments from anonymous people about fire danger and loss of property rights under NCCP which will be paraphrased in another email. Most of these individuals did not know about the Draft.</p>	
92	1/4/19	Daly	<p>I lived in the city of RPV for 24 years and although I've recently moved to Redondo Beach I enjoy hiking the beautiful trails in the RPV hills, and I keep up with land development activity in that area.</p> <p>I would like to express my concern about the recent RPV NCCP/HCP draft:</p> <p>I. I do not think it is fair (or possibly legal?) to acquire privately-owned land without purchasing it. It seems that the draft NCCP/HCP is stating that the intent is to basically acquire a private owner's property in RPV without fair</p>	<p>I. See Master Response Nos. 11-13.</p> <p>II. Comment noted.</p> <p>III. See Master Response No. 19.</p> <p>IV. Comment noted.</p> <p>V. See Master Response No. 18.</p> <p>VI. Comment noted.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>compensation. When homes are demolished to put in a freeway aren't the owners compensated for this "taking"?</p> <p>II. I would like part of any new nature preserve to include areas for hiking and bird photography</p> <p>III. I would like more trails</p> <p>IV. Please reconsider your position of granting 40 acres of the York property to the "Preserve". This is unfair and unjust.</p>	
93	1/7/19	Snell (3)	<p>I. Why would the City of RPV not be protecting California Quail and other native birds from Coyotes? RPV could take the money from their annual fund to pay for counting, trapping and relocating Peafowl to trapping Coyotes in areas where the Quail are. Protecting the Quail from Coyotes should have been addressed in the City of RPV NCCP/HCP Plan.</p> <p>II. I would like an extension of time to properly review the Draft.</p>	<p>I. The NCCP/HCP addresses impacts and mitigation for covered projects/activities proposed by the City and private entities within the City. Addressing impacts from naturally occurring predator – prey interactions is beyond the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p>
94	4/9/19	York	<p>I. The current draft of the RPV NCCP/HCP does not appear to have changed much from the March 2018 draft.</p> <p>II. The NCCP/HCP continues to contain the requirement that "any development" on our 94 acre property must require a minimum dedication of 40 acres to the NCCP/HCP preserve, regardless of the impact or magnitude of that development. This requirement is improper on its face because the NCCP/HCP makes no effort to justify this arbitrary number of acres for "any development," while the remainder of the NCCP/HCP carefully applies ratios of habitat disturbed to justify habitat required to be preserved. The NCCP/HCP itself shows that the arbitrary 40-acre demand is, among other things, an illegal and unconstitutional "taking" of our property.</p>	<p>I. See Master Response No. 18.</p> <p>II. See Master Response No. 18.</p> <p>III. No update available at this time.</p> <p>IV. The section 6 grant proposals continues to be evaluated by the Service's Headquarters.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>III. As you know, we have filed an application for a 37 lot residential project on our property. Today, after considerable additional expenses, we have filed with city staff documents and answers to respond to their questions on our project application. Due to topographic, spatial, and other significant constraints, the arbitrary 40-acre dedication requirement makes this project impossible! In addition, we received the City's "approval letter" for our Landslide Moratorium Exception Permit and it makes clear that the City is interpreting the terms of the HCP/NCCP as authorizing it to demand 40-acres dedicated for the impacts of a single home. That is an entirely unjustifiable exaction.</p> <p>IV. Section 4.4 of the NCCP "Other Private and Public Targeted Lands for Dedication to the Preserve (170.7 acres) states "The City and/or PVPLC, in coordination with the Wildlife Agencies, may also apply for a Section 6 Habitat Conservation Plan Acquisition grant that would complement the NCCP/HCP." What is the status of the grant request?</p>	
95	5/1/19	Cicoria	<p>I. I'm finding some additional items to comment upon in the NCCP (several are just cleanup items) and in my review have been looking for the provision in the PUMP that stated trails will not be widened for use/multi-use. You and I know that was a condition of the PUMP Committee recommendations for particular uses (why, for example, Landslide Scarp was recommended for equestrian/pedestrian use when it is basically a single track trail) and I recall that was in the original PUMP document. Can you direct me to that provision? Section 9.2.2.2 of the NCCP becomes problematic in discussing "appropriate" trail width, stating "taking into consideration the PUMP" if the PUMP does not include the prohibition on widening trails for use.</p> <p>II. Also, what is the thinking in that section 9.2.2.2 of the NCCP referring to taking measurements at 3 points along 3 of the</p>	<p>I. There is no specific language that states trails should not be widened for multiuse trails. The PUMP states, "Generally, trails are to be maintained or designed for minimum impact on existing and potential habitat". Moreover, public uses and trail routes/configurations are situated to be compatible with the Preserve, avoid disruption of any native vegetation (including an emphasis on avoiding or minimizing impacts to coastal</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>widest trail sections? Again using Landslide Scarp and Panorama Trails as examples, but it could be any of a number of trails, there are segments that are several feet wide (in the case of Panorama, at Burma Rd I'd venture the trail is 8-10 feet wide). It doesn't seem practical or desirable to categorize these trails as particular widths and I fear provides yet another entre for those who want to widen trails for use or managerial "efficiency".</p>	<p>sage scrub), habitat, or wildlife as identified in the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>II. The measurement of trails for the baseline survey takes into account the 3 widest points, as well as 3 "control points," that characterize the overall trail width. The control points will be recorded and used for monitoring purposes.</p>
96	5/4/19	Snell (4)	<p>I. Reference Figure 2-2. Existing Land Use within Rancho Palos Verdes Map on page 26 in the Final Draft of March 2018: The lot along Vanderlip Driveway assessor #7572-002-026 shows on the Legend as Vacant in error. The property is not vacant and needs to be shown as Single Family Residential. It appears to be a silly error as multiple Vacant lots in the area show as Single Family Residences. Even York's vacant property that the City wants to "take" shows as SFR.</p> <p>II. What does the shading indicate at #6 and the bottom of 10, 20 and 60 indicate? There should be no shading.</p> <p>III. When will this map be corrected?</p>	<p>I. The map has been corrected and is included in the NCCP/HCP that will be for consideration at the October 29, 2019, City Council Meeting.</p> <p>II. The light gray shading indicates neutral lands. Many figures are general maps showing approximate land use designations.</p> <p>III. See Specific Response to Comment I. above.</p>
97	5/4/19	Snell (5)	<p>FIGURE 4-17. Neutral Lands pg 83.</p> <p>I. What are the greyish color marks on the residential parcels at #6, 10 and 20 Vanderlip Driveway? The map should have no shaded areas for these parcels and there are NO Neutral Lands by 4.5 definition.</p> <p>II. The Neutral Lands shown on the map is way too wide for Altamira Canyon. Most of the properties that include Altamira Canyon have been developed since the 1950-1960's under LA County approval long before RPV was</p>	<p>I. See Specific Response to Comment No. 96 (II)</p> <p>II. See Specific Response to Comment No. 96 (II)</p> <p>III. The current definition is correct.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>incorporated. Why were already build on properties marked Neutral Lands?</p> <p>III. Should the explanation of Neutral Lands from “...currently undevelopable lands...” to “already built on” or “already developed” or “part of the developed parcel is not built on”?</p>	
98	5/4/19	Snell (6)	<p>I. Reference FIGURE 4-8 & 4-15. The head of the spring is located in the East Fork of Altamira Canyon about 1000’ above Vanderlip Driveway and the abandoned Fire Road. Aka: Indian Well Spring or Kelvin Canyon Spring. Which Management Unit is the head of the SPRING located in?</p> <p>II. Why is such a valuable resource not represented in this Plan with specific comments on what the City is planning to do? I last heard that the City wanted to pump out the spring water as a project for ACLAD slide abatement.</p> <p>III. How is one advised what the City is planning in the creek beds in both branches of Altamira Canyon?</p> <p>IV. When will the acacia be removed from the creek area?</p>	<p>I. Filiorum Reserve.</p> <p>II. This was outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>III. The City provides updates on upcoming City projects and activities in the Preserve through its Preserve listserv group and at quarterly Preserve Public Forums. Please visit www.rpvca.gov for more info.</p> <p>IV. There is no plan to remove acacia from the creek area. Fuel modification is detailed in Master Response No. 21.</p>
99	5/4/19	Nelson (2)	<p>I. Again, only 3 species are Federally listed. We are adopting RPV’s NCCP at a cost of millions to protect two Federal species found in the Preserve! Kinda reminds some of the smelt fiasco up north!</p> <p>II. Binder: Cover page states the order is 1. NCCP/HCP; 2. Implementing Agreement. In my copy these were reversed; the Implementing Agreement was the 1st section and the NCCP/HCP was in the 2nd section. Should be reversed to correct to the Cover Sheet or change the Cover Sheet listing order.</p> <p>III. Table of Contents: Pgs. iii, iv and v. Two lists of exhibits; one (pg. v) clearly states what each exhibit</p>	<p>I. See Master Response Nos. 3 and 6. One goal of the NCCP/HCP is to provide incidental take permits associated with covered projects and activities for listed species and address unlisted, sensitive species that may become listed during the permit term. Many of these species are addressed during the CEQA process. The intent of the</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>covers; the other (pgs. iii, iv) simply says Exhibit A through Exhibit E without any further detail. So we need to state 1. what are these unstated exhibits and 2. correct Exhibit D contents.</p> <p>IV. Pg. iii and iv: Now: As follows: no explanation of what each covers. Exhibit A City of RPV NCCP/HCP, Exhibit B, Exhibit C, Exhibit D, Exhibit E. Each letter should add what it covers and pages numbers as below: Exhibit A: pg. 54: Model Certificate of Inclusion, Exhibit B: pgs. 55-60: City Interim Resource Protection Ordinance, Exhibit C: pg. 61: Species Covered Under the Plan, Exhibit D: pgs. 62-82: Management Agreement between RPV and PVPLC, Following Exhibit D the Table of Contents omits the following additional Exhibits found in the Implementation Agreement. Since there are duplicate letters, change the letter designation shown and add each to the Table of Contents. Letter shown is what is in the Agreement's Exhibits. Exhibit A: pgs. 83-84: Map of Preserve Properties Managed by PVPLC, Exhibit B-1: pgs. 85-86: PVPLC Obligations (updated 11/30/2011), Exhibit B-2: pgs. 87-89: City of RPV Obligations (updated 11/30/2011), Exhibit B-3: pgs. 90-92: PVPLC Permissive Activities (updated 11/30/2011), Exhibit C: pgs. 93-104: Oceanfront Estates Management Requirements, Exhibit D: pgs. 105-108: Donor Recognition, Naming Criteria, Sites, * Pgs. 109-116: Amendments to RPV-PVPLC Management Agreement, *belongs after Exhibit D, pgs. 62-82: "Management Agreement between RPV and PVPLC," not here. ** Pgs. 117-118: Preserve Maps, **belongs after 2nd Exhibit A, pgs. 83-84: "Map of Preserve Properties Managed by PVPLC, Exhibit E: pgs. 119-132: Conservation Easement (RPV to PVPLC), Pg. v: Again lists some Exhibits with explanations but manages to</p>	<p>NCCP/HCP is to provide a streamlined approach for projects and conservation and to provide certainty to landowners.</p> <p>II. Correction noted.</p> <p>III. Correction noted.</p> <p>IV. Comment noted.</p> <p>V. Comment noted. Acronyms and Abbreviations can be found on Page ix of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>VI. Comment noted. The reader is directed to broad sections of the document where the entire section applies to the reference.</p> <p>VII. Comment noted. The NCCP/HCP is intended to be the document that describes the details pursuant to the section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA requirements.</p> <p>VIII. Correction noted.</p> <p>IX. See Master Response No. 20.</p> <p>X. See Master Response No. 21.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>avoid many! Page v should simply be deleted as correcting as above will complete the Exhibit list correctly. What got my attention was the Table of Contents using just letters with no content info, then calling out 57 pages of Appendix D “Donor recognition, Naming Criteria, Sites.” I know better! We don’t have anywhere near 57 pages of Donors! So when I got into those pages I found what should be and is listed above! Your call if you make those corrections.</p> <p>V. Add Acronym list (to avoid reader bewilderment as to what NEPA, PAP, SSC, ESHA, PHMP, ACOE etc. are and their added complications. (In my former employment we had hundreds of acronyms but, if you used one, you first wrote it out then paren the acronym, for example, Rancho Palos Verdes (RPV). Should be mandatory here because many reading / implementing these requirements may not, in reality, have a clue what some acronyms mean.</p> <p>VI. Vague references: Throughout the Implementation doc the Plan (NCCP) is cited or referred to but without anything more than something like ‘Section 5.7 of the Plan.’ Normally you would expect a Plan title and page number to follow that reference as “section 5.7: title, pgs. x-x”. I spent hours going back and forth from Implementation to the NCCP or Appendix double-checking and writing these details above these vague references!</p> <p>VII. Pg. 15: 3rd sentence: ‘All of the lands to be dedicated to the Preserve are identified in Table 4-1 and figure 4-2 of the Plan ... “THESE REFERENCES ARE NOT IN THE IMPLEMENTATION DOC, THEY ARE IN THE NCCP DOC. Might want to make that clear. Readers could spend considerable time hunting for most</p>	<p>XI. Comment noted.</p> <p>XII. See Master Response No. 31.</p> <p>XIII. Comment noted.</p> <p>XIV. See Master Response Nos. 6 and 18.</p> <p>XV. Staff time required to implement the NCCP/HCP is listed in the cost analysis located in Appendix C of the NCCP/HCP. See Master Response No. 31.</p> <p>XVI. The Preserve Access Protocol will be approved by the City Council at a public meeting and implemented consistent with the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>XVII. All code amendments will be conducted in public meetings. Again, we do not expect substantial revisions because the City has been implementing the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>XVIII. See Master Response No. 31.</p> <p>XIX. Assured funding sources are detailed in Master Response No. 31. Additionally, the Wildlife Agencies worked</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>references as they study the implementation requirements. But why don't we show immediately in the Implementation doc what lands are covered? Why go to a 2nd doc to find that out?</p> <p>VIII. Pg. 15: 7.3 (Neutral Lands) 2nd sentence: Approximately 1,696.7 acres ... exist outside the Preserve Boundary (see Section 4.5 and Figure 4-5 of the Plan). "Figure 4-5" should be "Figure 4.17 Neutral Lands" found on page 83. Figure 4-5 in the Plan is on page 66 labeled "Figure 4-5: Vista del Norte Management Plan." For clarification, might want to make that change.</p> <p>IX. Pg. 18: Public Use: "Public access to the Preserve is <i>conditionally</i> allowed for passive recreational purposes" The word '<i>conditionally</i>' needs definition. Can be interpreted (and is in some quarters) as 'temporary until Preserve advises city they no longer want the public to access their land (even though city owns it!). Need something like "Public access is perpetually guaranteed unless any of the following has occurred ... (ex: fire, landslide)."</p> <p>X. Pg. 19: Preserve Management: 8.3.3: "... 10) Maintenance of fire/fuel buffers ..." Cannot be emphasized enough. The Preserve has significantly burned in the past, taking homes, and today, if you just give available Preserve fuel a cursory glance as you drive by, you'll understand nothing real has been done for 'fuel modification' with the resultant liability to the city (which owns the land) for the next Portuguese Bend – Preserve fire.</p> <p>XI. Pg. 19: 8.6: Restrictions ... For Projects/Activities Abutting and Adjacent to the Preserve: The Plan (NCCP) includes measures to address Project and</p>	<p>cooperatively with the City and PVPLC to secure millions of dollars in state and Federal grants for the acquisition of Preserve land, and resource enhancing projects. The grant funding from the Wildlife Agencies supports the baseline conservation for the NCCP/HCP. The City, Wildlife Agencies and PVPLC continue to work cooperatively to identify grants to augment the operation of the Preserve.</p> <p>XX. The EIR referenced in this section of the Implementing Agreement is for the NCCP/HCP. It will not apply to individual projects covered by the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>XXI. See Master Response Nos. 24 and 26. PVPLC will continue to restore 5 acres of habitat annually as established in the NCCP/HCP and in the Management Agreement between the City and PVPLC, on the City's behalf to meet the City's NCCP/HCP habitat restoration requirements.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>Activities that are abutting or adjacent to the Preserve "... the CITY shall ensure restrictions and requirements listed in Section 5.7 of the Plan" Plan 5.7: pgs. 114-115: new developments: fencing, lighting, equestrian, landscaping, stormwater and urban runoff and might say that here.</p> <p>XII. Pg. 22: 10.1 Obligations of the CITY: ... "funding of the Plan (NCCP) ... the CITY will fulfill its funding responsibilities identified in Appendix C (Exhibit C-2) of the Plan" OK. There is no Appendix C in the Implementation Agreement that corresponds to 'funding.' But in the City of RPV NCCP/HCP mammoth separate 'Appendix' section there is! Appendix C is 57 pages; what RPV's real funding of the Preserve - NCCP will be, is well hidden! Pg. 47 of C-2) ends at RPV funding \$1,286,209 per year in perpetuity (both term and post term) vs. PVPLC's annual \$19,460 for term and \$5,000 post-term! And our Council, representing or 42,000 citizens, signed up for those numbers! No other Palos Verdes city is contributing a dime, at least is not listed. Starting at \$100,000 in 2004, the RPV escalation deserves serious fiscal investigation – who, what, where, when, why type of how did our citizens get into this and do they know? It seems if PVPLC wants anything like a truck just come to the Council and it's yours! But what will the number be like in 10, 20, 30, 40 years? When will citizens draw the line? It's been 15 years and the Preserve amount has grown 1300%! Do the math for the next 20 years! Do the citizens know? Should they? Council decision. For two species found in the Preserve!</p> <p>XIII. Pg. 23: 10.1.1: 3rd line: References the Plan, Table 4-1 and Figure 4.2 which are unreadable. Data too compressed – probably.</p>	<p>As established in the Management Agreement, the City pays the PVPLC the annual sum of \$100,000 (2006) baseline payment in cash. In addition to the Preserve management payment, the City pays PVPLC the annual sum of \$15,000 (2007) baseline payment) cash to perform the habitat and trail maintenance responsibilities on the City's Oceanfront Preserve properties. Each is increased annually for inflation based on the Consumer Price Index for Los Angeles County for all consumer for the month of February of each calendar year. The \$50,000 figure refers to the mitigation fee for private development; mitigation shall be provided by the project applicant by the payment of a Mitigation Fee to the City's Habitat Restoration Fund discussed in the amount of \$50,000 per acre based on the total mitigation acreage required. The PVPLC and City worked together to determine that \$50,000 (in</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>XIV. Pg. 23: 10.1.1: 2nd paragraph: ‘Targeted Lands’: references Plan section 4.4. Plan pg. 78 Section 4.4.5 specifically addresses what I am told is potentially inverse condemnation and /or ‘taking’ of 40 acres to provide a land corridor for 2 federal species that fly, don’t walk. Many question why seize a land corridor for a butterfly and bird – both fly – don’t walk! Council decision what to do.</p> <p>XV. Pg. 23: 10.1.2: Management of the Preserve System: “The CITY through the PVPLC shall manage the Preserve in perpetuity in accordance with the PHMP (no acronym definition provided) and other plans described in sections 8,0 and 9.0 of the Plan.” Suggest here, in the Implementation Agreement, we list all the plans that will have to be done to complete this. Further, in Section 10.1.3 “City Implementation Process” a hint at the massive workload facing the city: “ interim and permanent regulatory measures including codes, ordinances, policies ... guidelines for operations and management of public lands ... will provide interim protection to habitat lands etc..” Then “Entitlements will not be provided without compliance with ... (now pg. 24) General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, Grading Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance and any other applicable provisions of the Municipal Code ... the CITY shall amend ... General Plan, Municipal Code, Zoning Map and CEQA Guidelines ...” Thought is – you are here, reading how to implement this and you’ll not get a clue about any specificity for these extensive plans, ordinances, etc. that will be required to make this NCCP work. I took a peak and it is years of employment for our Planning Staff (drafting, continually revising) or a chance to favor a consultant with these years!!</p>	<p>2013 dollars) is the amount needed to restore and maintain 1 acre of coastal sage scrub habitat. The Mitigation Fee will be reviewed annually by the City and, if necessary, adjusted to account for inflation and/or higher-than-expected restoration and management costs. Master Response No. 31 identifies financial obligations of PVPLC, which is a co-applicant for the permits.</p> <p>XXII. Please see Page xi. of the NCCP/HCP for the list of acronyms and their associated definitions. TERPP is an acronym for Targeted Exotic Removal Plan for Plants. Section 7.6 of the NCCP/HCP addresses the TERPP.</p> <p>XXIII. Section 7.7.1 of the NCCP/HCP states that “Reintroduction is not a requirement of the NCCP/HCP or Permits.” Reintroduction may be a management tool that the Wildlife Agencies, the City, and other partners could</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>XVI. Pg. 24: 2nd paragraph: “Within 90 days of ... Permits ... the City and PVPLC shall develop and submit to the Wildlife Agencies a PAP (no acronym definition) to facilitate access by utility agencies and ... Public Works to areas within the Preserve.” Who will approve this for the CITY? Planning Commission, Council? Might also want the Portuguese Bend Community Asso (PBCA) to sign off since much of this travel will be in their area.</p> <p>XVII. pg. 24: 10.1.5: “Revisions to CITY Ordinances, regulations ... submitted to Wildlife Agencies for review and comment at least 60 days prior to adoption by City. Could we include having public input on the revisions? I’m not in favor of ignoring public input in either these formulative or revision documents and I don’t find anything saying there will be any public input. Tells me the PVPLC and CITY don’t want their citizens involved ... I understand – the rationale is normal citizens won’t understand what is being proposed so why have them involved? RPVers are starting to see a lot of this rationale employed but they are not stupid when it comes to their elected representatives or tax dollars.</p> <p>XVIII. Pg. 25: 10.2: PVPLC Obligations: Question why “the CITY is liable for any violation of the Permits or failure on the part of the PVPLC during the 40 year (or is it 50 year?) term (isn’t it ‘in perpetuity’) to carry out its assigned obligations <i>will be</i> under the Plan.” Sentence reads rough. Think the end should be “assigned obligations under the Plan,” deleting ‘will be.’ Interesting the City will carry out PVPLC’s obligations ... any cost set aside?</p> <p>XIX. Pgs. 25, 26: Obligations: It should be noted that when it comes to funding, this section states the obligations of our USFWS and CDFW (no acronym provided) include</p>	<p>implement in the figure, if appropriate.</p> <p>XXIV. See Specific Response to Comment No. VII to Specific Response to Comment No. 81 above.</p> <p>XXV. Management goals are discussed throughout the NCCP/HCP. Section 9 of the NCCP/HCP discusses the assessment that will be performed every three years that identifies the management goals for specific habitat and species conservation targets. Accomplishment of the management goals will be measured and reported.</p> <p>XXVI. See Master Response No. 20.</p> <p>XXVII. Comment noted.</p> <p>XXVIII. The Preserve Habitat Management Plan was approved by the City Council at a public meeting in 2007 as a component of the draft NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>XXIX. The annual coordination meeting is not a public meeting. The City and PVPLC coordinate quarterly</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>“cooperate with the CITY in obtaining additional funding from various sources to implement the Plan.” How they would do that (put an amount in their budget, take from their ‘rainy day’ funding, etc.) would be assurances here that these are real commitments. Maybe an additional sentence to that effect could be added.</p> <p>XX. 10.4.1: CEQA: “... the EIR prepared ... with this Plan ... will operate as a ‘program’ EIR... the CITY will use the EIR ... in evaluating future land use decisions, and in issuing any permits or other approvals within the Plan Area.” SUGGEST THIS DICTA BE SOFTENED. The Plan Area is defined as all of RPV. This says no land use decision can be made without applying the forthcoming NCCP EIR. That just gives staff another reason to say applications are ‘incomplete,’ something our citizens realize and duck under with weekend projects rather than sometimes waiting months for their application to be complete. Understand, staff has no firm checklist for what constitutes a complete application. Our citizens can be told its complete one day and a week later told it is not! This EIR simply reinforces delays and encourages work arounds. Soften it. Say staff has x days to issue permit or assign to Planning Commission.</p> <p>XXI. Pg. 27: 11.2 Habitat Restoration Plan: “The CITY shall be required to restore ... 5 acres of habitat each year ... Restoration shall ... establish native habitat in areas currently dominated by non-native habitat ... based on a 3 year Restoration Plan ... developed by the PVPLC in coordination with the CITY and Wildlife Agencies.” 5 acre restoration has been the job of the PVPLC, not the CITY. This is new. At what cost? \$50,000 per acre? Think this was PVPLC’s estimate. Right or wrong? Why is PVPLC determining RPV’s statement of work? Since City of RPV NCCP/HCP when? This needs revision,</p>	<p>Preserve Public Forums, which are calendared on the City’s website. Agendas and minutes are likewise published on the City’s website.</p> <p>XXX. Thank you. The City will continue to conduct activities in perpetuity pursuant to its obligations.</p> <p>XXXI. The numbers are correct. See Master Response No. 31. The costs are broken into costs to fulfill the conservation requirements of the permit, and costs related to land ownership and public access. Additionally, a grand total is provided. Please see Appendix C of the NCCP/HCP for additional funding information.</p> <p>XXXII. See Specific Response to Comment XXXI. Directly above.</p> <p>XXXIII. Comment noted.</p> <p>XXXIV. Comment noted. Changed Circumstances is a legal term for the HCP and Acts of God is not an acceptable example in this context.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>back to a PVPLC effort. RPV is in its budget cycle and where is it in the new budget?</p> <p>XXII. Pg. 28: 11.3: A reason for acronym definition: "PVPLC shall conduct weed control activities in fulfillment of the CITY's obligation through the TERPP as described in Section 7.6 of the Plan." As the person in charge of this Implementation Agreement, you totally understand all this, don't you? 1. What us TERPP? 2. What is Section 7.6 of the Plan?</p> <p>XXIII. Pg. 24: 11.4: Covered Species Reintroduction. Section 7.7 of the Plan addresses reintroduction of Covered Species ..." But then it says Reintroduction is not a requirement under the NCCP/HCP or Permits." So why is this section included? Obviously the CITY will not pay for something not part of the NCP! Right? The topic is not part of these documents! Delete it or get questions of why talk about it.</p> <p>XXIV. Pg. 29: 12.0: Monitoring, Management and Reporting: 1st paragraph: 1. "In collaboration with the CITY, PVPLC shall address management and enforcement issues ... along with remediation or Adaptive Management strategies." Adaptive Management is not explained. Enforcement is the elephant in the NCCP room! RPV has 2 code enforcement staff, overwhelmed with idiocy like AirBNB enforcement depriving our citizens of their livelihood as well as tracking the 4 lots (out of 14,000) deemed 'party houses. And we pay over \$500,000 to our Sheriff for Preserve enforcement but ... now we are talking about enforcing the NCCP restrictions over our entire city. Can I tell you? This will not happen, despite all the good intentions of the Agencies and CITY. Stephen Foster composed 'Beautiful Dreamer' to cover just such dreams!</p>	<p>XXXV. We cannot identify the paragraph referenced in this comment.</p> <p>XXXVI. Comment noted. See Master Response No. 4.</p> <p>XXXVII. Correction noted.</p> <p>XXXVIII. Thank you for the comment. The information in the NCCP/HCP has been collected for many years and has been used to help guide the conservation needs. Once a permit decision has been made on the NCCP/HCP, the Preserve Habitat Manager will be updating information such as species locations and habitat.</p> <p>XXXIX. Thank you for the comment.</p> <p>XL. See Master Response No. 2. The NCCP/HCP is intended to streamline and provide certainty to landowners. Landowners are able to seek their own individual permits; however, the project and conservation strategy will need to be consistent with the NCCP/HCP.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>XXV. “An assessment of funding needs and management goals will be provided in the Comprehensive and Annual Reports.” As most read this, their conclusion is we don’t know what is either ‘money required’ or ‘what constitutes management success’ other than the CITY or PVPLC declaring total victory! ‘Beautiful Dreamer’ may apply! Might want to give some detail – like where will we find ‘management goals’ or funding requirements now – citizens can do future escalation and ask for confirmation from the PVPLC and CITY.</p> <p>XXVI. Pg. 29: 12.1: Public Use Master Plan: PUMP: Confirms public use of the Preserve is ‘conditional.’ Also, the Preserve Trails Plan, “described in section 5.2.8 of the Plan,” is in the PUMP, approved by “the Wildlife Agencies.” Never heard of the Preserve Trails Plan – not part of the current Council trails investigation / research with the goal of what are real RPV trails without involving ‘Sunshine,’ who knows! Council decision, now employing another consultant in this effort! Suggest: erase ‘conditional.’ Continuation promotes negative NCCP press. And folks will always find a way in!</p> <p>XXVII. Pg. 29: 12.2: Fire and Fuel Modification in the Preserve. “... management guidelines identified in Section 9.2.3 of the Plan shall be implemented for performing the required fuel modification within the Preserve.” FYI – see pg. 177 of the Plan. Suggest: When the Implementation Plan references a section of the Plan, at least give the page in the Plan where it will be found! Otherwise you will find the implementer doing whatever gets the job done fast! And, since all of Palos Verdes Peninsula is a ‘High Fire Danger’ area, per the Agencies, citizens should know what is the fire drill.</p>	<p>XLI. See Specific Response to Comment No. 81.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>XXVIII. Pg. 30: 12.6: Reporting: 12.6.1: Preserve Habitat Management Plan. “The PVPLC has developed an initial PHMP for the Preserve.” State who approved it and might mention the public hearing regarding its approval, assuming there was one – which is very doubtful in RPV.</p> <p>XXIX. Pg. 33: 12.6.4: Annual Coordination Meeting: ‘The City and PVPLC shall meet ... once each year to review and coordinate implementation of the NCCP/HCP’ Add that this will be a public meeting, not one held in PVPLC offices with drawn curtains!</p> <p>XXX. Pg. 35: 14.0: Funding: This has an excellent summary of CITY obligations, both funding and services. Of concern, due to past fires, is fuel modification. Owning Preserve land, CITY is responsible for almost all fuel modification with PVPLC responsible only for Lunada Canyon. However, these are stated to be “in perpetuity” but nothing is “in perpetuity.” Couldn’t we say these will be reviewed at the end of the 40 – 50 year Plan period?</p> <p>XXXI. Pg. 35: 14.1: Management Budget Analysis: Number conflict – I think. This paragraph states “Based on the updated Preserve Management budget, the CITY and PVPLC total cost of operating the Preserve is estimated at \$1,785,438.” But in the Appendix, section C, pg. C-44, the number is “\$1,305,669” for the Permit Term period and “\$1,291,209” for post Permit term. Budgets are always fluid numbers and I note we are using an algorithm from the Center for Natural Lands. Stating that just muddies the budget waters – an item our citizens will closely focus on, given it started at \$100,000 years ago. Suggest we use a line item budget / expense worksheet and eliminate the mumbo-jumbo of</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>any algorithm. Worksheet budgets are understandable and easily defended when necessary.</p> <p>XXXII. Pg. 37: 14.3: Non-Wasting Endowment Fund. This title will make little sense to the average reader. Suggest we re-name it simply “Endowment Fund.”</p> <p>XXXIII. Pg. 38: 14.4: Effect of Inadequate Funding: Suggest rather than describe multiple ‘what ifs,’ as found here, we do what industry does – simply state “the budget will be examined to determine cutbacks necessary to regain balance.” That’s what will happen anyway.</p> <p>XXXIV. Pg. 39: 15.0: Changed Circumstances: Cites Plan: section 6.9.2 without any description of events believed to constitute ‘Changed Circumstances.’ Suggest we list 6.9.2 items here: fire, flood, landslide, drought, invasive species and add ‘Acts of God’ – the universal catchall for unlisted events.</p> <p>XXXV. Assuming this (Chief Justice Roberts opinion stated prior) will be the stance of our new Supreme Court re environmental items, that the Agencies can be found in error, this paragraph re changing environmental law, may be apropos here re habitat and endangered species that don’t live there.</p> <p>XXXVI. Pg. 3: 2.18: Rationale for RPV’s NCCP:: “The City of Rancho Palos Verdes’ NCCP/HCP is the first to occur in Los Angeles County” I’ve been asked many times ‘Why us? Why is no other Palos Verdes Peninsula town as enthusiastic as RPV?’ The answer is in researching the then-Council that pushed this forward some 10 years ago. Fiercely loyal to RPV’s environmentalists voter subset, that council found the NCCP a must document even though all this effort applies to only 3 named</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>species, one which hasn't been seen in RPV Preserve since the mid-80's (per the Agencies finding)!</p> <p>XXXVII. Appendix 'I' (Public Use Master Plan (PUMP) pages are numbered with 'H,' not 'I;' that is, 'H-5" instead of 'I-5' Might change page numbering to 'I' to align with other Appendices numbering. FYI: Appendix ' H' is the initial Preserved Habitat Management Plan.</p> <p>XXXVIII. Appendix 'H,' Initial Preserve Habitat Management Plan, is 181 pages, containing many detailed sections; I suggest Appendix 'H' cover page be expanded to provide the following Table of Contents listing these (see attached letter).The assumption a reader must make is that these remain valid and current, 12 and 13 years after being written. Out-of-date reports can easily be cited as meaningless to any discussion. Suggest we get statements from DUDEK and PVPLC that their reports included here remain valid. Overall: Many Appendix entries / reports are dated years ago; obviously, since they approving these, the Agencies have no problem with dated information but ... for some, challenging the validity of this data is easy.</p> <p>XXXIX. Lastly, 'Final' versions, might want to remove 'Draft' and use 'Approved – date' where apropos.</p> <p>XL. Going out thought: Remove 'private land owners' from this NCCP or reinstate their ability to 'opt out.' This would remove many public concerns, eliminate some 14,000 private lots from needing enforcement and provide better focus on Preserve lands. Just a thought.</p> <p>XLI. My Public Comments / Questions from December 2018 (comments follow).</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
100	5/4/19	Pilot (1)	<p>I. In a recent series of articles called “Destined to Burn”, the Palos Verdes Peninsula has been designated as a California community with some of the worst evacuation routes – “The Palos Verdes Peninsula in Los Angeles County, densely populated with some of the costliest real estate in the United States, has even more people and fewer lanes leading out, putting it at more than five times the population-to-lane ratio as Paradise.” https://www.apnews.com/e856b9efef7b426a90fd175510cd54dd</p> <p>II. Today, I write to you regarding my concerns over the lack of adequate evacuation routes out of Portuguese Bend, in Rancho Palos Verdes, and how this is impacted by the proposed NCCP/HCP. The private neighborhood of Portuguese Bend yields just two access points, both on Palos Verdes Drive South, and is home to many residents in addition to a riding stable, a non-profit therapeutic horse program, and numerous properties whose owners have horses and other large animals on site.</p> <p>III. The neighborhood of Portuguese Bend no longer has a northern route of escape. As time has passed the route, a fire road which runs from Vanderlip Drive north to Crenshaw Blvd. near Del Cerro Park, has not been maintained. While growing up I have watched many fire crews go through the double panel chain-link gate on Vanderlip Drive, near a fire hydrant, and travel up into the open fields to stage vehicles and personnel to defend my neighborhood and our homes from oncoming fires. The fire road, which consists of portions of Gary’s Gulch Trail, Vanderlip Trail, and Burma Road, was a great asset in the 1980’s and early 1990’s. This fire road was consistently maintained so the large vehicles of the various fire departments that come to our aide could travel it.</p>	I.-VI. See Master Response Nos. 21 and 22. Evacuation routes will be considered during creation of the Preserve Access Protocol.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>IV. Now, when I go for hikes in the Portuguese Bend Reserve I see this fire road has been reduced to just a trail – narrow in so many parts, full of large ditches and divots, and in no condition for a fire truck to drive on it to battle the blazes I have seen cross those hills. Depending upon the oncoming direction of a fire threat, many residents and visitors to the riding facilities would not have an available exit with the elimination of the fire road. As it stands, none of the streets in Portuguese Bend allow for street parking as all streets are designated as fire lanes – only allowing for two-way traffic. Many of these streets are also cul-de-sacs – providing a single direction for all on that street to travel in the event of an evacuation. In some cases, that could mean travelling into a fire in order to escape. I find this to be quite troubling. Maintaining evacuation routes for rural neighborhoods in our city is vital.</p> <p>V. After reflecting on the recent wildfires, what is the harm in maintaining a fire road through the preserve? Allows for an evacuation route for Del Cerro area residents to flee down the hill. Allows for an evacuation route for Portuguese Bend resident to flee up the hill. Allows for better access for the public with various disabilities to enjoy the preserve. Provides easier access for the rangers who tend the preserve.</p> <p>VI. Recommitting to the practice of a maintained fire road would be of great value for our community. I urge you to strongly consider reestablishing and maintaining the fire road in your plans.</p>	
101	5/5/19	Pilot (2)	<p>I. Over the past 10+ years there has been a degradation of the maintenance of fire breaks surrounding the neighborhoods which abut the preserve. The proposed NCCP/HCP seems to continue to create a larger threat to long standing neighborhoods in Rancho Palos Verdes.</p>	I.-VI. See Master Response No. 21.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>II. Being raised in Portuguese Bend, I was instilled with a great respect for fire. Growing up in a wildland-urban interface will do that. I heard stories of how the 1973 fire destroyed my family's property and demolished our home. As a child, I watched a fire started by a transformer in the canyon just off Palos Verdes Drive South systemically devour the dead weeds and brush around it. Then there are the fires that were large enough and close enough I was packing up possessions and pets to evacuate, and being told to lead our horses down the hill. Most recently this was about 10 years ago.</p> <p>III. Looking back, I remember every year a fire break surrounding my neighborhood was disced. It was routine. It was the process that reminded me fire season was coming. This setback was maintained around Portuguese Bend to protect it, to create a defensible space so fire crews could operate, to remove the fuel the fire consumes. This maintenance by discing was vital; eliminating seedlings from acacia and other invasive species while knocking down the prevalent black mustard which burns so easily.</p> <p>IV. Please note the characteristics of black mustard from the US Forest Service website, where it is listed in the category of "Invasive plants and weeds of the national forests and grasslands in the southwestern region" – Native to Eurasia; black mustard seeds and foliage have a pungent taste. Black mustard grows profusely and produces allelopathic chemicals that prevent germination of native plants; in addition, the seeds contain an alkaloid and the sinapina the glucoside sinigrin. This species generally occurs as a weed in wildland areas of the Southwestern Region rather than as an invasive plant." - https://www.fs.fed.us/r3/resources/health/invasives/yellowFors/blackMustard.shtml</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>V. Maintaining defensible space around the neighborhoods that surround the preserve is vital. Going back to the previous protocols is important to the residents in our communities. There is a duty to protect these people, their homes, and their property. Why was the previous protocol of creating a discd setback from the neighborhoods surrounding the preserve abandoned? What is the harm in maintaining a setback for the neighborhoods which border the preserve?</p> <p>VI. Cal Fire states that the law now requires fuel modification to be done to 100 feet or to the property line; while in high fire hazard areas a 200 foot setback is suggested. This should be the standard for the neighborhoods and roads surrounding the preserve. Additionally, to add a fire break around all electric poles and wire paths should be considered. http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildl_and_codes</p>	
102	5/5/19	Pilot (3)	<p>I. Lt. Col Jack Downhill USAF (Ret.) who resided at #20 Vanderlip Drive, Rancho Palos Verdes followed the protocol, paid the fees, and had an engineer submit a request to the City to allow an exception to the moratorium so he could apply for a lot split of his 6.94 acres and build homes similar to what the 47 undeveloped lot owners are now being allow to do. My understanding is there was never an answer to his application. Is it true that his application was not reviewed and responded to?</p> <p>II. Over his almost 50 years of ownership, Lt. Col. Downhill paid the ACLAD benefit assessment on his 6+ acres because he would be able to build additional dwellings after a lot split, yet to this day neither he nor his heirs have had that ability authorized by the city. Horan settlement money from a lawsuit against L.A. County and Rancho Palos Verdes, for triggering the slide, paid for the sewer laterals placed on Lt.</p>	I.-VII. Comments outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP. We forwarded your comments to the Community Development Department.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>Col. Downhill's investment property preparing for him to sub-divide and build on his R-1 property. That has not yet happened. He and others sacrificed to pay taxes and benefit assessments with little or no return at this point. Why have there been charges for future benefit if the benefit has not come? When will that benefit come?</p> <p>III. The lack of movement on Vanderlip Drive, in Zone 2, should be considered evidence that the area of Lt. Col. Downhill's property is much more stable than many of the lots in Zone 2 where building permits have been issued and building has commenced without issue.</p> <p>IV. In retrospect, the situation of Lt. Col. Downhill seems bewildering. What has the city leadership of Rancho Palos Verdes been angling for over all this time? Was this process a means to bend the truth and scheme to gain more property for the future Preserve? Manipulate ordinances to gain more Preserve properties and lessen property rights of residents?</p> <p>V. Why take these property rights, some may argue constitutional rights, from a war veteran whose flight crew was the backup for the Normandy invasion in WWII? Lt. Col. Downhill made this investment in his property to split it, and it seems that in the turnover of the council over time the split was not allowed. Some calculations estimate that value may be \$1.5 million per acre lot when split.</p> <p>VI. It is not too late to grant Lt. Col. Jack Downhill's children the right to apply for an exception to the moratorium and finish their father's dream to split and develop their property. In return they may agree to a very attractive conservation easement for the Preserve.</p> <p>VII. The PVPLC and RPV have raised millions of dollars in donations and grants. In the long term the NCCP's collections will reach over one billion of dollars in donations,</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>grants, and fee collections from the City based on the proposed NCCP/HCP. A lot of hard work has gone into the Nature Preserve and is a true gift to all that use the Nature Preserve. Please do ensure that the Preserve is a good neighbor.</p> <p>VIII. In closing, no subdivision of existing lots within Zone 2 was designated in 'Proposed Code Amendments to Exception "P" of Title 15.20.040 (Landslide Moratorium Ordinance) of the Rancho Palos Verdes Municipal Code pertaining to Zone 2'. I ask, will you reconsider and allow the ability for properties in Zone 2 to execute lots splits to no smaller than one acre? Will you issue an exception to the moratorium?</p>	
103	5/5/19	Houston	Keep your hands and laws off my private property!!!	See Master Response Nos. 11-13.
104	5/5/19	Cicoria	<p>As I commented previously, I support final approval and adoption of the Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) and Habitat Conservation Plan for the Palos Verdes Nature Preserve. That said, I have a number of clean-up comments as well as a few other comments/observations, regarding the Implementing Agreement and the NCCP, for your consideration.</p> <p>Implementing Agreement</p> <p>I. Section 4.44: The language here refers to "access by utility agencies and the CITY's Public Works Department", whereas, in order to conform to the NCCP language in Section 6.5.2, item 5, it should refer to "authorized vehicles".</p> <p>II. Section 8.3: This section refers to Other Covered Activities as if it is a defined term, whereas it is only a heading in NCCP Section 5.4. It's particularly confusing, because public use falls within Section 5.4 "Other Covered Activity", but does not fit the description in the intro to Section 5.4 nor the description in Section 8.3, i.e., it is not conducted by the City or public agency or utility. It is simply a "Covered</p>	<p>Implementing Agreement</p> <p>I. Comment noted.</p> <p>II. Comment noted. We will clarify language.</p> <p>III. See Master Response No. 7. Losses of coastal sage scrub and take have been documented since the Planning Agreement was signed in 1996. The City was allocated allowable coastal sage scrub losses and was issued several section 4(d) interim habitat loss permits. Since the City began implementing the NCCP/HCP, there has not been authorized habitat losses or take that has occurred under the unpermitted NCCP/HCP. Once permit decisions are made on the</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>Activity”. Perhaps “Other” should be lower case—“other Covered Activity”.</p> <p>III. Section 17: It remains unclear to me how the past take (since the date the draft NCCP was approved by the City and parties have been operating as if it were in effect) is applied and accounted for in these documents when the Permit term has been modified from 50 years to 40 years. Somewhere in this document, there should be a table showing cumulative take to date.</p> <p>IV. Section 17.4: The acceleration of restoration by PVPLC beyond 5 acres per year may occur as donors contribute to enhance the conservation values of the Preserve. That should not enable early withdrawal by the City from the Plan and yet I see nothing in the documentation to protect against that.</p> <p>V. Section 23.1: Is the reference to “Permittee” in this section more properly “City”?</p> <p>VI. Section 23.8: In the notice provision, Chairman of the Board should actually be “President of the Board”. It is correct in the signature block.</p> <p>NCCP</p> <p>I. Section 4.2.2: Shoreline Park may be retained for historical reference, but it has been wrapped into Ocean Trails Reserve.</p> <p>II. Section 5.2.3 and Section 5.4: It’s not clear how landslide abatement activities covered by these two sections will be distinguishable in practice.</p> <p>III. Section 5.2.8: The reference to a Public Use Management Plan is an error; should be Public Use Master Plan.</p> <p>IV. Section 5.2.8 and Section 5.4: It’s not clear how trails plan implementation and trails management covered by these sections will be distinguishable in practice.</p>	<p>NCCP/HCP, the City may convey its take authority for projects that result in incidental take.</p> <p>IV. Pursuant to Section 17.4 of the Implementing Agreement, the City, as the Permittee, may unilaterally withdraw from the NCCP/HCP provided it has complied with all mitigation obligations incurred under the requirement of the NCCP/HCP and associated permits. These mitigation obligations can include restoration by PVPLC beyond the required 5 acres per year.</p> <p>V. Comment noted.</p> <p>VI. Correction noted.</p> <p>NCCP/HCP</p> <p>I. Comment Noted.</p> <p>II. Landslide abatement activities described in Section 5.2.3 of the NCCP/HCP are projects that have associated allowable take. The landslide abatement activities in Section 5.4 of the NCCP/HCP are activities that are not expected to involve permanent loss of habitat.</p> <p>III. Typo noted.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>V. Section 5.4: I find the paragraph describing Other Covered Activities in this section to be more properly applied to Section 5.4.1 activities. See comment for IA Section 8.3, above.</p> <p>VI. Section 5.4.1: Is the redundancy within the first and second bullets and within the fourth and fifth bullet points intentional? (Note the same redundancies appear in the IA at Section 8.3.1.)</p> <p>VII. Section 5.4.1: Why is bullet 7 relating to filming and photography subject to a different condition than the other bullets? Shouldn't all of these activities both 1) avoid impacts to Covered Species and 2) not involve loss of Covered Species or habitat (otherwise, presumably, they would fall under Section 5.2)?</p> <p>VIII. Section 5.4.1: Regarding bullet 8 relating to law enforcement activity, is there a requirement for restoration in the event law enforcement activity results in lost habitat? Related, recently a car went off the road into the Preserve. How will restoration after such an incident be addressed?</p> <p>IX. Section 5.4.2: Either at bullet 6, or at Section 9.2.4 regarding signage, consider that signs within the Preserve should be installed as close as practicable to the trail bed to avoid greater than necessary habitat impacts during sign maintenance (replacement, graffiti removal, clearing for visibility, etc.).</p> <p>X. Section 5.4.3: Based on our experience and routine practice to date, I think we can anticipate other activities beyond those identified as Preserve Management Covered Activities, although the list may not be intended to be exhaustive. Here are a few things to consider adding as separate list items or as edits to existing listed items (many of which are done by</p>	<p>IV. Trail implementation activities in Section 5.2.3 of the NCCP/HCP are projects that have associated allowable take. Trail maintenance activities in Section 5.4 are activities that are not expected to involve permanent loss of habitat.</p> <p>V. Comment noted.</p> <p>VI. Correction noted.</p> <p>VII. Correction noted.</p> <p>VIII. The entity responsible for habitat damage is responsible for its repair/restoration.</p> <p>IX. This practice will be required by the PUMP and Habitat Impact Avoidance Minimization Measures defined in Section 5.5 of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>X. Section 5.4.3 is not intended to be an exhaustive list of allowable activities.</p> <p>XI. Commented noted.</p> <p>XII. Typo noted.</p> <p>XIII. Typo noted.</p> <p>XIV. Comment noted.</p> <p>XV. Comment noted.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>PVPLC volunteers, of course with a view to avoiding/minimizing impacts):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Monitoring public use and misuse. ● Maintaining signage (e.g. cleaning it, repairing it, clearing around it). ● Installing and maintaining barriers or access control mechanisms. ● Trash removal, including retrieving litter from habitat). ● Seed collection by PVPLC for propagation. <p>XI. Section 5.5: At item 8, consider adding an exception to the last sentence of paragraph 12 in the case of government shutdown.</p> <p>XII. Section 8, Figure 8-2, p. 170: The table shows data through 2015 but is labelled “. . .-2013”.</p> <p>XIII. Section 9.2.2.2: The heading should refer to the Public Use Master Plan, rather than Management Plan.</p> <p>XIV. Section 9.2.2.2: An awful lot of habitat can be taken under the “substantial widening” criteria of Section 9.2.2.2 before restoration is required—two feet over 3 miles of trail (10% of roughly 30 miles).</p> <p>XV. Section 9.3.1: Annual reports should not only include information about the annual take, but a cumulative tally of the take assessed against take allocations from the beginning of the initial 50-year Plan term.</p> <p>My comments are provided as a resident of Rancho Palos Verdes and not in any other capacity or role.</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
105	5/5/19	Snell (7)	<p>I. FIGURE 4-15 Filiorum pg 76 What is the colored dot in the southeast lower corner near the creek?</p> <p>II. 4.6 pg 85 Habitat Restoration For fire safety, why not remove all acacia first at least 1000' away from Preserve property lines especially abutting homes in Portuguese Bend?</p> <p>III. Brush Management is inadequate. www.fire.lacounty.gov 1). Embers from a wildfire can travel up to 1.5 miles. 2). California native plants were discouraged because they are more flammable. The Preserve needs more fire prevention within the boundaries. Why not continue the clearance of 8' high mustard weeds under power poles and lines so there is not a repeat of the last bad fire in the Preserve? Is it better to mow non-native grass now to save CSS from wildfires later? The 1973 fire burned for 3 days.</p> <p>IV. FIGURE 5-2 Locations of City Projects Where are Projects 3, 4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 & 19?</p> <p>V. Will the Water Tank land locked property have continued access through the Preserve? What the road called? What map is it on? Where is that covered?</p> <p>VI. What is "the life of this NCCP/HCP"?</p> <p>VII. How can items be corrected or changed once the NCCP/HCP is finalized?</p> <p>VIII. 5.3.3 Fuel Modification for Private Projects throughout the City. Is the fee charged for brush clearance on Preserve property a one-time fee or annual? Usually property owners are responsible to provide brush clearance on their own property</p>	<p>I. The dot indicates native habitat.</p> <p>II. See Master Response No. 21.</p> <p>III. See Master Response No. 21</p> <p>IV. Correction to map legend noted.</p> <p>V. We were unable to identify the area in question.</p> <p>VI. See Master Response No. 28.</p> <p>VII. The NCCP/HCP can be changed through minor or major amendments as described in Sections 6.8.1 and 6.8.2 of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>VIII. See Master Response No. 21</p> <p>IX. See Master Response No. 23</p> <p>X. Quail are not a covered species under the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>XI. It is not possible.</p> <p>XII. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>if their neighbor’s house is within the required set-back. Has that changed? Was the weed clearance determined prior to the last fire season? Firefighting ideas have changed since the bad fires during last fire season and more devastating wildfires are expected.</p> <p>IX. What are the plans for coyotes if a coyote bites a hiker?</p> <p>X. Why doesn’t the City of RPV protect the California Quail and other native birds from Coyotes? RPV could take the money from their annual fund that pays for counting, trapping and relocating Peafowl -to trapping Coyotes in areas where the Quail are. Protecting the native birds from Coyotes should have been addressed in the City of RPV NCCP/HCP Plan.</p> <p>XI. Is it possible to allow lots abutting a paved street in the Preserve not considered abutting the Preserve? Ie: Vanderlip Driveway.</p> <p>XII. Why won’t the City remove the Open Space Preserve designation from Vanderlip Driveway? Please understand that giving it a Nature Preserve designation is most threatening for those who use the driveway.</p>	

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
106	5/5/19	Snell (8)	<p>I. 5.2.1. Will the City identified project be limited to the main branch of Altamira Canyon or include the East Fork? Where and what is the project?</p> <p>II. Does the City know that there is a well in the main branch of Altamira Canyon alongside of the Vanderlip Estate that Frank Vanderlip used for his water supply in the early 1900's? Dewatering that well might produce more water than all of the wells put together. The higher quality water from the dewatering wells should no longer be piped to the ocean but used locally.</p> <p>III. Does the City know that the water entering the Altamira Canyon at the top of the hill can be taken west and not be dumped into the slide area only to have ACLAD have to pay to pump the water out?</p> <p>IV. 5.2.2. Dewatering Wells. Why does any CSS habitat have to be disturbed when there are so many non-native grassland opportunity's to place Wells?</p> <p>V. 5.2.3 Does "potentially subject to landslides" mean it hasn't moved in 200,000 years and is in ACLAD or is moving in the PB landslide? If in ACLAD on stable land, one should protect the gnatcatcher & dudleys by finding another place for abatement measures.</p> <p>VI. Neutral Lands Maps 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, etc. pg 43, 45, 47, 49. Neutral Lands are "currently undevelopable land" How can a developed property be called Neutral? #6, 10, & 20 Vanderlip Driveway were original homes dating back to the 1940's that were built for the original developers. All three properties with homes have had large numbers of horses, riding rings, jumps, orchards and cactus farms which fully developed the properties. Please remove the yellow "Neutral" from all of the private developed property off of Vanderlip Driveway.</p>	<p>I. The project is not defined at this time.</p> <p>II. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>III. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>IV. Dewatering wells are placed in locations where they optimally extract ground water. It is possible that coastal sage scrub may be impacted. Minimizations measures will be implemented to avoid impacts to CSS to extent possible.</p> <p>V. Section 5.2.3 of the NCCP/HCP does not make reference to "potentially subject to landslides" but describes landslide abatement measures.</p> <p>VI. Neutral lands can be located on developed or undeveloped lands. However, neutral lands are that portion of a lot that cannot be developed per the City's Municipal Code and General Plan because of extreme slopes (35% or greater or an open space hazard designation). The NCCP/HCP identifies neutral lands as providing added biological function and value to the Preserve. There are no</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			VII. What does “a point location” mean?	neutral lands noted on the maps directly off Vanderlip Drive. VII. A point location means the actual spatial location where data is recorded for documented species locals or a permanent point where data can be collected through time.
107	5/5/19	Day	Just to let you know we really object to including private properties in the NCCP. Overreach, for sure. Not necessary.	See Master Response Nos. 11-13.
108	5/5/19	Butler	I object to private properties being included in the NCCP.	See Master Response Nos. 11-13.
109	5/5/19	Snell (9)	<p>I. Does the City understand that when selling or refinancing developed properties within 500’ of the Preserve, the 500’ abutment restrictions will have to be disclosed? Property values will go down for those properties that abut the Preserve.</p> <p>II. Does the 17.4 acre Del Cerro Buffer Property protect any private residences from the 500’ restrictions? Is the Del Cerro Buffer in the Preserve? If not, what can the less fortunate owners of properties abutting the Preserve do to get a buffer too?</p> <p>III. What specific restrictions will be in effect for those developed properties within 500’ of Preserve?</p> <p>IV. What fees are associated with items requiring approval for those developed properties within 500’ of the Preserve?</p>	<p>I. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>II. The Del Cerro Buffer is part of the Preserve. It is not a “buffer” for residents’ homes.</p> <p>III. See Master Response No. 16.</p> <p>IV. Fees are dependent on the specific permit requested as established per City Council resolution. Thus, a specific fee cannot be identified as a response to this comment because it is unclear what specific permit is being considered.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>V. If only one part of a developed lot is within 500' of the Preserve, does the other part of the developed lot further than 500' fall under the restrictions also? If so, why? Where is that explained?</p> <p>VI. As a courtesy, were the home owners living within 500' of the Preserve notified by U.S. mail of the potential loss of use and added burden of being next to the Preserve? If the residences were not notified of the 500' restrictions, why not?</p> <p>VII. Will the property owners with homes 500' from the Preserve be compensated for loss of use and/or having to comply with additional burdens? If not, why not?</p> <p>VIII. Since the Preserve is so spread out, why place an extra burden on home owners who live within 500' of Preserve? Is this just a way to charge fees and regulate more property to support the Preserve?</p> <p>IX. It's bad enough for me having about 1000' of a shared property line on an asphalt driveway with the Preserve without the 500' penalty. Can properties abutting the Preserve boundary with a driveway be considered differently since the abutting Preserve is asphalt?</p> <p>X. Why not plant fire safe native plants and specific CSS next to the Preserve boundaries that will buffer the Preserve making the Preserve self-contained?</p> <p>XI. Will it be legal for coyotes to be trapped on private property located within 500' of the Preserve?</p> <p>XII. What can be done with the fire engines, paramedics, Sheriff, RPV trucks, Land Conservancy trucks, California Bird vans and many more vehicles that park on my private property to access the Preserve?</p>	<p>V. See Master Response No. 16.</p> <p>VI. The NCCP/HCP has been noticed and reviewed at numerous public meetings, the most recent being the October 14, 2019, Quarterly Preserve Public Forum and the Special City Council Meeting held October 29, 2019.</p> <p>VII. See Master Response Nos. 16 and 17.</p> <p>VIII. See Master Response Nos. 16 and 17.</p> <p>IX. Properties abutting the Preserve boundary are not considered differently if improved as a driveway with asphalt. New projects abutting the Preserve will be reviewed to ensure that they avoid and minimize impacts to covered species habitat. It is not expected that many landowners will have projects that will impact the Preserve. Please see Section 5.7 of the NCCP/HCP for additional details.</p> <p>X. See Master Response No. 21. Section 5.7 of the NCCP/HCP describes measures to be implemented for new developments adjacent to the</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>XIII. What is being done about the Homeless people living in the Preserve who walk down the driveway to catch a bus at the bottom of the hill? What can be done about gang members who also come out of the Preserve? What can be done about the Homeless living in the Preserve who shoplift in Peninsula Center?</p> <p>XIV. What is being done about the heavy trail use that caused a wash out that flooded over the driveway during the rains?</p> <p>XV. What is being done for those who live off of Crest and Crenshaw having horrible traffic and parking congestion due to Preserve vehicle traffic?</p> <p>XVI. Please remove the 500' restrictions on developed properties as those who live next to the Preserve do not need more grief than they already have. It is an unnecessary "taking" of property rights. The Preserve should be self contained. Be respectful of property rights of those whose properties abut the Preserve and there will be more generous contributions.</p> <p>Attachments</p>	<p>Preserve. These measures are designed to limit impacts from new developments on the Preserve. Limits on trespass, domestic animals, lighting, invasive plants, and stormwater are typical adjacent to Preserves to allow the Preserves to support the plants and wildlife they were established to protect. Without these measures, new developments may cause unanticipated impacts that the Preserve Habitat Managers and the City are not equipped to address.</p> <p>XI. See Master Response No. 23.</p> <p>XII. Question outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP. See Master Response No. 22.</p> <p>XIII. Refer crime to the Lomita Sheriff's department.</p> <p>XIV. Most trail damage caused by recent storms was due to unusually high volume of rain, and trails lacking water control measure (like grade dips and water bars). The City coordinates with PVPLC to install trail improvements to improve maintenance and condition of trails.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
				<p>XV. The City is working directly with the Del Cerro and Island View HOAs to mitigate negative impacts to their neighborhoods stemming from public use of the Preserve. This question is related to impacts of public access in the Preserve and is not directly relevant to the NCCP/HCP as the NCCP/HCP does not require public access.</p> <p>XVI. Comment noted. Please see comments addressed above.</p>
110	5/6/19	Birkey	<p>On behalf of York Point View Properties, LLC, attached are comments on the Recirculated Draft City of Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Community Conservation Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan and related documents.</p> <p>Attachment</p>	Comments noted. See Specific Response to Comment No. 67 above.
111	5/6/19	Snell (10)	<p>4.2.2 City-Owned Lands Dedicated to the Preserve (1,123) page 60</p> <p>I. The 100 year old Vanderlip Driveway used by multiple homes on the driveway should have been deeded back to the homeowners when the City purchased 7572-001-903, but it wasn't.</p> <p>II. Why can't Vanderlip Driveway and stripes on Narcissa that land-locks three homes on the east and two homes on the west on Narcissa and about 25 homes off of Vanderlip Driveway be kept as Single Family Residential and not changed to Nature Preserve on the Maps? A private driveway is not a Nature Preserve.</p> <p>III. Why not record a permanent easement for the landowners using Vanderlip Driveway and the two strips on Narcissa?</p>	<p>I. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).</p> <p>II. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).</p> <p>III. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).</p> <p>IV. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>V. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>VI. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>IV. Does the City understand that the homeowners may not be able to refinance due to being land-locked by the Nature Preserve designation?</p> <p>V. Does the City understand that, when selling, the homeowner must declare that the only ingress-egress is over Nature Preserve land that has only had access protected in RPV's Municipal Codes that can be changed at any time? Potential loss of value would be hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not more.</p> <p>VI. When did the City know they purchased the private driveway for 25 homes? Was there any attempt to try to correct the situation as the City has with other properties? Or did the City wish to control the access?</p> <p>VII. What Nature Preserve restrictions will be placed on Vanderlip Driveway?</p> <p>VIII. Will Vanderlip Driveway be "...in the Preserve to ensure it's conservation in perpetuity."?</p> <p>IX. Will the City allow those bordering the driveway to maintain the historical Olmsted designed plantings: geraniums, pittosporum undulatum and pepper trees currently on Preserve property? Allow homeowners to use the irrigation lines and pay for the water meter?</p> <p>X. Will the City be paying their fair share to maintain the asphalt driveway as the water department has to access the fire road?</p> <p>XI. Does the City have a copy of the Grant Deed for 7572-001-903?</p> <p>XII. Shouldn't the easements for residences using Vanderlip Driveway noted in the Grant Deed be covered in this Plan? If not, why not?</p>	<p>VII. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).</p> <p>VIII. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).</p> <p>IX. See Master Response No. 16.</p> <p>X. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>XI. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP. We forwarded the comment to the Recreation and Parks Department.</p> <p>XII. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>XIII. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).</p> <p>XIV. See Specific Response to Comment No. 82 (V).</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>XIII. How can a private easement for 25 homeowners be changed to Nature Preserve designation?</p> <p>XIV. The ingress egress on Vanderlip Driveway needs to be addressed and included in this Plan or the Plan will be incomplete.</p> <p>Please be a good neighbor.</p> <p>Attachment</p>	
112	5/6/19	Snell (11)	<p>5.7 Restrictions and Requirements for Projects/Activities Abutting and Adjacent to the Preserve.</p> <p>7.4 Non-Native Animal Species Management</p> <p>I. All NCCP sections that protect endangered species that are not in the Preserve should not come into force until the specific endangered species are confirmed and verified in the Preserve.</p> <p>II. There is no need for residences to hire a biologist to check for and control Cowbirds in new horse caring facilities because there are no gnatcatchers. There should be no Cowbird Trapping.</p> <p>III. To control feral cat populations, have the cats trapped, neutered and returned.</p> <p>IV. Create a Preserve that is self contained so it won't be taking away private property rights of those within 500' of the Preserve.</p> <p>“Owned or regulated by the community as a whole” = Socialism.</p> <p>Be a good neighbor. Don't take property rights.</p>	<p>I. Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly have not be found recently in the Plan Area; however, this species was historically observed in the Agua Amarga Canyon, the Filiorum parcel, Portuguese Bend, the Forrestal Parcel, the Switchbacks, and neutral Lands near Trump National/Ocean Trail HCP. The species historically occupied lands within the City. The City and NCCP/HCP Working group decided to cover this species under the NCCP/HCP. The Preserve may be able to support this species again and aid in its recovery; therefore, the species was addressed in the NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>II. Coastal California gnatcatchers persist within the NCCP/HCP plan area, and recent documentation exists in the 2013-2015 Preserve</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
				<p>Comprehensive Report available on the City's webpage.</p> <p>III. Comment outside scope of NCCP/HCP.</p> <p>IV. Section 5.7 of the NCCP/HCP describes measures to be implemented for new developments adjacent to the Preserve. These measures are designed to limit impacts from new developments (associated structures) on the Preserve. Limits on trespass, domestic animals, lighting, invasive plants, and stormwater are typical adjacent to Preserves to allow the Preserves to support the plants and wildlife they were established to protect. Without these measures, new developments may cause unanticipated impacts that the Preserve Habitat Manager and the City are not equipped to address.</p>
113	5/6/19	Snell (12)	<p>1.0 Introduction.</p> <p>I. "A Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) must identify and provide for the regional or area-wide protection and management of natural wildlife diversity while <i>allowing for compatible and appropriate development and growth.</i>"</p>	<p>I. and II. Comment noted.</p> <p>III. Comment outside of the scope of the NCCP/HCP. Comment forwarded to the Community Development Department.</p> <p>IV. See Master Response Nos. 11-13.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>II. The <i>NCCP</i> Act is intended to promote cooperation and coordination among public agencies, landowners, and other interested organizations or individuals.”</p> <p>III. With the City not allowing lot splits off of Vanderlip Driveway in Zone 2 when 40 lots on less stable land are able to build, the City is not adhering to the NCCP Act. The City needs to be a good neighbor or not participate in an NCCP.</p> <p>IV. I am for a “self-contained” Preserve with very limited killing of any animals. NCCP should not be City wide. No private property owners should have their property rights taken or be burdened with regulations due to the Preserve.</p> <p>V. The City Council of Rancho Palos Verdes must maintain control of the Preserve.</p>	<p>V. Comment noted.</p>
114	5/6/19	Snell (13)	<p>Please confirm if the PVP Watch Newsletter is correct:</p> <p>I. No Blue butterfly’s</p> <p>II. 2No Gnatcatcher’s (may soon be removed from endangered species list?)</p> <p>III. 3Why no recent documentation of Gnatcatcher’s?</p> <p>IV. 4Why is there a Preserve when the reasons for the Preserve don’t exist?</p> <p>V. 5Is the entire city in the NCCP area? Please explain.</p> <p>VI. How can the homeowner who is dissatisfied with the management of the Preserve change anything? Now we can vote out the City Council.</p>	<p>I. See Specific Response to Comment No. 112 (I).</p> <p>II. See Specific Response to Comment No. 112 (II).</p> <p>III. See Specific Response to Comment II. above.</p> <p>IV. See Master Response No. 3.</p> <p>V. See Master Response Nos. 3 and 9.</p> <p>VI. A homeowner dissatisfied with the management of the Preserve should reach out to the City’s Recreation and Parks Department at trails@rpvca.gov, or may escalate the concern to the City Council.</p>

			<p>Quote</p> <p>PVP Watch Newsletter – May – 3 - 2019</p> <p><u>Section 1 – Purpose and Need</u></p> <p><u>Section 1.1</u> - Introduction; the proposed NCCP planning area encompasses the 13.6 square mile coastal city of Rancho Palos Verdes. Inclusion will include the <i>endangered</i> Palos Verdes blue butterfly, the <i>endangered</i> El Segundo blue butterfly and the <i>endangered</i> coastal California gnatcatcher. In addition to the three listed species, the Draft NCCP addresses the conservation of seven additional species, six plant species and one bird species that are not currently listed as <i>endangered</i>.</p> <p>Under the proposed action, the PVPLC (Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy) would act as Preserve Habitat Manager for the City.</p> <p><u>Section 1.2</u> - Purpose and Need for Federal Action; Listed species present or historically present within the City include the federally endangered El Segundo Blue Butterfly, the federally endangered Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly and the federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher.</p> <p>This section continues with “although the PV Butterfly is not currently known to be present within RPV, there is designated critical habitat for the Blue Butterfly should it return.”</p> <p>The population of threatened coastal California gnatcatchers that occur in RPV and in other within the Peninsula is considered isolated from the remainder of the United States population.</p> <p><u>Section 1.4 – Developing the NCCP/HCP</u>; The NCCP sub region includes the entire Peninsula, however, only RPV has entered into an NCCP/HCP planning document. RPV residents should be concerned.....</p> <p>Editor: We recognize that targeting of the NCCP is narrow but the amount of information at 885 pages is overwhelming thus the need to target critical NCCP issues confronting RPV residents.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>The NCCP includes ALL RPV properties, in the NCCP. Also, the fact that RPV gives NCCP control to the PVPLC for 40 years. The 10 year history of Preserve management by the PVPLC, so far, clearly demonstrates that the PVPLC does what it desires without input of RPV resident or RPV City Hall. There is no logical reason why RPV City Hall is including private properties in the NCCP. This is but another attempt of City Hall attempting governmental control of private properties. There is already excessive control of private properties by City Hall.</p> <p>The NCCP almost ignores that there are NO Blue Butterflies and no findings of gnatcatchers in the RPV area as well... What is not being reported is that there are an abundance of gnatcatchers in the Huntington Beach / Orange County area as well as further South and into Mexico. There has been NO recent documentation of gnatcatchers in RPV. Residents are also not being told that there is a pending lawsuit that removes gnatcatchers from the Endangered Species list. If there are no Blue Butterflies or gnatcatchers a bigger question becomes why is there a Preserve when the reasons for the preserve don't exist?</p> <p>End quote. Attachment</p>	
115	5/7/19	Snell (14)	<p>Largest fire on the Peninsula in history. The pink burn area is very close to the NCCP area! Additional clearance within the Preserve is needed. LA County can maintain the fire roads and make fire breaks as they are doing throughout Los Angeles.</p> <p>Attachment</p>	See Master Response No. 21.
116	5/7/19	Wold	<p>It is alarming, as private homeowners in the city of Rancho Palos Verdes, to learn that we are being included, without our permission, of your control of our property in the NCCP.</p> <p>We purchased our land, built our home, pay all taxes on it and maintain our property.</p>	See Master Response Nos. 11-13.

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>We make decisions on our PRIVATE home and land. Not you. It's decisions like these which are eroding our support of PVPLC.</p>	
117	5/7/19	Ilsen	<p>This is to inform you that I am vehemently oppose inclusion of any private property under the National Community Conservation Plan.</p> <p>Rancho Palos Verdes exists as a perfectly happy and very attractive community without additional 850 pages of regulations and a new team of parasitic snoops to enforce them.</p> <p>I think that there is already more than enough various self-appointed do-gooders that are happy to intrude on my privacy for their feeling of accomplishment and entertainment.</p> <p>I will make an effort to find out who are the busy bodies promoting this harassment scheme and will do my best to defeat them in the nearest election.</p>	See Master Response Nos. 11-13.
118	5/9/19	DeLong	<p>I. The following comments were posted in the PVP Watch newsletter (www.pvpwatch.com / Newsletters page) posted 5-3-2019</p> <p>II. The NCCP (National Community Conservation Plan) has returned and is now 885 Total Pages broken into Section 1 <u>1 Draft Implementation Agreement (132 pgs.)</u>, Section 2 <u>Draft Final NCCP (199 pgs.)</u>, Appendix (463 pgs) and <u>Draft Environmental Assessment (91 pgs)</u>.</p> <p>III. RPV residents should recall that the proposed NCCP was available for review during the recent Holiday Season and the comment period ended December 31, 2018.</p> <p>IV. The NCCP has been updated with a reported 885 “red Line” pages including staff / Council changes made since March, 2018.</p>	<p>III. The NCCP/HCP was also recirculated for public comment for an additional 30 days.</p> <p>VI. See Master Response No. 6. Including non-listed species in a NCCP/HCP can avoid the requirement of a new HCP and permit application or burdensome amendments to the HCP in the event that a species becomes listed prior to completion of the permit term. The NCCP/HCP Working Group and the City chose to include the cactus wren as a protected species in its NCCP/HCP in anticipation that it is likely that it</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>V. <u>The following comments are from Section 1 – Purpose and Need</u></p> <p>VI. <u>Section 1.1 – Introduction</u>; the proposed NCCP planning area encompasses <u>the 13.6 square mile coastal city of Rancho Palos Verdes</u>. Inclusion will include the <i>endangered</i> Palos Verdes blue butterfly (no longer found in RPV), the <i>endangered</i> El Segundo blue butterfly and <i>threatened</i> coastal California gnatcatcher. In addition to the three listed species, the Draft NCCP addresses the conservation of seven additional species, six plant species and one bird species that are not currently listed by any Federal Agency as <i>endangered</i></p> <p>VII. Under the proposed action, the PVPLC (Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy) would act as Preserve Habitat Manager for the City.</p> <p>VIII. <u>Section 1.2 – Purpose and Need for Federal Action</u>; Listed species present or historically present within the City include the federally endangered El Segundo Blue Butterfly, the federally endangered Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly and the federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher.</p> <p>IX. <u>This section continues with “although the PV Butterfly is not currently known to be present within RPV, there is designated critical habitat for the Blue Butterfly <u>should</u> it return.</u></p> <p>X. <u>Section 1.4 – Developing the NCCP/HCP</u>; The NCCP sub region includes the entire Peninsula, however, only RPV has entered into an NCCP/HCP planning document. RPV residents should be concerned.....</p> <p>XI. Editor: We recognize that targeting of the NCCP is narrow but the amount of information at 885 pages is overwhelming thus the need to target critical NCCP issues confronting RPV residents.</p>	<p>will be listed at some time over the span of its 40 year permit term. Thus, by including the cactus wren, the City’s NCCP/HCP is covered and there is no need to obtain additional permits from the Wildlife Agencies. The conservation measures will also support the CEQA process for projects.</p> <p>X. See Master Response Nos. 4 and 11-13.</p> <p>XI. Comment noted.</p> <p>XII. See Master Response Nos. 24, 26, 27, and 11-13. We do not believe that the NCCP/HCP encumbers property rights.</p> <p>XIII: Annual surveys confirm that coastal California gnatcatchers persist within the Preserve. The most recent survey was part of the 2013-2015 Comprehensive Management and Monitoring Report which is available on the City’s website.</p>

No.	DATE	COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>XII. The NCCP includes <u>ALL RPV properties</u>, in the NCCP. Also, the fact that RPV gives <u>NCCP control to the PVPLC for 40 years</u>. The 10 year history of Preserve management by the PVPLC, so far, clearly demonstrates that the PVPLC does what it desires without input of RPV residents or RPV City Hall. There is no logical reason why RPV City Hall is including private properties in the NCCP. This is but another effort of City Hall attempting governmental control of private properties. There is already excessive control of private properties by City Hall.</p> <p>XIII. The NCCP almost ignores that there are NO Blue Butterflies and no recent no findings of gnatcatchers in the RPV area as well. What is not being reported is that there are an abundance of gnatcatchers in the Huntington Beach / Orange County area as well as further South and into Mexico. There has been NO recent documentation of gnatcatchers in RPV. Residents are also not being told that there is a pending lawsuit that removes gnatcatchers from the Endangered Species list. If there are no Palos Verdes Blue Butterflies or gnatcatchers a bigger question becomes why is there a Preserve when the reasons for the preserve don't exist?</p> <p>XIV. PVP Watch urges ALL RPV residents to make your opposition to the NCCP including all private properties in RPV known to RPV City Hall.</p> <p>1- A brief message to the RPV Council (cc@rpvca.org) stating that you object to including private properties in the NCCP will suffice.</p> <p>2- Suggest sending an Email copy to fw8cfwocomments@fws.gov. Include "City of RPV NCCP/HCP" in the subject line.</p>	