

PVP Newsletter #1 - NCCP (4/12/04)

This is the first in a series of periodic messages that will address issues facing the citizens of RPV. If you prefer not to be on our e-mail list please let us know in your response. If, however, you know someone or some group that should be included please have them provide their name and e-mail address-or, if appropriate, provide this information yourself.

The RPV Natural Communities Conservation Planning Subarea Plan (NCCP) and associated Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) are currently under review; Tuesday, 20 April is the closing date for comments and questions on the latter. A hearing on the DEIR will be held at 7 PM on Wednesday 14 April in the Community Room at RPV City Hall.

The NCCP deals with the acquisition of ~700 acres in RPV for ~\$27M. This will be part of an ~1500 acre nature preserve. We are concerned with several features of this plan:

- (1) Rather than complying with the RPV general Plan (GP) it requires modification of the GP to qualify for government funding.
- (2) The plan ignores several Policies and Goals of the GP such as "Encourage the building of playing fields for multiple uses by various recreational groups-----" and "Develop recreational programs that will address the recreational needs of all citizens----".
- (3) The financial plan includes a \$4M endowment and \$6M commitment from the Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy (PVPLC) as well as \$17M in State funds and \$3M in other government funding. The only fund that exists at this time is \$1M from the City of RPV.
- (4) This project, which has been described as an experiment, also includes a commitment of at least \$250K per year for between 50 and 300 years.
- (5) The DEIR states that there will be no impact on traffic, parking, trash (there are no planned public facilities), etc. Neighbors of current Reserves indicate that this issue already exists.
- (6) Certain private properties are identified as "Neutral Lands" with restrictions. Since the plan will "encompass the entire city" and be managed by the PVPLC there are serious private property rights issues.
- (7) The plan addresses a very limited set of habitat and species and does not consider the broader implications of all wildlife, both good and bad.

I am on record as favoring a balanced plan that addresses natural space, recreation, parks and social assets on an equal basis. I do not believe this plan does that. Whether you agree or disagree please investigate this issue and provide your comments or questions to Joel Rojas at RPV City Hall. His e-mail address is joelr@RPV.com

Sincerely,
DFReeves