

December 29, 2003

Los Angeles City Planning Department
Maya E. Zaitzevsky
200 North Spring Street, Room 763
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RECEIVED
CITY OF LOS ANGELES

JAN 02 2004

ENVIRONMENTAL
UNIT

SUBJECT: Canyon Hill Development Project, Case no: ENV-2002-2481-EIR, Reference Nos: SCH #2002091018

- CONCLUSIONS:
- 1) I strongly opposed the proposed project.
 - 2) I support Alternative D.
 - 3) I secondarily support Alternative E. I strongly opposed the proposed project.

161-1

Dear Ms. Zaitzevsky;

I am a professional botanist and I have reviewed the Canyon Hills, Draft EIR. I want to compliment Christopher A. Joseph & Associates for their choice of environmental consultants. It is clear that the staff at Glenn Lukos Associates took great care in preparing the Biological Technical Report.

161-2

However, even though this is an excellent report, I do have some concerns.

- 1) Lichen surveys were conducted but there did not appear to be a qualified lichenologist on staff.
- 2) On page 20, the Biological Technical Report states that 'Plant surveys were limited by fairly dry conditions in the vicinity of the Study Area as precipitation in the region during the 2001-2002 rainfall season was only about 30% of normal. Any annual and bulbiferous perennial plant species may fail to germinate or grow during adverse conditions, including sub-optimal rainfall years'.

161-3

161-4

Many specially listed plant species may have been missed because they would not have bloomed during a dry year. The plant surveys should be conducted during an appropriate rainfall year to properly assess specially listed plant species impact.

- 3) Thread-leaved brodiaea (*Brodiaea filifolia*) was not included in the survey. It is a federally listed threatened plant. Suitable habitat does exist on site and this is an additional concern since the surveys were conducted during a drier than normal year.

161-5

- 4) There is no information on the dates and the number hours for the plant surveys.

161-6

- 5) The following trees have no tree information but they still have a condition rating: 5, 27, 28, 41, 60, 75, 76, 78, 79, 97, 131, 154, 155, 164, 168, 205, 222, 225, 237, 279, 304, 328, 369,

161-7

380, 392, 397, 402, 434, 435, 440, 461, 462, 463, 487, 510, and 511.

161-7

6) 53% of the trees had the canopy widths were estimated and there is no explanation. My concern is the tree measurements are not accurate and therefore cannot accurately be replaced. Whether the number is higher or lower.

161-8

I am concerned that if the tree canopies were estimated are the tree diameters also estimated.

7) According to the tree rating system, it is possible that a tree may have a low rating but may be a healthy tree that will live for many years. The citation for the tree rating system is difficult to verify.

161-9

8) The degradation in air quality due to the proposed project. Tujunga has been known as a haven for those with respiratory illnesses. I have noticed an improvement in my asthma and allergies since I have moved to Tujunga.

161-10

9) The traffic congestion will increase dramatically as a result of the proposed project. The freeways and surface streets are simply not equipped to handle the extra traffic in a manner that will maintain the current quality of life.

161-11

10) I am alarmed by the large number of oak trees that will be removed as a result of this project. Oaks are slow growing and it is difficult to create an oak woodland in a reasonable amount of time. These trees should be cared for a minimum of five years and replaced according to mortality of young trees.

161-12

11) I don't believe the Draft EIR adequately addresses the concerns of the community. These include schools, traffic, air quality, lack of guarantee regarding open space of remaining 700 acres, length of time for development,

161-13

Again, I am opposed to the project plan. I support alternative D, and secondly alternative E.

161-14

Thank you,

Janet Nickerman
Janet Nickerman
10026 Pali Ave
Tujunga, CA 91042