

EXHIBIT F
CHAIN OF CORRESPONDENCE FOR
APPROVAL OF STANDING INSTRUCTIONS

CESPD-ED-W (CESPL-ED-HR/29 May 90) (1110-2-240) 1st End Hsu/bg/5-1550
SUBJECT: Lytle Creek Intake Structure Standing Instructions

DA, South Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, 630 Sansome Street,
Room 720, San Francisco CA 94111-2206

LG NOV 1990

For Commander, Los Angeles District, ATTN: CESPL-ED-HR

1. Subject manual is approved subject to the enclosed comments and the following paragraphs. District should submit four copies of the final printing of Lytle Creek Intake Structure Standing Instructions as soon as practicable after completion.
2. We have concern with the lack of an alternate means of reading the water surface elevation. Basing all operations on the readings of the "official staff gage" which is exposed to damage by vandals (as has occurred at several sites) might present problems. Suggest an alternate float well gaging system be considered.
3. District is requested to provide this office its responses to all Division comments and concerns on the water control manual.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Encl


JAY K. SOPER
Director, Engineering



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
LOS ANGELES DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 2711
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90053-2325

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

GESPL-ED-HR (1110-2-240)

29 May 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, South Pacific Division, Attn: GESPD-ED-W

SUBJECT: Lytle Creek Intake Structure Standing Instructions

Enclosed are three copies of the Standing Instructions to the Project Operator for Water Control for your review and approval. The required Environmental Assessment (EA) for Lytle Creek Intake Structure will be forwarded shortly.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Encls (3 copies)



ROBERT E. KOPLIN, PE
Chief, Engineering Division

10 August 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR CESPD-ED-W

SUBJECT: Lytle Creek Standing Instruction

1. Reference memorandum, CESPD-ED-W, 18 July 1990, SAB.
2. The subject document and EA have been reviewed in the Directorate of Planning. We have the following comments:
3. Public notification and public involvement in development of water control manuals is required (by ERS 1110-2-240 and 241) but is not documented by the district. That information should be made part of this package.
4. Environmental Assessment. The NEPA documentation provided is inadequate, and must be revised and resubmitted, in accordance with the following points:
 - a. False Proposed Action. The EA, a crude draft, takes as its purpose the assessment of "no construction or environmental modification" and finds, needless to say, that this will result in no significant impact. This is ~~completely~~ completely unsatisfactory. The EA must be revised to assess the actual action -- the revisions or potential revisions in the regulation schedule.
 - b. No Draft FONSI. A draft FONSI must accompany the EA.
 - c. No Alternatives Considered. One of the requirements of NEPA is that alternatives be developed and that they be discussed in the EA.
 - d. No 404(b)(1) Evaluation. Paragraph 4D states that "the COE provided the State Regional Water Control Board (RWQCB) with pertinent information regarding the proposed action and requested state certification for the project." It is unclear why the proposed action would require state certification, but if it does, the EA must include information on discharge or fill and the 404(b)(1) evaluation must be included in the review package accompanying the decision document.
5. The point of contact in Environmental Analysis Division is Todd Snow, 705-1622.


BEVERLEY B. GETZEN, Chief
Environmental Analysis Division