

Feb. 4, 2011

Attached are the revised Illinois Valley files. Generally speaking, I changed the document to reflect the comments if the original text was never correct. When the original text was accurate, but in need of an update due to the lapse of time, I added a footnote to explain the disparity. The reason for this is we don't want to imply that everything is in fact up-to-date.

As for Alex's comments, I offer the following (unless noted, I made revisions as he suggested):

- Page 1-2. Footnote added to provide continuity with past planning documents.
- Page 2-1. Revising as suggested would not be accurate. Sentence deleted, as it is history that isn't necessary to discuss now.
- Page 3-12. Date not changed, footnote added.
- Page 4-6. As you said, the preferred alternative is a combination of alternatives.
- Page 4-9, 4th bullet. In order for sentence to make sense, I had to remove everything past "for development..."
- Page 4-9, last paragraph, 3rd sentence. Removed "as utilities ... available" because it contradicts discussions at the PAC meeting.

Regarding the ALP Review Committee Comments, particularly those that Alex highlighted:

- "Other Buildings" section on Page 1-5 revised as such... "Along the east side of the Airport, nine additional buildings exist. Eight of these buildings are part of the decommissioned smokejumper base. The airport buildings include a bunkhouse (used by the Lions Club), restrooms, mess hall (renovated as a restaurant), dispatch office (now miscellaneous storage^[1]), parachute loft (leased by an airport tenant), and smokejumper warehouse located north of the parachute loft. Two airport caretaker residences are near the Airport's entrance from US 199."
 - I did not revise to read "The historic buildings..." as the buildings are indeed on airport property. It is not this document's purview to determine what is "historic."
 - I did not change *restaurant* to read "mess hall (renovated as a historic mess hall)" as it doesn't make sense.
 - The other three points given by the committee were made by either text changes or addition of footnotes.
 - Exhibit 1B, 4th suggestion. I don't see the need to change "airport buildings" to "historic smokejumper base buildings." They are airport buildings. It is not this document's purview to determine what is "historic."
 - Exhibit 1F, I've attached the exhibit, as well as the assessor's map used as a reference. We've never heard of BLM as a Land use designation. We think you're mixing land use with ownership.
-