

>> CHAIR LOUIE: GOOD MORNING.GREETINGS, SALUTATIONS, WELCOME TO THE MARCH 13TH REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION.I WOULD ASK COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN IF HE WOULD LEAD US IN THE FLAG SALUTE.WOULD YOU PLEASE STAND.

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: PLEASE RISE, FACE THE FLAG AND PLACE YOUR RIGHT HAND ON YOUR HEART.(PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE).

>> I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND TO THE REPUBLIC FOR WHICH IT STANDS ONE NATION UNDER GOD, INDIVISIBLE, WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: GREETINGS.FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE VISITING US FOR THE FIRST TIME, THERE ARE AGENDAS AT THE REAR OF THE ROOM AND IF YOU PLAN TO SPEAK ON ANY OF THE MATTERS BEFORE THIS COMMISSION TODAY, YOU'LL NEED TO COMPLETE A SPEAKER CARD AND BRING THAT FORTH.LOOKING FOR APPROVAL OF THE REVISED AGENDA.

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: MOVED AND SECONDED, NO OBJECTIONS, THE AGENDA IS APPROVED.MADAM COUNTY COUNSEL, ANY REPORTS THIS MORNING?

>> GOOD MORNING, NO REPORTS FOR YOU THIS MORNING.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: DEPUTY DIRECTOR?

>> NO REPORTS FOR YOU THIS MORNING.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, NOW WE'RE LOOKING FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 20TH?MOVED AND SECONDED, NO OBJECTIONS, THE MINUTES ARE APPROVED AND WE'RE ON TO PUBLIC HEARINGS, FIRST -- YES, SIR?

>> [INAUDIBLE].

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: WE PROBABLY SHOULD APPROVE THAT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MEETING SO WE KNOW WHETHER WE'RE GOING TO TAKE THAT FIRST OR SECOND.SO, I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT WE TAKE IT AS THE SECOND MEETING TODAY AS PROPOSED.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THAT'S FINE, THAT WAS THE GAME PLAN.

>> YES, THAT'S FINE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU.DOES IT REQUIRE ANY ACTION?DO WE REQUIRE ANY ACTION ON THAT?NO?SO, HEADS-UP, AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION IS GOING TO MEET SUBSEQUENT TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION.SO, WE'RE ON TO ITEM NUMBER 6, PROJECT NUMBER 04035, MS. HIKICHI, I APOLOGIZE FOR MY MISPRONUNCIATION.

>> MS. HIKICHI: GOOD MORNING, COMMISSIONER, I'M LINDA HIKICHI WITH THE LAND DIVISION SECTION, I'M HERE TO PRESENT AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 6, PROJECT NUMBER 04035, A CONTINUED ITEM FROM OCTOBER 17TH, 2012 AND DECEMBER 12TH, 2012 PUBLIC HEARING, PROJECT NUMBER 04035 INCLUDES TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 060973 TO CREATE 10 SINGLE FAMILY LOTS ON 12.3 GROSS ACRES AND A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 200800169 TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH HILLSIDE DESIGN, IT IS LOCATED AT 2342 VIA CIELO, HACIENDA HEIGHTS.THE STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO PROVIDE A LETTER TO THE APPLICANT LISTING ALL ITEMS REQUIRED FOR THE PROJECT'S FEASIBILITY.A MATRIX WAS CREATED LISTING THE ITEMS AND THE APPLICANT'S RESPONSES AND STAFF'S RESPONSES TO EACH ITEM, THIS MATRIX WAS LISTED IN THE COMMISSION'S PACKAGE, THERE ARE STILL OUTSTANDING ISSUES TO NAME A FEW, ONE, THE TENTATIVE MAP EXHIBIT A AND OPEN SPACE CONTAINED INCONSISTENT INFORMATION, FOR EXAMPLE, THE TENTATIVE MAP LISTED 52 THOUSAND 163 SQUARE FEET FOR A LOT 6 AREA BUT THE OPEN SPACE EXHIBIT HAS 41 THOUSAND 202 SQUARE FEET GROSS AREA, THERE IS A DETACHED GARAGE LOCATED ON THE PROPERTY BUT THIS WAS NOT DEPICTED ON ANY OF THE MAPS OR

EXHIBITS.THE APPLICANT DID SUBSEQUENTLY SUBMIT A REVISED OPEN SPACE EXHIBIT DEPICTING THE DETACHED GARAGE, THIS INFORMATION WAS ALSO PROVIDED TO THE COMMISSION IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL PACKAGE.LOT 6, NUMBER 2, LOT 6 CONTAINS LESS THAN 70% OPEN SPACE AND DOES NOT MEET THE MINIMUM 70 SPACE OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENT, NUMBER 3, THE PROPOSED RETAINING WALL HEIGHT ON THE TENTATIVE MAP AND EXHIBIT ARE INCONSISTENT.NUMBER 4, THE GRADING TABLE WAS REVISED TO INCLUDE THE CUT AND FILL FOR THE PROPOSED DRIVEWAY AND FIRE LANE BUT CONTAINS NO INFORMATION ABOUT THE INDIVIDUAL BUILDING PADS.NUMBER 5, BUILDING PADS ARE DEPICTED BUT HAVE NO GRADING INFORMATION.SINCE STEP GRADING IS NOT PROPOSED, THAT LEADS US WITH THE SAME QUESTION, WHERE IS THE APPLICANT ACCESSING THE ACCESS DIRT FOR THE ADDITIONAL PADS, [INAUDIBLE] ON A HILLSIDE LOT WITHOUT EXPORTING OR IMPORTING OFF-SITE DIRT, THIS EXAMPLE SHOWS CUT AND FILL AREAS FOR LOT 4, STAFF NEEDS CUT AND FILL INFORMATION FOR ALL OF THE PROPOSED LOTS, THE GRADING TABLE HAS 0 CUT AND FILL FOR THE PROJECT EXCAVATION.NUMBER 6, SINCE THE PROJECTION REQUIRES A HILLSIDE CUP, IT IS REQUIRED NOW AT THIS TIME TO EVALUATE THE FULL IMPACTS OF THE HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT.NUMBER 7, THE EXHIBIT A SHOWS A PROPOSED BUILDING PADS, THE OPEN SPACE EXHIBIT SHOWS THE PROPOSED BUILDING PADS AND AREAS, IT DEPICTS EXPANDED BUILDING PADS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN ANALYZED, IN FACT, BASED ON THE EXPANDED BUILDING PADS SHOWN ON THE OPEN SPACE EXHIBIT, THE DEPARTMENT WILL NOT SUPPORT A 10 LOT 7 DIVISION S AS PROPOSED AND NUMBER 8, AN

UPDATED OAK TREE REPORT WAS SUBMITTED BUT A SITE VISITED TO THE PROPERTY INDICATES THE CANOPY OF OAK TREE NUMBER ONE WAS INCORRECTLY DEPICTED ON THE MAP AND EXHIBITS, THE CANOPY CURRENTLY EXPANDS INTO THE CURRENT DRIVEWAY, HOWEVER THE MAP EXHIBIT A, OPEN SPACE EXHIBIT AND TREE LOCATER MAP SHOWS THE CANOPY DOES NOT EXPAND INTO THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY. SINCE THE CANOPY EXTENDS INTO THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY, THE PROPOSED DRIVEWAY AND FIRE LANE WILL ENCROACH INTO THE PROTECTED ZONE OF OAK TREE NUMBER ONE AND LASTLY, THE DEPARTMENT RECENTLY OBTAINED THE COMMENTS FROM THE WILDLIFE CORRIDOR CONSERVATION WHICH DOES NOT RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT AS PROPOSED WITHOUT THE CONSERVATION EASEMENTS WHICH WILL GUARANTEE PROTECTION OF THE BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, IF NOT, URGES THE COUNTY TO HAVE A LESS INTENSE DEVELOPMENT ON THE PROPERTY IT WAS CREATED AS PART OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL PACK MATERIALS, STAFF RECOMMENDS THE HEARING TO BE CONTINUED TO MAY 8TH TO GIVE THE OWNER AND APPLICANT THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY INFORMATION TO FULLY ANALYZE THE PROJECT PROPOSAL AND FOR THE PROMPTING TO RETURN TO THE SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE FOR NEW ANALYSIS AND FURTHER IMPACTS OF THE REVISIONS, THANK YOU, AND STAFF IS AVAILABLE FOR QUESTIONS.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU. QUESTIONS? YES, SIR?

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: SO, AS FAR AS THE PAD GRADING IS CONCERNED, IF IT WAS APPROVED AS PRESENTED RIGHT NOW, WOULD THE INDIVIDUAL LOT OWNERS SUBSEQUENTLY HAVE TO GO BACK AND GET A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO GRADE ON THEIR LOT?

>> MS. HIKICHI: SO, BASED ON THE EXHIBIT A, THE GRADING PERMIT THEY HAVE NOW BECAUSE THE CURRENT PROPOSAL IS A PAD EXCAVATION, IN A WAY, WE'RE APPROVING A HALL ROUTE OR INPUT OF DIRT BECAUSE WHERE ARE THEY GETTING THEIR DIRT, HE DID PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE OF HOW HE WOULD BALANCE THE EARTH ON-SITE BUT HE DIDN'T GIVE US A CUT AND FILL ON THE INDIVIDUAL SITES, WE'RE APPROVING THE HALL ROUTE, RIGHT NOW HE IS PROPOSING 0 EXCAVATION FOR THE BUILDING PADS OR ANOTHER SCENARIO, BECAUSE THERE IS LACK OF INFORMATION, WE DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHERE THEY'RE GOING TO GET THE DIRT OR HOW MUCH DIRT, THE INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY OWNERS IN THE FUTURE MAY HAVE TO GET AN INDIVIDUAL CUP FOR INDIVIDUAL LOTS IN THE FUTURE.

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: ALRIGHT, THANK YOU.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU, NO FURTHER QUESTIONS. IS THE APPLICANT PRESENT?

>> MS. HIKICHI: YES, HE IS.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: DO THEY WANT TO MAKE A STATEMENT?PLEASE, STEP ON FORWARD.REMAIN STANDING IF YOU WOULD, IF THERE ARE OTHER INDIVIDUALS IN THE AUDIENCE THAT WANT TO SPEAK ON THIS OR OTHER MATTERS TODAY, I WOULD ASK YOU TO STAND AND BE SWORN IN.OKAY, IF YOU COULD RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND.TODAY IS MARCH 13TH, 2013, DO YOU SWEAR OR AFFIRM UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE TESTIMONY YOU MAY GIVE IN THE MATTER NOW PENDING BEFORE THE COMMISSION SHALL BE THE TRUTH, THE WHOLE TRUTH AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH?I'M SORRY?

>> I DO.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU.PLEASE HAVE A SEAT.

>> DO YOU WANT TO SWEAR ME IN AS WELL?

>> CHAIR LOUIE: IF YOU PLAN TO SPEAK.

>> I'M THE OWNER SO I MAY SPEAK, I MAY NOT.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: SO, WHY DON'T YOU STAND AND RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND.(SWEARING-IN SPEAKER).

>> I DO.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: PLEASE HAVE A SEAT. AS THE APPLICANT, YOU'LL HAVE 15 MINUTES TO PRESENT YOUR MATTER BEFORE THIS COMMISSION. THERE WILL BE A PERIOD OF TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT, IF THERE IS ANY, AND THEN ANOTHER 10 MINUTES AFTER THAT FOR REBUTTAL, SO YOUR TIME WILL START WHEN YOU STATE YOUR NAME. THERE'S A TIMER ON THE DESK THAT GLOWS GREEN FOR THE 14 AND A HALF MINUTES, 30 SECONDS IN YELLOW AND RED, WE WILL ASK YOU TO CONCLUDE. SO, IF YOU CAN BEGIN BY STATING YOUR NAME.

>> MY NAME IS MICHAEL MAXWELL, I'M THE ENGINEER OF RECORD. I HAVE WITH ME HERE ART BARERRA TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS ON THE PROJECT. WE HAVE BEEN HERE OBVIOUSLY BEFORE ON THIS MATTER AND THE ISSUES THAT I UNDERSTAND THAT LINDA HAS BROUGHT UP ARE THINGS THAT WE HAVE DISCUSSED BEFORE ON IT. LET ME GO THROUGH, I BELIEVE, THE LIST SHE WAS READING OFF OF HERE AND CLARIFY SOME OF THOSE ISSUES. NUMBER 1, WE HAD SOME ISSUES ABOUT THE DISCREPANCY OF THE SQUARE FOOTAGE OR ACREAGE IN TWO DIFFERENT LOCATIONS. THEY ARE TWO DIFFERENT TABLES OR MAPS AND THEY ARE CORRECT. ONE IS A SQUARE FOOTAGE OF AN ACREAGE OF THE ENTIRE SITE, THE OTHER ONE IS JUST THE TOTAL OF THE ACREAGE OF THE LOTS LESS THE DEDICATION FOR GRALACITO AND THAT QUESTION HAS BEEN COME UP BEFORE AND HAS BEEN ANSWERED PRIOR TO THE LAST MEETING ACTUALLY. IN THE OPEN SPACE EXHIBIT, THERE WAS A DISCREPANCY IN THE TABLE THAT LISTED THE LOT 6, THE TOTAL AREA WAS WRONG ON THAT, THE NUMBER ISSUED AS THE TOTAL AREA SHOULD HAVE

BEEN THE NET GROSS AREA OF THAT LOT.I HAVE SHIFTED THOSE OVER, WHAT IT AMOUNTED TO WAS THAT THE REST OF THE TABLE MIGHT HAVE FLUCTUATED A THOUSAND SQUARE FOOT INCREASING BOTH THE BUILDABLE ACREAGE OR FOOTAGE AND ALSO THE SQUARE FOOTAGE IN THE OPEN SPACE AREA.IT WAS OVERLOOKED AND I APOLOGIZE FOR THAT.I'VE READ MANY DOCUMENTS OVER AND OVER AGAIN AND NOT SEEN MY MISTAKES BEFORE, BUT THIS ONE, I DON'T THINK IS THAT CRITICAL.THEY COMMENTED ABOUT SOME CROSS SECTIONS ON SOME MAPS AND STUFF THAT DON'T MATCH.THEY ARE TYPICAL CROSS SECTIONS, THEY ARE EXAMPLES OF WHAT THE RETAINING WALLS MIGHT LOOK ABOVE IN THOSE THAT WERE BELOW THE STREET LEVELS, THEY ARE ON SEPARATE MAPS, THEY ARE NOT NECESSARILY SUPPOSED TO BE IDENTICAL, YET THEY DO -- THE ONLY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SOME OF THOSE DETAILS IN THOSE EXHIBITS IS A RANGE OF THE HEIGHT OF THE WALLS AND WE HAVE BEEN MOVING THE GRADES UP AND DOWN TO BALANCE DIRT WORK PER YOUR REQUEST AT THE LAST MEETING.THE BIGGEST ISSUES HERE, IT SEEMS TO BE WITH THE GRADING OF THE PARCELS AND AS STATED EARLIER AND PREVIOUS MEETINGS IN FRONT OF YOU, THAT WE DON'T INTEND ON GRADING INDIVIDUAL LOTS AT THIS TIME.THE ONLY THING WE'RE PROPOSING TO DO IS BUILD AND INSTALL THE STREETS AND THE UTILITIES WITHIN THOSE STREETS AND THE GRADING ASSOCIATED WITH THAT CONSTRUCTION.LAST MEETING, YOU ASKED ME TO ELIMINATE THE NEED FOR A STOCK PILE AREA AND I TOLD YOU I COULD DO THAT AND HAVE SHOWN THAT WE ADJUSTED THE GRADES AND ELEVATIONS OF THE STREET CONSTRUCTION TO BALANCE THE DIRT WORK.SINCE WE'RE NOT PROPOSING

ANY EARTH WORK ON EACH INDIVIDUAL LOTS, WE'RE NOT PROPOSING ANY STOCK PILE OR ANY EXCESS TO BE USED ON THOSE PARCELS.I ALSO STAINED THAT WE COULD BECAUSE OF THE TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION THAT GOES ON IN HILLSIDE, CONSTRUCTION HERE, THAT WE COULD BALANCE DIRT WORK WITHIN THOSE SITES, AND THERE WAS A CONCERN ABOUT TRYING TO ELIMINATE EXPORTING OR IMPORTING DIRT ACROSS LOT LINES, AND THESE ARE LARGER LOTS AND CAN BE EASILY HANDLED.NOT THINKING THAT I WAS VERY CLEAR IN MY EXPLANATION OF HOW THAT COULD BE DONE, I ADDED AN EXHIBIT TO YOUR PACKAGES, JUST AS A TYPICAL EXAMPLE OF HOW WE MIGHT APPROACH BALANCING DIRT WORK ON EACH SITE.AS FAR AS THE GRADING ISSUES ON EACH SITE, THIS IS A HILLSIDE MANAGEMENT OR HILLSIDE SITUATION IN WHICH THE CONSTRUCTION WILL PROBABLY BE A STEP TYPE OF FOUNDATION, AND I HAVE ADDED A FLOOR LEVEL TO THE PADS LOCATION.AT THIS TIME, THEY WILL BE CUSTOM HOMES, I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THEY'LL LOOK LIKE.I'VE TRIED TO ANTICIPATE WHAT A TYPICAL HOUSE MIGHT IMPACT THOSE PARTICULAR LOTS THAT ARE 8 THAT ARE OF QUESTION IN USING A LOWER LEVEL AND EASY TO BALANCE THE DIRT WORK ON-SITE.I THINK I'VE TRIED TO ANSWER THAT PARTICULAR QUESTION, WHAT I CAN'T DO FOR YOU IS I CAN'T GIVE YOU AN EXACT FOOTPRINT OF THE BUILDING ITSELF.I INDICATED THERE ARE WALLS ON EACH ONE OF THOSE PADS.THEY ARE FOUNDATION WALLS, IN A SENSE, THEY ARE BASIC BASEMENT WALL, YOU CAN CONSIDER THAT A RETAINING WALL BUT A FOUNDATION WALL NOT ONLY RETAINS THE DIRT FROM THE OUTSIDE BUT IT ALSO SUPPORTS THE FOUNDATION OF THE STRUCTURE, THEY'RE NOT

INTENDED TO BE SHOWN AS RETAINING WALLS AND PER REFERENCE TO THE USE OF THE RETAINING WALLS AND NOT BEING ABLE TO -- WE REALLY DON'T HAVE ANY RETAINING WALLS OR ARE PROPOSING ON THOSE PARTICULAR LOTS.GETTING ON VERY QUICKLY AND I'M NOT SURE I FOLLOWED EVERYTHING THAT WAS ON THAT LIST THAT LINDA READ OFF, WE COME DOWN TO THE OAK TREE STUDY AND STUFF, WE HAVE SUBMITTED AN OAK TREE CONSULTANT'S PACKAGE IN 2008 WHICH WAS REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE LAST MEETING OR SINCE OUR LAST MEETING, IT WAS REQUESTED WE UPDATE THAT REPORT, AND WE RETAINED A CONSULTANT AGAIN AND HAD HIM UPDATE THE REPORT SHOWING THE CONDITIONS AS -- OF HIS LAST UPDATE, AND STILL COMPLYING WITH THE APPROVED -- THE ORIGINAL APPROVED STUDY.THERE WAS A COMMENT ABOUT THE EXHIBIT NOT BEING THE SAME.IT WAS THE SAME EXHIBIT AS WAS IN THE ORIGINAL REPORT.IT JUST HAS BEEN UPDATED WITH A DATE BASICALLY AND HIS COMMENTS ON THAT.THERE ARE NO ENCROACHMENTS INTO THE PROTECTED AREAS OF THE TREES AND WE HAVE BEEN VERY SENSITIVE ABOUT THAT FROM DAY 1, ABOUT THE OAK TREE PRESERVATION AND THE ALIGNMENT OF THE STREET CONFIGURATION AND ALSO THE LOTS THEMSELVES AND THE HOUSES, SO WE ARE CONCERNED WITH THAT.AS FAR AS THE FIRE DEPARTMENT'S ACCESS, SHE'S INCORRECT IN SAYING WE HAVE ENCROACHED INTO IT BECAUSE WE ARE NOT PROPOSING INTO THAT AND WE HAVE PHYSICALLY STAKED THE CUL-DE-SAC IN THE FIELD OR YOU CAN PHYSICALLY SEE WHERE THE PROPOSED TURN AROUND AND ALSO WHERE THE GATE AT OUR PROPERTY LINE WILL BE WITH THE FIRE DEPARTMENT, THEY REQUESTED A 20 FOOT

EASEMENT THERE AND YOU HAVE A 24 VIA CIELO RIGHT-OF-WAY WHICH WE WILL CONNECT TO, IT DOES NOT ENCROACH ON ANY TREES.THE LAST THING THAT I RECALL HERE BEING COMMENTED ON WAS A WILDLIFE CORRIDOR COMMENTS OR LETTER, AND WE RECEIVED THAT LETTER IN DECEMBER 5, 2011.AT THAT TIME, WE HAD RETAINED OR THE OWNER HAD RETAINED A CONSULTANT, A BIOLOGY CONSULTANT AND ALSO AN ARCHAEOLOGIST AS WELL OR A TREE CONSULTANT WERE ON AT THAT TIME, REPORTS WERE SUBMITTED TO THE COUNTY ON JANUARY 9TH AND JANUARY 20TH, I BELIEVE IT WAS, FROM BOTH OF THOSE OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS ADDRESSING THE WILDLIFE CORRIDOR.THOSE WERE REVIEWED, COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT CAME BACK IN SAYING THAT THE REPARATION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS BEING PREPARED AT THAT TIME, SO I THINK WE HAVE ADDRESSED THAT ISSUE QUITE SOME TIME AGO.IF THERE ARE OTHER THINGS THAT I HAVE FORGOTTEN HERE TO MENTION, I'LL BE HAPPY TO DO SO.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU.FELLOW COMMISSIONERS,
QUESTIONS?COMMISSIONER HELSLEY?

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: MR. CHAIRMAN, THANK YOU.AS YOU RELATE TO THE WILDLIFE CORRIDOR, YOU HAVE A FAIRLY EXTENSIVE SET OF OAKS THERE IN THE UPPER PORTION, THE CANYON THAT COMES INTO THAT AREA, THE INTERFACE WITH THIS IS GOING TO BE IN WHAT MANNER?

>> THE OAK TREE STUDY IDENTIFIED THE OAK TREES AND THE OAK TREES, WE TRY TO KEEP OUT OF IT. AS I POINTED OUT BEFORE, THIS IS A VACANT, AN ABANDONED AGRICULTURAL FIELD IS WHAT IT IS, IT'S BEEN GRADED BEFORE, IT HAS THE OLD PIPE IRRIGATION IS ON THERE, IT'S ON THE ACCOUNT OF THE PERIPHERAL OR THE AREAS NORTH AND SOUTH OF THE PROPERTIES AND THOSE WOULD BE KEPT AWAY FROM -- AS FAR AS THE COMMENTS FROM THE WILDLIFE CORRIDOR AND THEIR SUGGESTIONS, WE HAVE TAKEN THAT INTO CONSIDERATION THAT OUR OPEN SPACE AREAS AS PROPOSED ARE CONNECTED, THEY ARE WIDE ENOUGH FOR CORRIDORS FOR THE WILDLIFE TO TRAVERS -- TRAVERS THE AREA, WE PRETTY MUCH COMPLIED EVERYTHING THEY ASKED FOR IN THERE EXCEPT FOR THE FEES.

>> MS. HIKICHI: IF I MAY TO INTERJECT, I'M SORRY TO INTERRUPT, THE LETTER MAY BE REFERRING TO MIGHT BE FROM THE FISH AND GAMES, NOT FROM THE WILDLIFE CORRIDOR CONSERVATION AUTHORITY. WE RECENTLY BECAME AWARE OF THIS LETTER JUST RECENTLY AND THAT WAS BECAUSE THE REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE WILDLIFE CORRIDOR AUTHORITY CONTACTED OUR DEPARTMENT ASKING FOR STATUS, AND SHE OUT OF THE BLUE SAID, BY THE WAY, WERE COMMENTS TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION FOR THE CONDITIONS AND I DIDN'T KNOW WHAT SHE WAS REFERRING TO SO I HAD HER E-MAIL A COPY OF THE LETTER, I DID GO THROUGH OUR FILES AND I DID NOT COME ACROSS THAT LETTER. I DID SPEAK WITH HER A COUPLE OF DAYS AGO AND SHE DID SAY, AS FAR AS SHE KNOWS, SHE DID NOT FORWARD A COPY TO APPLICANT BECAUSE SHE DID NOT HAVE THE APPLICANT'S CONTACT

INFORMATION AS WELL AS THERE WAS NO -- THE LETTER WAS MAILED TO OUR DEPARTMENT AND IT SEEMS LIKE WE NEVER RECEIVED IT BECAUSE THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE TOO OF THE E-MAILS, WHETHER ONE GOT IT, ONE RECEIVED IT, DID YOU GET IT, THERE WAS NONE OF THAT CORRESPONDENCE IN THE E-MAILS THAT SHE COULD FIND, SO THIS LETTER THAT THE WILDLIFE CORRIDOR AS WE RECENTLY OBTAINED A COPY AND THAT'S WHAT WE SUBMITTED TO IT AS A SUPPLEMENTAL AND NOT GIVEN BACK TO YOU IN DECEMBER, AND THE LETTER THAT MR. MAXWELL MAY BE REFERRING TO IS THE LETTER FROM THE FISH AND WILDLIFE WHICH WAS CONSIDERED AND THAT WAS CONSIDERING CEQA AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS AND IT WAS TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: MR. CHAIRMAN, LET ME APOLOGIZE FOR BEING SLIGHTLY CONFUSED ON THIS, THIS IS THE THIRD TIME WE'VE SEEN THIS PRESENTATION, STAFF IS INDICATING THERE'S AN INSUFFICIENT AMOUNT OF INFORMATION FOR THEM TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OR DENIAL AND THEREFORE HAS REQUESTED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND A CONTINUANCE. THE APPLICANT HAS NOT ADDRESSED THE -- WHETHER HE'S IN SUPPORT OF THE CONTINUANCE BUT IS REALLY ALMOST TAKING A DIFFERENT POSITION THAT HE'S PROVIDED ALL THE INFORMATION THAT WE NEED AND WANTS US TO SORT OF NEGOTIATE. THIS IS NOT A NEGOTIATING BODY, THIS IS AN APPROVAL BODY AND I DON'T WANT TO BE PUT IN A POSITION OF STARTING TO SORT OF LET'S PUT THIS CONDITION, THAT CONDITION, ETC.. I THINK WHERE WE'VE GOT AN IMPASSE IS A LACK

OF UNDERSTANDING PERHAPS, AT LEAST I'M FEELING THAT, OF WHAT IS THE OWNER'S INTENT HERE. IF THE OWNER'S INTENT IS TO GET SOME SUBDIVISION BUT NOT NECESSARILY COME IN WITH GRADING PLANS AND VARIOUS SORT OF ASPECTS OF IT WITH PERHAPS HAVING SUBDIVIDED LOTS POTENTIALLY GO OUT AND SELL INDIVIDUAL LOTS WITHOUT LOOKING AT IT AS A COMPLETE PROJECT WHICH THEN PUTS EACH OF THE PURCHASERS, IF THERE IS ONE PURCHASER, FIVE PURCHASERS OR 10 PURCHASERS, THEN THAT PUTS A BURDEN OF PROOF ON EACH OF THEM TO COME IN AND WHAT KIND OF RECIPROCAL EASEMENTS THEY HAVE FOR THE DRIVEWAY, WHAT KIND OF CONDITIONS THEY HAVE IN TERMS OF GRADING, ETC., SO I'M BEGINNING TO FEEL AS IF THE APPLICANT WANTS TO GET US PART WAY AND THAT WE HAVE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION FOR A SUBDIVISION AND STAFF IS SAYING, WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH FOR A SUBDIVISION AND I'M NOT SURE IF, AGAIN, IF I'M PERCEIVING THIS CORRECTLY OR INCORRECTLY, BUT THERE'S NOT ENOUGH HERE RIGHT NOW IF WE'RE LOOKING AT A SUBDIVISION UNDER ONE OWNERSHIP AND ONE OWNER'S GOING TO GO THROUGH AND DO GRADING, PUT ALL THE IMPROVEMENTS AND WHETHER HE THEN SELLS THEM AS BUILDABLE LOTS WHICH HAVE GOT ALL THE GRADING, ALL THE APPROVALS, ALL THE DRIVEWAYS, ETC., DONE, OR THE INTENT IS LET'S TAKE IT PART WAY AND SEE WHAT WE CAN DO, AND TO COME BACK AND HAVE INDIVIDUAL OWNERS THEN SAY, I BOUGHT A PIECE OF PROPERTY I WANT TO BUILD ON IT AND THE REST OF THEM NOT BEING READY TO BUILD AND THAT PUTS THE BURDEN OF PROOF ON THAT SINGLE PURCHASER TO PUT ALL THE NECESSARY IMPROVEMENTS AND THEY JUST TRY TO DEAL

WITH POTENTIALLY TEN OWNERS WITH EASEMENTS AT -- SO, THAT'S WHAT I'M GETTING AT, I DON'T KNOW IF THE REST OF YOU FEEL THE SAME, BUT THE APPLICANT SEEMS TO BE SAYING, I THINK THE MOST RECENT CORRESPONDENCE WE GOT IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS LAST FRIDAY, IS HE THINKS WE'RE READY TO GO, AND STAFF IS BASICALLY SAYING WE'RE NOT READY TO GO, AND THIS IS NOT A NEGOTIATING BODY TO SIT HERE AND SAY, WELL, YES, WE AGREE HERE AND WE AGREE THERE SO LET'S GO AHEAD AND MAKE IT WORK. I THINK THE QUESTION COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN ASKED AT THE VERY BEGINNING ABOUT CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS AND CAN THEY BE TIED INTO INDIVIDUAL LOTS LATER ON, I THINK THAT GETS VERY, VERY DIFFICULT FOR STAFF TO TRY AND MANAGE BECAUSE IF WE GO THROUGH AND DO A MODERN SUBDIVISION, THAT THING BETTER HAVE EVERYTHING SORT OF PUT IN PLACE, SO I APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT THE APPLICANT HAS MADE A NUMBER OF STATEMENTS, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT WE'RE PREPARED TO DO ANYTHING UNLESS HE'S SEEKING A DENIAL ON THE PROJECT AT THIS POINT IN TIME BECAUSE OF INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION, BUT I DON'T ENJOY HAVING CASES CONTINUE TO COME BACK AND THE SAME IMPASSE COMING BACK TO US NOW THAT WE SAW IN DECEMBER, AND THE APPLICANT EITHER WANTS TO TRY AND HELP US GET TO A POINT THAT WE'VE GOT AN APPROVABLE PROJECT OR IF WE COME BACK AGAIN IN MAY, IT'S A PROJECT THAT IS GOING TO BE DENIED OR APPROVED AND I WOULD SUGGEST IF THE APPLICANT HAS NOT PROVIDED THE INFORMATION THAT STAFF FEELS COMFORTABLE WITH IN TERMS OF DOING THAT TO COME BACK

WITH REASONS FOR DENIAL AT THAT JUNCTURE, THOSE ARE JUST MY COMMENTS, I APPRECIATE THE OTHERS SPEAKING.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, I APPRECIATE THEM AND FRANKLY, I AGREE, I WAS GOING TO ASK THE QUESTION, WHAT IS YOUR REQUEST, WHAT ARE YOU ASKING FOR?WE HAVE A STAFF REPORT REQUESTING A CONTINUANCE FOR MORE TIME, YOU AS THE APPLICANT ARE MAKING A STATEMENT TO AGREE WITH THE CONTINUANCE?WHAT ARE YOU ASKING FOR?

>> MY PROBLEM IS THAT WE'VE DISCUSSED THE SAME THING -- THESE ARE THE ISSUES WE FIRST BROUGHT UP IN NOVEMBER AT THE FIRST PUBLIC HEARING.THE BIGGEST ISSUE SEEMS TO BE IS CAN WE DEAL WITH A SUBDIVISION THAT DOESN'T HAVE A PLAN FOR EACH PARTICULAR LOT.WE HAVE SHOWN THAT YOU CAN BUILD ON EACH LOT AND WE'LL PUT IN THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND STUFF TO SUPPORT THAT TYPE OF A DEVELOPMENT AND ANSWER ALL THE OTHER QUESTIONS, THE ISSUE IS BASICALLY, I CAN'T TELL YOU WHAT EACH LOT IS GOING TO LOOK LIKE, CAN YOU GIVE ME THAT FLEXIBILITY AND WE'RE HAPPY TO BRING THAT BACK, EACH INDIVIDUAL LOT BACK TO SEE IF IT COMPLIES WITH THAT CRITERIA, ALL WE'RE TRYING TO SAY IS HERE'S OUR SUBDIVISION, AND GO AHEAD AND LEGALLY FILE A SUBDIVISION MAP ON THAT AND CREATE THAT DEVELOPMENT, GO AHEAD AND BEING ABLE TO PROCESS OUR ENGINEERING DRAWINGS AND OUR FINAL MAP TO DO THAT, BUILD THE THING, AND THEN COME BACK LATER ON, ON EACH INDIVIDUAL LOTS AND WE SAID WE WILL BRING THOSE BACK,

THE CCNR, THE CUP FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL LOTS TO SEE IF IT DOES COMPLY AND THE GRADING PLAN, YOU'VE ASKED ME NOT TO REFER TO AS A CONCEPTUAL ONE, I'M SAYING IT'S A PLAN, WE'RE NOT REALLY ASKING FOR APPROVAL, WE'RE JUST SAYING CAN WE HELP YOU ESTABLISH THAT CRITERIA ABOUT WHAT FUTURE DEVELOPERS OR FUTURE BUILDERS WILL PROPOSE ON THOSE LOTS. I'M NOT ASKING FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE BUILD-OUT, I'M JUST -- JUST AS THE DEVELOPMENT ITSELF.

>> MS. HIKICHI: IF I MAY, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF THIS WAS A STRAIGHT SUBDIVISION WITHOUT AN ASSOCIATED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, WHAT HE'S PROPOSING AND WHAT HE HAS SUBMITTED IS SUFFICIENT FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. BECAUSE THIS IS HILLSIDE AND IT HAS AN ASSOCIATED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TIED TO THIS PROJECT, WHAT WE ARE ASKING IS ROUTINE INFORMATION, AND WE NEED THIS INFORMATION NOW TO RECOMMEND THE LOCATION OF THE PADS, THE IMPACTS, THE AMOUNT OF GRADING, THE NUMBER OF LOTS, SO BASED ON THE GRADE INFORMATION HE HAS NOW, BASED ON THE BUILDING PADS THAT HE IS PROPOSING NOW, THEN WE CAN RECOMMEND THE NUMBER OF LOTS, THE LOCATION FOR FUTURE AREAS, SO IF THIS WAS JUST A STRAIGHT SUBDIVISION, WHAT HE HAS IS SUFFICIENT, BUT BECAUSE THERE'S AN ASSOCIATED ENTITLEMENT, A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR HILLSIDE, THIS IS ROUTINE INFORMATION THAT WE ASK OF ALL APPLICANTS, WE'RE NOT ASKING ANYTHING ADDITIONAL, THIS IS THE SAME ROUTINE INFORMATION THAT WE ASK FROM EACH OF OUR APPLICANTS WHICH THEY USUALLY DO, AND THEY GIVE US AND

WE UNDERSTAND THAT HE'S NOT PROPOSING TO BUILD RIGHT NOW, AND ALL THE SUBDIVISIONS THAT WE RECEIVE THAT HAS AN ASSOCIATED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT ARE NOT PLANNING TO BUILD AT THIS TIME, BUT THEY DO ANTICIPATE IF WE WERE TO BUILD, THIS IS THE LOCATION, THIS IS HOW MUCH GRADING IS RIPER, AND WE DO UNDERSTAND IN THE FUTURE, THERE MAY BE OTHER ISSUES INVOLVED THAT WE ARE NOT AWARE OF IT NOW THAT COME INTO PLAY SO IN YOUR CONDITIONS IN THE APPROVAL, WE USUALLY BUILD IN A PERCENTAGE, WHETHER IT'S 3 OR 5 PERCENT, SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IF HE'S PROPOSING TO CUT 100 CUBIC YARDS FOR EXAMPLE AND IT TURNS OUT WE NEED 120, WE DO BUILD IN THAT LITTLE LEVERAGE FOR FLEXIBILITY WHERE THEY WOULD NOT NEED A NEW CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT OR DO NOT NEED TO COME BACK TO REGIONAL PLANNING BECAUSE WE DID BUILD THAT IN FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE, IN THIS CASE, WE DON'T HAVE ANY INFORMATION FOR INDIVIDUAL LOTS AND BECAUSE IT'S A HILLSIDE, WE DO HAVE TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE DRAINAGE, THE LOCATION AND IN ADDITION, THERE IS WILDLIFE HABITATS THAT HAS BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION TO THE NORTH SIDE AND TO THE SOUTHERN SIDE, SO WE HAVE TO TAKE ALL THAT INTO CONSIDERATION AS WELL AS THE OPEN SPACE AREA, THE BUILDING PADS THAT YOU SEE ON THE LEFT HAND SIDE, THAT SCREEN, THE DARK SQUARE IS BASICALLY THE BUILDING PADS AND THE YELLOW AREAS IS HIS BUILDABLE AREA, IF YOU WERE TO APPROVE THAT NOW, WE'RE BASICALLY IMPROVING THE ENTIRE YELLOW AREA AS BUILDING PADS, AND AGAIN, WE DON'T HAVE THE GRADING INFO, HOW MUCH ARE YOU GRADING, WHERE ARE YOU GRADING, AND THE LOCATION OF

THOSE AREAS, IS IT APPROPRIATE FOR A HILLSIDE, SO BECAUSE THIS HAS AN ASSOCIATED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, WE NEED THAT NOW, WE KNOW HE'S NOT PROPOSING TO BUILD OR CUT IN PHIL NOW BUT WE DID ADVISE HIM, GIVE US THE INFORMATION AS IF YOU ARE GOING TO BUILD NOW EVEN THOUGH YOU'RE NOT GOING TO BUILD BECAUSE WE NEED ALL THAT INFORMATION TO UNDERSTAND ALL THAT INFORMATION.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU.

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

>> MS. HIKICHI: SO, BASED ON THE SUB DENSITY ANALYSIS, BASED ON THE STEEPNESS OF THE AREA, THE LOT, THE LOW DENSITY FLESH HOLD WAS TWO, SO IF HE WANTED TO BUILD TWO, HE WOULD NOT REQUIRE A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED WAS 10 AND THEIR POINT WAS 6, SO AT THE TIME WHEN 10 WAS PROPOSED, I'M SORRY, BUT I WASN'T HERE AT THE TIME, SO 10 WAS PROPOSED A FEW YEARS AGO AND THAT WAS A PROPOSED PROJECT, BUT WITHOUT A CUP, IT WOULD BE TWO, BUT BECAUSE HE WANTS MORE THAN TWO, A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT IS REQUIRED.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU, THANK YOU. ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS? DISCUSSION?

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: I GUESS IT'S UP TO THE APPLICANT THEN, DOES HE WANT TO PROCEED TO GO BACK WITH STAFF WITH TWO LOTS.

>> WE ALREADY HAVE TWO HOUSES ON THE PLACE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: MY SENSE IS IF THERE WAS A CONTINUANCE, YOU WOULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRY TO COMPLY WITH THE REQUEST, AND IT SOUNDS TO ME THAT YOU FEEL LIKE YOU'VE EXHAUSTED THAT, THAT YOU'VE ANSWERED EVERYTHING THAT YOU CAN ANSWER AND THAT YOUR REQUEST IS WE JUST NEED TO PUSH FORWARD?

>> I'M SORRY, I'M HAVING DIFFICULTY.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: IN SUMMARY, I THINK YOU HAVE A COUPLE OF OPTIONS HERE, ONE IS TO GO WITH THE CONTINUANCE, SIT DOWN WITH STAFF, SEE IF YOU CAN SATISFY THE REQUESTS, SEE IF YOU CAN MOVE FORWARD WITH YOUR ORIGINAL APPLICATION AND BRING IT BACK BEFORE THIS COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL. ALTERNATIVELY, IF YOU FEEL YOU'VE EXHAUSTED YOUR DISCUSSIONS WITH STAFF, THAT YOU'VE DONE EVERYTHING YOU CAN DO AND THAT YOU'RE HERE TO SAY I REALLY WANT TO PUSH ON AND PUT ASIDE THE RECOMMENDATION OF STAFF, THAT'S ANOTHER OPTION I SUSPECT.

>> THOSE CALLS ARE UP TO MY CLIENT OBVIOUSLY. THE ONLY THING I THINK I'M ASKING FOR HERE AND I'VE ASKED IT BEFORE IS IF YOU DON'T LIKE MY DRAWING, GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT TYPE OF A FOOTPRINT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE WITH MY CONSTRAINTS AND THAT BASICALLY IS I DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT FOOTPRINT IS GOING TO LOOK LIKE BUT YOU TELL ME WHAT YOU WANT TO SEE ON THERE AND I'LL PUT IT ON THE DRAWING. THE PADS THAT I'VE SHOWN ON THERE ARE NOT NECESSARILY THINGS I WOULD RECOMMEND OR I THINK A GOOD DESIGNER WOULD NECESSARILY END UP WITH. MY PERSONAL OPINION, I WOULD MUCH RATHER HAVE YOU CONTINUE THAN TO AVOID IT NOW, BUT WHAT I GUESS I'M LOOKING FOR FROM YOU PEOPLE IS SOMEWHAT OF A DIRECTION ABOUT HOW

WE APPROACH JUST ONE TECHNICAL THING AND THAT'S JUST AN EXHIBIT ABOUT WHAT THOSE PADS MIGHT LOOK LIKE.

>> ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE CAN SEE FROM WORKING WITH THE APPLICANT HERE, WE WOULD NEED INFORMATION THAT SHOWS THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPING THE LOTS AS THEY'RE BEING PROPOSED. IF WE HAD GRADING THAT SHOWED THE AMOUNT OF FILL, YOU KNOW, OF IMPORT, IF IT INVOLVED ANY HALL ROUTES, WE WOULD NEED TO ANALYZE THAT, WE'RE NOT REQUIRING THE APPLICANT GRADE THE PROJECT AS PART OF THIS APPROVAL BUT WE WOULD NEED TO UNDERSTAND THE SCOPE OF THE WORK NEEDED TO DEVELOP THESE LOTS SO THAT WE WOULD UNDERSTAND AND ESPECIALLY GOING THROUGH THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS, WE WOULD UNDERSTAND THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT, THAT'S THE LEVEL OF INFORMATION THAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR, THAT WOULD MEAN THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE SOME DESIGN, MAYBE THE PADS, BUT IT WOULD NEED TO BE SOME SORT OF GRADING WE CAN UNDERSTAND AND BE ABLE TO ANALYZE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: I APPRECIATE THAT, I UNDERSTAND THAT STAFF HAS SHARED THAT WITH THE APPLICANT ALREADY, THIS IS NOT THE FIRST TIME THAT THAT STATEMENT WAS MADE.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: AGAIN, MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK THIS IS A BODY THAT SHOULD BE DOING THAT PLANNING, FROM MY PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE, I ALWAYS STRIVE FOR MIDPOINTS AND I THINK MIDPOINT IS

A PLACE THAT WE SHOULD LOOK FOR WITH DEVELOPMENTS, UNLESS THERE IS SOME EXTRAORDINARY REASON WE'VE GOT SOME INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIT IN THE AREA AND THEY'RE MAKING A GREATER CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THAT INFRASTRUCTURE, IF THE APPLICANT IS LOOKING FOR SOME DIRECTION, I AS ONE MEMBER OF THIS BODY WOULD DIRECT IT BACK TOWARDS MIDPOINT AND IF MIDPOINT IS 5 OR 6, THEN THAT'S MORE WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE V BUT THAT'S JUST ME AND HE HAS TO CONVINCING STAFF THAT HE'S BRINGING SOMETHING ABOVE AND BEYOND TO THIS COMMUNITY WHICH WOULD GO TO A MAXIMUM LEVEL OF BUILD.AGAIN, WE'RE AT THIS ONGOING IMPASSE AND QUITE FRANKLY, I THINK THAT WE SHOULD GO AHEAD AND APPROVE A CONTINUANCE.I FOR ONE WOULD DIRECT TOWARDS MIDPOINT AND IF THE APPLICANT AND STAFF CANNOT COME BACK WITHIN THAT REASONABLE TIMEFRAME WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL, I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE REASONS FOR DENIAL SO THAT WE DON'T CONTINUE TO MOVE ON WITH THIS.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU.COMMISSIONER HELSLEY?

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD CONCUR WITH THAT AND I THINK ONE OF THE THINGS THAT IS KIND OF STRIVED FOR IF THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT IS GOING TO PROVIDE THE APPLICANT WITH SOME BONUSES ABOVE AND BEYOND WHAT IS BASICALLY ALLOWED WITHIN HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT, THEN THERE NEEDS TO BE SOME BONUSES FOR THE COMMUNITY OR THERE NEEDS TO BE A TRADE-OFF FOR THAT, THAT IS DESIGNATED TO THE COMMUNITY AS A COMMUNITY BENEFIT, AND THAT'S -- I DON'T SEE

THAT IN ANY STRENGTH AT THIS POINT, AND I THINK WHAT YOU'VE DONE FOR LOT 6 MAKES SOME SENSE TO ME AS TO -- I CAN UNDERSTAND THE BALANCE. I DON'T HAVE ANY IDEA WHAT IT IS FOR THE OTHER PARCELS, AND THAT'S WHERE I THINK MY HANG-UP IS.

>> MY PROBLEM WITH THE REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER OF LOTS DOES NOT CHANGE THE CRITERIA OF PERCENTAGE OF OPEN SPACE VERSUS BUILDABLE SPACE, THAT'S BASED ON THE SQUARE FOOTAGE AND ACREAGE, NOT ON THE NUMBER OF LOTS. WHAT I STILL DON'T HEAR IS THAT IF I REDUCE THAT TO FIVE OR SIX LOTS, WHAT DOES THAT EXHIBIT THAT YOU'RE ASKING ME BEFORE LOOK LIKE? WE HAVE GONE THROUGH THE HYDROLOGY STUDY, WE'VE SHOWN THAT WE'VE TAKEN CARE OF COLLECTING ANY ADDITIONAL RUN-OFF AND BEING ABLE TO TREAT THAT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PUBLIC WORKS, WE'VE GONE THROUGH THOSE STEPS AND STUFF TO ANSWER THOSE, JUST DECREASING THE NUMBER OF LOTS DOES NOT ANSWER MY PROBLEM, WHAT DO YOU WANT TO SEE ON THAT EXHIBIT AS FAR AS THAT FOOTPRINT? I CAN'T SHOW YOU GRADING IF I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE FOOTPRINT LOOKS LIKE, I CAN'T SHOW YOU CULVERTS, I HAVE DEMONSTRATED THAT I COULD BALANCE DIRT WORK WITHIN THE FOOTINGS ITSELF.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: ANY OTHER GUIDANCE ONE WANTS TO SHARE WITH MR. MAXWELL, OTHERWISE, I THINK WE'RE IN A POSITION -- UNLESS THERE ARE ANY OTHER FINAL STATEMENTS FROM STAFF?

>> MS. HIKICHI: THE INFORMATION THAT WE'VE BEEN ASKING HAS BEEN ASKED FROM DAY 1, I BELIEVE, FROM SPEAKING FROM THE OTHER PLANNERS, AND LIKE I SAID, THIS IS ROUTINE INFORMATION THAT WE ASK OF ALL APPLICANTS IF IT DEALS WITH HILLSIDE CUP, AND WHAT WE'VE BEEN ASKING IS INDIVIDUAL GRADING PAD INFORMATION, AND WE'VE ASKED THAT FOR A LONG TIME NOW AND WE KEEP GETTING THE SAME INFORMATION, THE SAME MAPS. HE DOES UPDATE A PORTION OF THE MAP BUT HE DOESN'T UPDATE THE EXHIBIT OR THE OPEN SPACE, SO THEY ARE INCONSISTENT, BUT BESIDES THAT POINT, WHAT WE NEED -- WHAT STAFF NEEDS TO FULLY MAKE A RECOMMENDATION IS DEGRADING INFORMATION FOR THE INDIVIDUAL PADS AS WELL AS THE OPEN SPACE. THE OPEN SPACE AS WELL AS THE EXHIBIT A DO NOT EVEN MATCH BECAUSE THE OPEN SPACE HAS THE BUILDABLE AREAS, IF THAT IS WHAT HE'S PROPOSING, THAT BUILDABLE AREA OF THE PAD IS JUST TOO BIG AND WE WOULD NOT RECOMMEND A 10 LOT SUBDIVISION.

>> IF I MAY INTERRUPT, FROM WHAT YOU SAID THIS MORNING, I THINK STAFF HAS ENOUGH TO COME BACK TO YOU WITH A RECOMMENDATION.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: I WANTED TO MAKE SURE THERE WAS ANY OTHER GUIDANCE THAT THIS COMMISSION WANTED TO OFFER IF WE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY, AND I'M PREPARED TO GIVE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THIS MATTER.

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: I'LL MOVE THAT WE CONTINUE THIS MATTER TO A DATE -- DO WE HAVE A SPECIFIC DATE?

>> THE RECOMMENDED DATE WAS MAY 8TH.

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: TO MAY 8TH, 2013.

>> MY NAME IS ARTURO BARERRA, AS OF NOW, THE 10 LOTS, TWO OF THE HOMES ARE OCCUPIED BY MY SISTERS, THE OTHER LOTS, WE WANT TO KEEP AS A FAMILY, AT THIS POINT, WE'RE NOT INTENDING TO SELL ANYTHING. I PLAN TO PUT A HOUSE THERE MYSELF IN THE FUTURE, MY BROTHERS AS WELL AND MY FATHER IS AS WELL, SO OUR MAIN CONCERN, IF WE DO PUT SOMETHING ON THERE THAT'S GOING TO STAY WITH THE HOUSE AND THE PLOT IS GOING TO LOOK LIKE, IF WE DO DECIDE TO SELL IN THE FUTURE, THAT THAT NEW OWN R WILL BE SADDLED WITH WHATEVER IS THERE, HE WON'T BE ABLE TO DO ANYTHING THAT HE CAN MAKE THE HOUSE OR THE LOT HIS OWN AND THAT'S BEEN OUR PROBLEM SINCE DAY 1. WE'VE TOLD THIS TO THE PREVIOUS PLANNERS, PEOPLE FROM THE PLANNING THAT AT THIS POINT, WE DON'T -- WE WOULD NOT LIKE TO DO THAT BECAUSE WE DON'T KNOW WHAT IT'S GOING TO LOOK LIKE AND AT THAT POINT, IT WAS NOT AN ISSUE, THEY SAID WE CAN COME BACK FOR THE INDIVIDUAL LOTS AND SEE WHAT THEY CAN DO, JUST SHOW THEM THE INDIVIDUAL PAD, WHAT IT'S GOING TO LOOK LIKE, AND LATER ON THE INDIVIDUAL OWNER, IF WE DO DECIDE TO SELL THE PROPERTY CAN COME BACK AND NEEDS TO DO WHATEVER

THEY NEED TO DO AND CONFORM TO WHATEVER THEY NEED TO DO.AT THIS POINT, WE'RE NOT PLANNING TO SELL ANYTHING.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: I SUGGEST WE TAKE THIS OFF CALENDAR, WHEN THE APPLICANT'S READY FOR WHATEVER PROJECT IT MAY BE, THEY APPROACH THE STAFF AND REPROCESS IT.WE HAVE A MOTION ON THE FLOOR. CAN WE CONTINUE THIS AND TAKE IT OFF CALENDAR?

>> CHAIR LOUIE: MOVED, SECONDED, DISCUSSION?

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: I WOULD LIKE THE ADD ONE COMMENT TO BOTH OF YOU, AND SOMETIMES THE THINGS THAT YOU WANT, YOU CANNOT GET BECAUSE OF OUR RULES OR REQUIREMENTS, AND I WANT YOU TO CONSIDER THAT.YOU HAVE TO GO BY THE REQUIREMENTS [INAUDIBLE] AND IT MAY NOT BE EXACTLY WHAT YOU WOULD WANT TO DO, YOU HAVE TO COMPROMISE AND YOU HAVE TO GO BY WHAT'S REQUIRED IF YOU WANT TO DO THIS.THAT'S ALL I'M GOING TO TELL YOU.

>> AND I UNDERSTAND THAT.

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: NO MORE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, IT'S BEENMOVED, SECONDED, OPPOSED?MOTION IS APPROVED.THANK YOU.

>> MS. HIKICHI: THANK YOU.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: IS THIS A SINGLE LOT AT THE PRESENT TIME OR IS IT TWO LOTS?

>> MS. HIKICHI: CURRENTLY, THERE ARE THREE LOTS THAT WILL BE CONSOLIDATED INTO ONE PROJECT.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: SO, RIGHT NOW THERE ARE THREE SPECIFIC LOTS, EACH OF THOSE LOTS IS BUILDABLE?

>> MS. HIKICHI: SO, THERE ARE THREE LOTS, TWO OF THEM ALREADY HAVE HOMES, ONE IS A LOT RIGHT BEHIND IT, AND I THINK THAT IS A LAND LOT.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: SO, IF THERE WAS -- THERE MAY BE A WAY OF DOING SOMETHING AND AGAIN IF THEY'RE LOOKING ALL FOR FAMILY UNITS, WE DO HAVE -- I DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S A RESTRICTION IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA, BUT THERE'S A SECOND UNIT AS WELL.

>> MS. HIKICHI: SO, I BELIEVE THIS IS --

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: I THINK AGAIN --

>> I DON'T THINK WE HAVE THREE LOTS, NOT THREE LEGAL LOTS.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU VERY MUMP, AND I APPRECIATE THE TIME YOU SPENT WITH US AND I THINK IT'S TIME TO MOVE ON.THANK YOU.THANK YOU.WE'RE ON TO PART V, I'M NUMBER 7, PROJECT NUMBER R201300255, ADVANCED PLANNING.MR. EVANGELHO.

>> MR. EVANGELHO: GOOD MORNING.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: GOOD MORNING.

>> MR. EVANGELHO: MY NAME IS TROY EVANGELHO, TODAY I'M GOING TO BE GIVING YOU A PRESENTATION ON THE 2012 GENERAL PLAN AND HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT, I WANT TO BE UPDATING YOU ON OUR EFFORTS TO DEVELOPING THE GENERAL PLAN AND NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.I WOULD LIKE TO START OUT WITH SOME QUICK BACKGROUND, THESE ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS ARE REQUIRED BY STATE LAW, IT'S A TIME FOR STAFF TO COME BACK AND CHECK IN WITH THE COMMISSION AND REPORT ON OUR PROGRESS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE GENERAL PLAN AND HOUSING ELEMENT.AFTER YOUR CONSIDERATION TODAY, THESE REPORTS WILL BE GOING TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION AND AFTER THAT, WE'LL BE SUBMITTED TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH AND ALSO THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. WITH THAT, I WOULD LIKE TO START WITH THE 2012 GENERAL PLAN PROGRESS REPORT. IN 2012, WE ADOPTED A NUMBER OF ORDINANCES WHICH HELPED TO FURTHER THE GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE GENERAL PLAN. THESE ORDINANCES INCLUDE THE [INAUDIBLE] CSC, HEALTHY DESIGN ORDINANCE, RURAL OUTDOOR DISTRICT AND CLEANUP TO TITLE 22, IN ADDITION TO THESE ORDINANCES THAT WE'VE ADOPTED, STAFF IS ALSO CURRENTLY WORKING ON DEVELOPING A NUMBER OF ORDINANCES AND PROGRAMS. THESE INCLUDE AMBULANCE SERVICES ORDINANCE, BRACKETT FIELD LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN, GREEN ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS, HEALTHY DESIGN PHASE II, HILLSIDE MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION AMENDMENTS, HOUSING FOR SENIOR CITIZENS, SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AREAS ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS, SMALL LOT ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS, TECHNICAL UPDATE TO TITLE 22 AND THE ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE PROGRAM. IN ADDITION TO ORDINANCES TO FURTHER IMPLEMENT THE GENERAL PLAN, WE'VE ALSO HAD A NUMBER OF AMENDMENTS IN 2012. THESE INCLUDE THE ADOPTION OF THE BICYCLE MASTER PLAN AND THE SANTA CLARITA VALLEY UPDATES FOR THE AREA PLAN. IN ADDITION TO THE ADOPTED AMEND PTS, WE ALSO HAVE A NUMBER OF PENDING AMENDMENTS THAT STAFF IS CURRENTLY WORKING ON PROCESSING AND DEVELOPING. THESE COUNTYWIDE AMENDMENTS INCLUDE THE NEW GENERAL PLAN AND HOUSING ELEMENTS AND ALSO THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN. SOME OF THE AREA PLAN AND COMMUNITY PLANS WE'RE CURRENTLY WORKING ON INCLUDE ANTELOPE VALLEY AREA PLAN, SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS AREA PLAN AND THE FLORENCE-FIRESTONE AREA COMMUNITY PLAN, LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAMS

INCLUDE THE MARINA DEL REY AND SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS COASTAL PROGRAM UPDATES AND WE ARE CURRENTLY DEVELOPING AND PROCESSING NEW SPECIFIC PLANS WHICH INCLUDE CENTENNIAL EAST L.A. SPECIFIC PLAN AND UNIVERSAL STUDIOS. ALSO AS THE 2012 GENERAL PLAN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT, WE'RE UPDATING THE BICYCLE PLAN MASTER PLAN, THIS IS A SUB ELEMENT OF THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT IN THE GENERAL PLAN, THE PURPOSE OF THE BICYCLE MASTER PLAN IS TO GUIDE DEVELOPMENT OF BIKEWAYS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY. SINCE ITS ADOPTION IN 2012, THE COUNTY'S UNDERTAKEN 9 PROJECTS FOR ROUGHLY 14 MILES OF BIKEWAYS, ALSO BICYCLE MASTER PLAN HAS BEEN AWARDED NUMEROUS GRANTS FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION WHICH INCLUDE 450 THOUSAND DOLLARS FROM THE SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM, 833 THOUSAND DOLLARS FROM THE BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNTS GRANTS, AND 2.49 MILLION FROM THE HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. THIS CONCLUDES THE 2012 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND I WOULD NOW LIKE TO MOVE ON AND GIVE YOU AN UPDATE OF OUR EFFORTS FOR DEVELOPING THE NEW GENERAL PLAN.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: A QUESTION BEFORE YOU LEAVE THIS AREA, AND THAT IS I DIDN'T HEAR THE INCREASE OR THE POTENTIAL INCREASE COMING IN FROM UNIVERSAL STUDIOS, OR UNIVERSAL PROJECT ON THE BIKEWAYS.

>> MR. EVANGELHO: THAT INFORMATION I WOULD HAVE TO CHECK WITH THE PLANNER THAT'S WORKING ON PROCESSING IT, I DON'T HAVE THAT

READILY AVAILABLE.I'LL MAKE A NOTE OF THAT.MOVING ON TO GIVE YOU AN UPDATE OF THE CURRENT EFFORTS FOR DEVELOPING THE NEW GENERAL PLAN, AS YOU KNOW, IN 1997, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INITIATED THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, SINCE THAT TIME, STAFF HAS CONDUCTED OVER 100 COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND RELEASED NUMEROUS DRAFTS OF THE GENERAL PLAN.THE GENERAL PLAN WILL HELP GUIDE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE YEAR 2035 AND OUR EFFORTS IN 2012 INCLUDE RELEASING A REVISED PLAN, THE GENERAL PLAN AND MEETING WITH STAKEHOLDERS SUCH AS REGIONAL AND STATE AGENCIES, BUILDING INDUSTRY AND BILLING ECONOMIC BUILDING AGENCIES, ENVIRONMENTAL AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING GROUPS AS WELL AS TOWN COUNCILS AND NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS.BASED ON THEIR INPUT, WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO FURTHER REFINE OUR DRAFT OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND IN ADDITION TO STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH, WE'VE ALSO BEEN WORKING INTERNALLY WITH STAFF, GIS IN PARTICULAR TO HELP DEVELOP OUR GIS BUILD- OUT MODEL FOR THE GENERAL PLAN AS WELL AS OTHER SECTIONS TO WORK ON PROJECTS SUCH AS THE ANTELOPE VALLEY PLAN, HILLSIDE MANAGEMENT UPDATES ORDINANCE UPDATES, ZONING CONSISTENCY.STAFF ANTICIPATES A DRAFT EIR FOR THE NEW GENERAL PLAN LATE IN 2013 AND WE PLAN ON BRINGING THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE FINAL EIR BACK FOR YOUR FINAL CONSIDERATION IN 2014.IN THE MEANTIME, STAFF WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH STAKEHOLDERS AND UPDATE THE GENERAL PLAN.NEXT -- YES?

>> CHAIR LOUIE: QUESTIONS?

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: A COMMENT, AS I LOOK AT THE SECTIONS, AND I APPRECIATE THE OVERVIEW THAT WE GOT ON THE GENERAL PLAN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT, IT WAS VERY HELPFUL, AND AS I WAS REVIEWING IT, THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE, MAYBE WE SHOULD BE CHANGING THE DATE OF WHEN THE BUILDING BECOMES HISTORIC BECAUSE WE HAVE A LOT OF BUILDINGS -- I THINK I HAVE FOUR YEARS LEFT BEFORE MY HOUSE BECOMES HISTORIC POTENTIALLY, AND I THINK THAT THIS IS KIND OF A RUNNING TARGET, WHERE DO WE SAY THAT THAT BECOMES HISTORIC BECAUSE MY HOUSE IS NOT HISTORIC, AND THAT PERIOD OF TIME THAT IS CURRENTLY DESIGNATED, MAYBE SOME THOUGHT SHOULD BE GIVEN TO EXTENDING IT FOR A LONGER PERIOD OF TIME.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU. YOU KNOW, GOVERNMENT CODE 65400 MANDATES AN ANNUAL REPORTING. IS THERE ANY MANDATED UPDATING OF THE GENERAL PLAN, CAN YOU JUST SLIDE OVER DECADES AND --

>> MR. EVANGELHO: RIGHT, THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH HAS AN ADVISORY GUIDE AND IT RECOMMENDS REVISING AND UPDATING THE GENERAL PLAN EVERY 10 YEARS, WE'RE PUTTING THAT IN OUR LANGUAGE TO BRING FORWARD THAT WE KEEP UP WITH THAT AND UPDATING IT EVERY 10 YEARS.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU.

>> MR. EVANGELHO: NEXT, I WOULD LIKE TO PRESENT THE 2012 HOUSING ELEMENT ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT. OUR CURRENT HOUSING ELEMENT COVERS THE PLANNING YEARS 2008 TO 2014. SCAG, THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS HAS BEEN TASKED WITH ASSIGNING A REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION TO ALL OF THE REGIONAL JURISDICTIONS, TO ALL OF TO MUNICIPALITIES WITHIN ITSELF JURISDICTION, OUR HOUSING ALLOCATION FROM THAT PERIOD IS 57 THOUSAND 176 UNITS, NOW, OUR TASK IS TO PLAN FOR THESE UNITS, NOT NECESSARILY BUILD THEM, WE HAVE TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE ENOUGH SITES WITH THE PROPER LAND USE AND ZONING AND CAPACITY TO ALLOW FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THESE UNITS BUT NOT NECESSARILY TO BUILD THEM. WITH THAT, CURRENTLY WE'RE AT 12% OF THAT NUMBER, WE'VE ISSUED 6 THOUSAND 295 BUILDING PERMITS FOR THAT PLANNING PERIOD, 2008-2014. IN ADDITION, WE'VE HAD A NUMBER OF ANNEXATIONS TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA IN THIS PAST YEAR, 2012, WITH THOSE ANNEXATIONS WHEN SANTA CLARITA TAKES UNINCORPORATED COUNTY LAND, THEY TAKE THAT HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION ALONG WITH THEM, SO IN 2012, WE TRANSFERRED 1981 UNITS TO THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA. IN ADDITION TO PLANNING FOR ADDITIONAL HOUSING GROWTH, ANOTHER PART OF THE GENERAL PLAN, I'M SORRY, HOUSING ELEMENT, IS TO PROVIDE PROGRAMS, GOALS AND POLICIES TO HELP REDUCE THE BURDENS ON HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AND TO INCENTIVIZE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS, .AND IN DOING SO, WE'VE INCLUDED A NUMBER OF PROGRAMS IN OUR HOUSING ELEMENTS

SUCH AS THE SECOND UNITS ORDINANCE, THE DENSITY BONUS ORDINANCE, [INAUDIBLE] ORDINANCE, FARM WORKER/HOUSING ORDINANCE AND REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS ORDINANCE. IN 2012, THE SECOND UNITS ORDINANCE ALLOWED FOR THE APPROVAL OF 24 UNITS, THE DENSITY BONUS ORDINANCE ALLOWED FOR THE APPROVAL OF 55 UNIT, WE'VE RECEIVED THREE APPLICATIONS FOR THE REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS, AND THE MIXED USE AND FARM WORKER HOUSING ORDINANCES DID NOT RECEIVE ANY APPLICATIONS TO PRODUCE ANY NEW UNITS. IN ADDITION, IN 2012, STAFF MET WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND PRESENTED AN INCLUSIONARY HOUSING RECORD WHICH RECOMMEND NOT INCLUDING OR PURSUING AN INCLUSIONARY HOUSING POLICY OR HOUSING AT TIME AND ALSO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION INITIATED THE STAFF TO BEGIN DEVELOPING A SMALL LOT SUBDIVISIONS ORDINANCE WHICH WE ANTICIPATE BRINGING BACK FOR A PUBLIC HEARING IN 2014. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE ON TO AN UPDATE OF OUR CURRENT EFFORTS FOR --

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE A QUESTION ON THAT, WHEN THOSE NUMBERS WERE DEBRIEFED DERIVED AND I SEEM TO RECOLLECT SEVERAL YEARS AGO, WE WERE TOLD THAT THE STATE HAD A DEFICIT OF SOME 200 THOUSAND UNITS PER YEAR BASED UPON GROWTH PROJECTIONS, THE COUNTY ALLOCATIONS WAS SOMETHING LIKE 50 THOUSAND, THE RECESSION HIT AND EVERYTHING STOPPED, POPULATION, MIGRATION TO CALIFORNIA HAS SLOWED, INDEED THERE'S BEEN CERTAIN YEARS THERE'S BEEN A MIGRATION OUT, SO THE PROJECTIONS FROM WHICH

THOSE NUMBERS CAME FROM THE STATE, SCAG LOOKED AT THEM, IF WE'RE LOOKING AT 2008-2014 TIME PERIOD, WE'RE EITHER WOEFULLY BEHIND OR THOSE NUMBERS NEED MAJOR OVERHAUL, SO THE FIRST QUESTION IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION WITH SCAG OR THE STATE IN TERMS OF SOME MODIFICATION OF THOSE NUMBERS?SECONDLY, TO WHAT DEGREE OF THOSE 57 THOUSAND UNITS THAT WE HAD TO ACHIEVE DID NEWHALL RANCH FALL WITHIN THAT OR OUTSIDE OF IT, AND AGAIN WE SORT OF MASTER PLANNED LARGE GROUPS BUT INDIVIDUAL SUBDIVISIONS WITHIN THAT SPECIFY THE NUMBERS, SO HOW DOES THAT FALL INTO PLACE AND CENTENNIAL WHICH HAS BEEN SORT OF ON THE BOOKS IN SOMETHING THAT I THINK AS LONG AS I'VE BEEN ON THIS COMMISSION, IT HAS BEEN DISCUSSED AND WE'VE NEVER SEEN ANYTHING OTHER THAN PERIODIC UPDATES, AND BOTH NEWHALL RANCH AND CENTENNIAL WOULD TAKE CARE OF A LOT OF THOSE NUMBERS, HOW HAVE THEY BEEN FACTORED IN OR NOT FACTORED IN, A SORT OF THREE PART QUESTION.

>> MR. EVANGELHO: FOR NEWHALL, SINCE IT IS AN APPROVED SPECIFIC PLAN, WE WERE ABLE TO COUNT THOSE UNITS TOWARDS OUR REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION AND WE'VE DONE THAT IN THE CURRENT 2008-2014 HOUSING ELEMENT AND WE'RE ALSO CONTINUING TO DO THAT IN THE NEW UPDATED HOUSING ELEMENT.THE CENTENNIAL, I'M NOT AS FAMILIAR WITH CENTENNIAL, I'M GOING TO HAVE MY COLLEAGUE HERE.

>> CONNIE CHUNK IN THE HOUSING SECTION, AS MR. EVANGELHO INDICATED, AT PARTS OF OUR INVENT TORE FOR THE CURRENT HOUSING ELEMENT, WE DID INCLUDE THAT AS A POSSIBLE WAY IN WHICH WE CAN MEET OUR HOUSING NEEDS DURING THE PLANNING PERIOD.THE NUMBERS THAT WE PROVIDE TO YOU IN THE ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT ARE BASED ON BUILDING PERMIT DATA, SO WHAT WE REPORT ON ARE THE ACTUAL UNITS THAT HAVE BEEN BUILT, BUT IN TERMS OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT WHERE WE IDENTIFY SITES THAT COULD POTENTIALLY HELP MEET THE HOUSING NEEDS WITHIN THE PLANNING PERIOD, WE DO CITE SPECIFIC PLAN -- APPROVE SPECIFIC PLAN AREAS SUCH AS NEWHALL LAND, SO THAT IS IN THERE AND THE -- I KNOW THERE HAVE BEEN SOME APPROVALS IN NEWHALL BUT WE CONTINUE TO CREDIT THE POTENTIAL THAT WE HAVE FOR NOT ONLY HOUSING BUT ALSO AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE NEWHALL SPECIFIC PLAN AREA, CENTENNIAL IS A PENDING PROJECT, CENTENNIAL SPECIFIC PLAN IS A PENDING PROJECT, WE DO LIST IT AS A PENDING POSSIBLE PLAN AMENDMENT IN THE GENERAL PLAN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT AND THAT IS AN ONGOING PROJECT.IF CENTENNIAL IS -- OR ANY OTHER PENDING SPECIFIC PLAN IS ADOPTED, THEN AS PART OF THE ADEQUATE SITES INVENTORY FOR A FUTURE HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE, WE WOULD INCLUDE THAT AS PART OF HOW WE COULD MEET OUR HOUSING NEEDS, BUT AT THIS TIME, BECAUSE IT'S PENDING, IT'S PREMATURE TO INCLUDE IT.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: DO WE HAVE LIKE PLACE HOLDERS IN FOR THOSE THAT WE THINK MIGHT COME ALONG AND THEN I KNOW NEWHALL LAND,

NEWHALL RANCH WAS A SPECIFIC PLAN, BUT THEN THE VARIOUS COMMUNITIES THAT HAVE COME THROUGH THIS BODY, I THINK EACH ONE OF THEM HAS HAD A REDUCTION IN TERMS OF REQUESTS WHICH HAVE BEEN APPROVED AND THAT HAS NOT -- I THINK FROM THEIR STANDPOINT, THAT CREDIT THEY WOULD LIKE TO SORT OF MOVE ON AND RESERVE FOR SOME FUTURE ACTIVITY, BUT AT SOME POINT IN TIME, THAT IS EITHER GOING TO MEET THE NUMBERS THAT WERE ORIGINALLY PART OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN OR MASTER PLAN FOR THAT, OR WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO ADD THOSE -- SORT OF TAKE THOSE BACK AND ADD THEM. WE'VE HAD A NUMBER OF OTHER KIND OF APPROVED PROJECTS THAT NEVER GOT DONE THAT I KNOW WE'VE DONE A LOT OF HOUSE CLEANING OVER THE LAST FEW YEARS AND WE'VE REMOVED THOSE, HAS THERE BEEN ANY CHARGE BACK OF THOSE AS WELL, BUT ARE YOU AGAIN LOOKING AT BUILDING PERMITS BECAUSE I KNOW AT ONE POINT IN TIME, SANTA CLARITA VALLEY HAD A MASSIVE NUMBER OF UNITS THAT WERE SORT OF ON THE DRAWING BOARD, AND I THINK THAT NUMBER HAS COME DOWN DRAMATICALLY.

>> IT DEPENDS ON -- IT'S ESPECIALLY WITH THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS AND FOR THE COUNTYWIDE DOCUMENT, IT'S CALLED THE ADEQUATE SITES INVENTORY, IT'S A LIST LITERALLY OF PARCEL NUMBERS, OF ALL THE SITES THAT HELP WITH THE PROPER ZONING AND LAND USE DESIGNATION THAT DEMONSTRATES TO THE STATE THAT WE HAVE THE CAPACITY TO MEET OUR HOUSING NEEDS, ACTUALLY BUILDING THEM DURING THE PLANNING PERIOD IS A DIFFERENT STORY, BUT OUR OBLIGATION THROUGH THE

HOUSING ELEMENT IS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT WE AT LEAST HAVE THOSE SITES. IN THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT, A WAY TO LOOK AT IT IS IT'S AN ACCOUNTING SHEET OF THE SITES THAT WE IDENTIFIED, IDENTIFIED IN THE ACTUAL SITES INVENTORY AND WHETHER ANYTHING'S BEEN BUILT AND IF THE AMOUNT OF UNITS THAT WE HAD ORIGINALLY PROJECTED HAD ACTUALLY BEEN BUILT, SO IF THERE'S A SITE THAT WE INCLUDED AND WE SAID THAT BASED ON THE DENSITY, WE WOULD HAVE 100 UNITS ON THE SITE AND WHEN AN APPLICANT COMES IN AND PROPOSES ONE UNIT, THEN ESSENTIALLY WE'RE OBLIGATED TO POINT TO A DIFFERENT SITE OR IF WE HAVE A SURPLUS OF SITES, TO MAKE UP FOR THE 99 UNIT POTENTIAL THAT WE LOST WHEN SOMEONE ACTUALLY BUILT SOMETHING ON THE SITE, SO IT GETS A LITTLE COMPLICATED BUT USUALLY THE SITES THAT WE INCLUDE IN THE ADEQUATE SITES INVENTORY IN ADDITION TO THE POTENTIAL IN THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREAS ARE PRIMARILY I WOULD SAY WITHIN OUR URBAN INFILL FARES WITH DENSITIES THAT ALLOW 30 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: THERE HAS BEEN NO ADJUSTMENT FROM THE STATE OR SCAG IN TERMS OF THOSE NUMBERS SO IS IT FAIR TO SAY THAT THIS IS SORT OF A ROLLING TARGET AND THAT WHAT'S NOT DONE DURING THE 2008-2014 PLANNING PERIOD SORT OF ROLLS OVER WITH SOME ADJUSTMENT THAT MAY COME DOWN FROM THE STATE OR FROM SCAG?

>> RIGHT, BECAUSE AS MR. EVANGELHO MENTIONED, WE ARE NOT REPORTING JUST ON AN EXISTING HOUSING ELEMENT, BUT ONE THAT'S EXISTING, WE DID RECEIVE A NEW ASSESSMENT HOUSE NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND IT IS AROUND [INAUDIBLE] FOR 2013-2021 PLANNING PERIOD, SO IF YOU COMPARE THAT TO THE LAST PLANNING PERIOD OF 57 THOUSAND, THE NUMBER DID REDUCE SIGNIFICANTLY IN TERMS OF WHAT OUR HOUSING NEED PROJECTIONS ARE.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: SO, THE 30 IS NOT THEN TAKING INTO ACCOUNT AN ASSUMPTION THAT THE 57 WERE ACHIEVED, SO AGAIN, IT'S JUST A ROLLING TARGET, SO THE REALITY IS THE 57 THOUSAND WERE NOT ACHIEVED SO NOW FOR ANOTHER 5 YEAR PERIOD WHICH TAKES OVER A 10 YEAR PERIOD, THAT 57 FROM FIVE YEARS IS NOW 30 FOR TEN YEARS, IS THAT SORT OF A REASONABLE --

>> AND IF ANYTHING, MY GUESS IS NOT ONLY US BUT A LOT OF OTHER JURISDICTIONS HAVE PROBABLY IDENTIFIED SITES WHERE, YOU KNOW, THEY SAID THERE WOULD BE HOUSING POTENTIAL AND THEY'RE PROBABLY STILL VACANT AND UNDERUTILIZED BECAUSE OF THE MINIMAL BUILDING ACTIVITY THAT WE'VE HAD OVER THE LAST FEW YEAR, SO THE OPTION IS FOR LOCAL JURISDICTIONS TO TAKE THOSE SITES AND APPLY THEM TO THE NEXT HOUSING ELEMENT PLANNING PERIOD AND THAT'S PROBABLY GOING TO BE THE CASE FOR A LOT OF THE SITES IN OUR HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE AS WELL.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: THANK YOU.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU, A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS, ONE, THE INCLUSIONARY HOUSING PROGRAM WAS CURTAILED WITH JEFF PALMER AND THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, IS THERE ANY THOUGHT THAT THE REQUIREMENT COULD BE REWORDED, REDRAFTED TO BEGIN AN INCLUSIONARY PROGRAM, OR IS THAT -- WE'RE DONE WITH THAT?

>> I FEEL THERE IS A CURRENT PROPOSED BILL, IT'S CALLED AB1229 ATKINS, AND IT'S ONE OF MAYBE THREE BILLS WHERE WE'VE TRIED, THE HOUSING COMMUNITY HAS TRIED TO LEGISLATIVELY MAKE IT CLEAR THAT LOCAL INCLUSIONARY HOUSING ORDINANCES OR REQUIREMENTS ARE PERMITTED, I THINK WITH THE PALMER DECISION, THERE WAS A REALIZATION OF THE HAWKINS ACT, IF WE CAN ADDRESS IT LEGISLATIVELY, I THINK IT'S SOMETHING WE COULD CONSIDER IN OUR HOUSING ACTIVITY UPDATE, IT'S CERTAINLY A PROGRAM THAT WE'RE DEFINITELY INTERESTED IN EXPLORING FURTHER, BUT DUE TO THE LIMITATIONS OF THE PALMER DECISION, WE'VE KIND OF LEFT IT AT THAT POINT. IN ADDITION, I DO HAVE TO MAKE THE POINT TOO THAT WE'RE ALSO IN A PERIOD WHERE I THINK THERE AREN'T A LOT OF RESOURCES FOR HOUSING, BOTH FROM A REGULATORY STANDPOINT AND A FUNDING STANDPOINT, SO I THINK AS PART OF OUR CONSIDERATIONS FOR MOVING FORWARD WITH AN INCLUSIONARY PROGRAM, WE'D HAVE TO CONSIDER KIND OF THE CONTEXT AS WELL, AND IF

IT'S THE RIGHT ENVIRONMENT TO BE PUTTING INCLUSIONARY REQUIREMENTS
IN PLACE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU, AND THEN THERE'S AN ADAPTIVE REUSE
ORDINANCE WITHIN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES THAT APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN
VERY SUCCESSFUL IN HAVING THE CONVERSION OF OLDER STRUCTURES AND
CREATING HOUSING. IS THAT SOMETHING THAT MIGHT HAVE APPLICATION TO
THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES?

>> IT COULD. IT'S SOMETHING THAT WE COULD LOOK AT EVEN AS AN
IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM OF THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, AND I CAN'T
TELL YOU FOR SURE, BUT IT COULD EVEN BE IN OUR DRAFT
IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM, BUT IT'S CERTAINLY A GOOD RECOMMENDATION
AND WE COULD LOOK INTO IT AND CONSIDER IT AS PART OF THE GENERAL
PLAN UPDATE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: IS IT POSSIBLE THAT THE NEXT TIME THAT YOU
REPORT BACK THAT THERE COULD BE A COMMENT ABOUT THAT, WHETHER IT'S
NOT GOING TO WORK IN THE COUNTY OR, YEAH, LET'S TAKE A CLOSER
LOOK?

>> SURE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: I WOULD APPRECIATE IT. YES, YOU WANT TO PROCEED? I'M SORRY?

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: I WOULD LIKE TO GET AN EXPLANATION OF THE PROGRAM THAT'S IN L.A. CITY THAT I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES HAS THE ADAPTIVE REUSE ORDINANCE, AND IT APPLIES TO BUILDINGS, I BELIEVE, BUILT PRIOR TO 1987, AND --

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: HISTORIC BUILDINGS?

>> CHAIR LOUIE: 1987, YEAH, BUILDINGS BUILT BEFORE 1987, AND A DEVELOPER OR SOMEONE WHO WANTS TO CHANGE THE USE OF THE BUILDING HAS THE ABILITY TO REDUCE HIS PARKING REQUIREMENTS, AVOID -- HAS PREFERENTIAL APPROVAL PROCESS AND THAT'S BEEN APPLIED TO A NUMBER OF THE HISTORIC CORE BUILDINGS IN DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES AND IT IS ONE OF THE REASONS THAT OUR DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES AREA HAS GONE FROM 15 THOUSAND RESIDENTS 8, 9 YEARS AGO TO OVER 50 THOUSAND RESIDENTS SO MANY OF THE OLDER BUILDINGS THAT HAD REMAINED VACANT ON THE UPPER FLOORS HAVE REVISED THE ORDINANCE TO MAKE THE REVISION, SO IT'S SORT OF A WAY THAT THE DEVELOPERS CAN FIGURE OUT THAT THE NUMBERS CROSS AND THERE'S A PROFITABLE END RESULT.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: OKAY.I LIKE THAT AND I THINK THAT IT LEADS INTO MY COMMENT THAT I WAS GOING TO MAKE WITH COMMISSIONER MODUGNO'S POSITION, THE WORD IS BOTH, WE'RE SOULFULLY INADEQUATE AND THE PLANNING IS A NUMBER THAT'S PUT OUT THERE FOR US TO HOPEFULLY HIT.I HAVE CONCERNS IN THAT AS WE TAKE AND LOOK INTO THE CRYSTAL BALL, IT'S VERY FUZZY, BUT IT'S A SITUATION WHERE WE START LOOKING AT LAND AND WE'RE STILL PROMOTING SPRAWL RATHER THAN TAKING AND PROMOTING THE COMPRESSION AND HIGHER DENSITY.THE LARGER, DENSER AREAS LEAVE THE COUNTY AND BECOME INCORPORATED, AND AT THAT POINT, WE HAVE A PROBLEM FOR OUR NUMBERS.WHEN WE HAVE TAKEN OUR CORRIDORS AND WE'VE PUT NODES AROUND THE TRANSPORTATION AREAS, THE CRITICAL POSITION AND MAKE WE FEED TO INCREASE THOSE NODES OR MAYBE WE NEED TO INCREASE THE HEIGHT OR THE DENSITY OR SOMETHING OF THAT NATURE SO THAT WE'RE INTENSIFYING LOCATION IN DEVELOPED AREAS RATHER THAN TAKING AND LOOKING AT THE LARGE HILLS OUT IN ACTIN WHERE WE HAD 6 AND 7 HUNDRED UNIT SUBDIVISIONS PROPOSED AND THEY'VE BEEN SITTING THERE IN THOSE CANYONS NOW FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS.WE DON'T HAVE ANY TRANSPORTATION TO THAT, AND IF THOSE WERE TO BE DEVELOPED, THE INFLOW INTO THE CITY BECOMES MUCH MORE DIFFICULT, OUR USE OF RESOURCES, PARTICULARLY OF OUR FOSSIL FUEL RESOURCES HIGHLY INCREASES AND IS THAT REALLY WHERE WE SHOULD BE GOING?IS THAT SOMETHING WE SHOULD BE PROMOTING?AND SO TAKING THAT INTO CONSIDERATION, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE OUR PLAN DIMINISH THE

SPRAWL AS MUCH AS WE CAN AND COMPACT IT WHERE TRANSPORTATION AND SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU.PLEASE PROCEED.

>> MR. EVANGELHO: NOW I WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH A QUICK UPDATE ON OUR CURRENT EFFORTS FOR DEVELOPING THE NEW HOUSING ELEMENT.THE NEW HOUSING ELEMENT COVERS THE PLANNING PERIOD OF 2014-2021, AND AS MY COLLEAGUE MENTIONED, OUR REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION IS SIGNIFICANTLY LESS, OUR CURRENT REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION IS 57 THOUSAND UNITS ROUGHLY, AND OUR NEW REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS IS 30 THOUSAND 145, SO THEY HAVE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT THE SORT OF SLUMP OF BUILDING ACTIVITY AND HAVE ADJUSTED ACCORDINGLY.ALSO NEW TO THE HOUSING ELEMENT, WE HAVE NEW CENSUS DATA, NEW 2010 CENSUS DATA, WE'LL BE USING THIS DATA FOR DEVELOPING OUR STATISTICS AND DEMOGRAPHICS TO DEVELOPING OUR HOUSING NEEDS IN THE AREAS.WE'LL ALSO BE TAKING A LOOK AT OUR NUMBER OF PROGRAMS AND REVISING THEM, REMOVING PROGRAMS WE'VE ALREADY IMPLEMENTED, ADDING NEW PROGRAMS AND ADJUSTING FOR ONES THAT WE'VE DEEMED WE CANNOT IMPLEMENT.THE NEW HOUSING ELEMENTS IS STATE MANDATED TO BE ADOPTED BY OCTOBER OF THIS YEAR, OCTOBER 15TH, AND WE ARE CURRENTLY WORKING ON A DRAFT WHICH WE HOPE TO HAVE AVAILABLE FOR THE PUBLIC SOON.THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION AND I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY OTHER QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU, QUESTIONS?THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> MR. EVANGELHO: THANK YOU.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: PUBLIC COMMENT?DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DO WE HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?

>> NO, THERE WAS NOBODY THAT SIGNED UP FOR THAT.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: I APPRECIATE THAT, THANK YOU.YES, SIR?OKAY.ITEM NUMBER 9, CALL FOR REVIEW, ARE THERE?NONE?COMMISSION/COUNSEL/DIRECTOR REPORTS?

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: [INAUDIBLE].OKAY, THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. CHAIR, WE RECEIVED A COPY OF AN APPEAL THAT WAS FILED BY THE SANITATION DISTRICTS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY WITH RESPECT TO A CONDITION, MODIFICATION ON A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, AND THIS HAS TO DO WITH THE PUENTE HILLS, SO WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST, WE KNOW WE'VE BEEN OUT THERE BEFORE, THAT THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT MEETING IN TERMS OF THERE ARE A LOT OF CONCERNS IN THE COMMUNITY AND SO I WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST THAT WE SCHEDULE A MEETING IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY, I WOULD LIKE IT TO -- I ASK STAFF TO BRING BACK DATES FOR THAT MEETING TO BE HELD AND IF POSSIBLE, WE WOULD LIKE

TO HOLD THAT MEETING IN THE SAN DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS, THEY ARE VERY NICE, THEY HAVE A LOT OF PARK, IT'S EASY FOR PEOPLE TO GET THERE, SO IF THAT WOULD BE POSSIBLE, I WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST THAT.

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: I SECOND THAT MOTION OR SECOND THE REQUEST.IT IS A MOTION, RIGHT, IN THE FORM OF A MOTION?

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: I DON'T KNOW IF I NEED A MOTION, BY DIRECTION OF THE CHAIR I THINK -- YES, IT'S A REQUEST, OKAY, IT'S A REQUEST.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: I WOULD SUPPORT THE REQUEST.I KNOW THAT WE'VE TAKEN AND LOOKED AT THIS BEFORE AND WE'VE HAD VERY, VERY STRONG COMMUNITY CONCERNS ABOUT IT WITH THE DOWN-TURN, WE'VE HAD THE ELEVATION OF THE LA PUENTE LANDFILL HAS NOT REACHED THE HEIGHT THAT IT WAS EXPECTED TO GET TO IN RELATION TO THE CLOSING OUT OF IT SO WE HAVE SEEN SOME MAJOR CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED IN OUR TRASH AND COLLECTION AND RECYCLING PROCESSES.AND SO I THINK THAT I THINK IT WOULD BE GOOD TO HAVE COMMUNITY INPUT IN THE COMMUNITY.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: EXCELLENT.THAT'S A GOOD SUGGESTION.I AGREE.DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DO YOU HAVE ANY PROPOSED DATES?

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: I THINK THEY'LL BRING BACK PROPOSED DATES FOR US.

>> WE WILL CHECK WITH THE REST OF THE STAFF AND COME BACK WITH A POSSIBLE DATE FOR YOU TO CONSIDER.

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: YES, AND CAN YOU MAKE SURE THAT ALL FIVE OF US WOULD BE ABLE TO ATTEND THAT MEETING.

>> YES, I WILL.

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: THANK YOU.

>> [INAUDIBLE].

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: IN LIEU OF A MEETING, A WEDNESDAY MEETING FOR THAT WEEK, WE COULD DO THAT WEEK, WE WOULD ONLY HAVE THE MEETING IN THE COMMUNITY, IF THERE'S NO OBJECTION, THE WEEK THAT WE WOULD BE SCHEDULED, WE WOULD NOT HAVE THE WEDNESDAY MEETING ON THAT DATE.OKAY, WE CAN CHECK WITH THE COMMISSION.IS THERE A PROBLEM WITH MONDAY MEETINGS FOR ANYBODY?

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: NO, MONDAY'S FINE, I HAVE PROBLEMS WITH WEDNESDAY EVENINGS.

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: SO, THEN A MONDAY WOULD BE FINE, I'M OKAY ON A MONDAY ALSO.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: MONDAYS ARE FINE, GENTLEMEN?

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: SO, SCHEDULE IT ON A MONDAY AND THEN WE WILL NOT HAVE OUR MEETING ON WEDNESDAY.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: SO, LET IT BE DONE, LET IT BE SCHEDULED. ANY ADDITIONAL REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS? YES, SIR, COMMISSIONER HELSLEY?

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: I'M SORRY.

>> COMMISSIONER MODUGNO: MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CANCEL THE MARCH 20, 2013 MEETING.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THOSE IN FAVOR, AYE.

>> AYE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: OPPOSED? MOTION CARRIED. WITH THAT IN MIND, WE ARE IN ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY MARCH 27TH, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: BUT THAT'S NOT THE END OF US.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: WELL, TREGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION IS ADJOURNED AND WE WILL TAKE A 7 MINUTE BREAK, WE WILL RECONVENE AS THE AIRPORT COMMISSION.(RECESS FOR 7 MINUTES, TO RECONVENE AT 10:30).

>> CHAIR LOUIE: OKAY, WELCOME AGAIN, ROUND 2, THIS IS THE AIRPORT AND LAND USE COMMISSION MEETING OF MARCH 13TH, WE'LL START OFF WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.MOVED AND SECONDED, NO OBJECTIONS, THE AGENDA'S APPROVED.COUNTY COUNSEL, DO YOU HAVE ANY REPORTS FOR US THIS MORNING?

>> NO REPORTS.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DEPUTY DIRECTOR?

>> NO REPORTS THIS MORNING.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: OKAY, THANK YOU, I LOOK FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 20TH?

>> SO MOVED.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: MOVED AND SECONDED, NO OBJECTIONS, THE MINUTES ARE APPROVED, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTIONS, COMMUNITIES STUDY EAST, PROJECT NUMBER 201202527, MS. SINCLAIR AND MR. BRODY, I UNDERSTAND MR. BRODY IS SITTING ON A TRIPOD AT THIS MOMENT?

>> MR. SINCLAIR: GOOD MORNING, MY NAME IS ELIZABETH SINCLAIR WITH COMMUNITY'S EAST AND I'M ON HERE FOR AGENDA ITEM 5, THE BRACKETT FIELD AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN, THIS IS TO UPDATE YOUR COMMISSION ON THE BRACKETT FIELD AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN WHICH WAS INITIATED IN 2012 AND IS SCHEDULED TO BE CLEARED AT THE END OF THIS CALENDAR YEAR, THIS IS FUNDED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND IS BEING DEVELOPED BY ALUC STAFF BY AN AVIATION FORM, THE PROJECT LEAD IS SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER IS MR. KEN BRODY WHO JOINS US TODAY VIA WEB BASED CAM AND WE ARE GRATEFUL FOR THE TECHNICAL SUPPORT THAT MADE THAT POSSIBLE, MR. BRODY AND I WILL BOTH BE AVAILABLE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS OR LISTEN TO ANY SUGGESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.

>> MR. BRODY: GOOD MORNING.

>> MR. SINCLAIR: BY WAY OF BACKGROUND, STAFF PRESENTED THIS TO YOUR COMMISSION ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2012 AND AT THAT POINT PROVIDED LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLANS FOR BRACKETT FIELD WHICH IS LOCATED WITHIN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AS WELL AS THE PROJECT

SCOPE AND PROJECT DELIVERABLES, STAFF ALSO REPORTED AT THAT TIME ON THE FIRST MEETING OF AN INTERJURISDICTIONAL WORKING GROUP THAT CONSISTS OF LAND USE PLANNERS FROM EACH OF THE NEIGHBORING CITIES, THIS INCLUDES LA VERNE, PAMONA, WALNUT AS WELL AS AVIATION SPECIALIST FROM THE AVIATION COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AS WELL AS CALTRANS. AS DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY, EACH ALUC IN CALIFORNIA HAS THREE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES, COORDINATE AIRPORT LAND COMPATIBILITY PLANNING EFFORTS, TO PREPARE AND ADOPT AN AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN FOR EACH OF THE PUBLIC AIRPORTS IN EACH OF ITS JURISDICTION AND TO REVIEW PLANS AND LEGISLATION OF AIRPORT LAND OPERATORS. FOLLOWING STAFF'S PRESENTATION AT THE DECEMBER DISCUSSION, YOUR COMMISSION PROVIDED SEVERAL IMPORTANT POINTS OF DIRECTION CITING SEVERAL CONCERNS, IN RESPONSE TO THOSE KEY CONCERNS, STAFF HAS PRESENTED THE FOLLOWING RESPONSES, FIRST TO SUMMARIZE THOSE CONCERNS, ONE, THAT SMALL PLANES NOT BE SIZED OUT AS HAS BEEN DONE IN OTHER AIRPORTS AND THAT THE CONSULTANTS AND THE ENTIRE WORKING GROUP BE AWARE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF SMALL PLAN ACCESS. NUMBER 2, THAT ALL STAKEHOLDERS INCLUDING SMALL PILOTS ASSOCIATIONS BE INVOLVED AS EARLY IN THE PLANNING PROCESS AS POSSIBLE, THREE, THAT STRONGER REGULATIONS BE MAINTAINED AS BUILD-OUT OCCURS, AND FINALLY FOUR, THAT YOUR COMMISSION BE INVOLVED THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE PROCESS. I'LL ADDRESS EACH OF THOSE CONCERNS ONE AT A TIME. THE INTENT OF YOUR COMMISSION TO PROTECT SMALL PLANES WAS CONVEYED TO THE CONSULTANTS AS WELL AS

THE AVIATION DIVISION WHICH OVERSEES DIVISIONS AT COUNTY AIRPORTS, ALL PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS ARE ALSO AWARE OF THIS PRIORITY. IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE HERE THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLANS WHICH COVER EVERYTHING OUTSIDE THE FENCE AND AIRPORT MASTER PLANS WHICH COVER EVERYTHING INSIDE THE FENCE. IT'S THROUGH THE MASTER PLAN IN PROCESS THAT THE NEEDS AND DEMANDS OF AIRPORT TENANTS, USERS AND THE PUBLIC AT LARGE ARE CONSIDERED, FOR EXAMPLE, THE FLEET MIX OR THE TYPES OF AIRCRAFT ALLOWED TO OPERATE AT BRACKETT FIELD IS INTRODUCED IN THE BRACKETT FIELD AIRPORT MASTER PLAN WHICH WAS DEVELOPED BY THE AVIATION DIVISION AND APPROVED BY THE AVIATION COMMISSION, THE ALUC DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION OVER THE OPERATION OF THE AIRPORT. ALSO AT YOUR DIRECTION, STAFF RESEARCHED AND IDENTIFIED A NUMBER OF SMALL PILOT ASSOCIATIONS, AND WE ARE BUILDING WORKING RELATIONSHIPS WITH THOSE GROUPS, THAT HAS BECOME AN IMPORTANT PIECE OF OUR OUTREACH STRATEGY WHICH BRINGS ME TO MY SECOND POINT, WHILE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION HAS ALSO BEEN A KEY PART OF OUR PLAN FOR COMPLETING THIS PROJECT, AT YOUR DIRECTION, WE MOVED UP AND EXPANDED THAT EFFORT TO INCLUDE A BROADER RANGE OF STAKEHOLDERS EARLIER IN OUR PROCESS, SPECIFICALLY STAFF HAS DESIGNED AND IMPLEMENTED A STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH STRATEGY THAT INCLUDES CONTACT WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF ORGANIZATION, PILOT GROUPS, PROMINENT NEIGHBORS TO THE WORKGROUP, HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATIONS, REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT COMPANIES, EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER

APPROXIMATE SENSITIVE USES, FINALLY OF COURSE RESIDENTS LIVING NEAR THE AIRPORT WILL BE CONTACTED AND INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN OUR UPCOMING PUBLIC WORKSHOP THIS SUMMER. SO FAR, STAFF HAS PRESENTED THE PROJECT TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY FAIRPLEX, AVIATION COMMISSION, BRACKETT AIRPORT ASSOCIATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE AND DONELLI PARK, PRESENTATIONS ARE PLANNED FOR THE SAN GABRIEL VALLEY, WHICH IS A NON-PROFIT GROUP OF WOMEN PILOTS AND HOA'S AT A JOINT MEETING THAT IS HOSTED BY THE FAIRPLEX, STAFF IS CONTINUING TO FOLLOW UP WITH THE GROUPS MENTIONED. WITH RESPECT TO LEGISLATION, SPECIFIC POLICY REGULATIONS WILL BE DRAFTED BY THE CONSULTANTS OVER THE NEXT FEW MONTHS WITH INPUT FROM STAFF IN THE WORKING GROUP, THE FORTHCOMING PAPER DISTRIBUTION NUMBER 2, POLICY CONSIDERATIONS WILL INCLUDE PROPOSALS FOR EXPLICIT GUIDANCE ON HOW FUTURE DEVELOPMENT WILL BE REGULATED, SPECIFICALLY THE PROPOSED POLICIES WILL ADDRESS BASIC CRITERIA AS WELL AS SUPPORTING CRITERIA WHICH INCLUDE NOISE, SAFETY, AIR SPACE PROTECTION AND OVERFLIGHT, THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN WILL DEAL ONLY WITH COMPATIBILITY CRITERIA, PROCEDURAL CRITERIA ARE ADDRESSED SEPARATELY. DISCUSSION PAPER NUMBER 2, POLICY CONSIDERATIONS WILL BE AVAILABLE AT THE END OF APRIL AND WILL BE BROUGHT TO YOUR COMMISSION AT A SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION. FINALLY WITH REGARD TO YOUR INVOLVEMENT, YOUR COMMISSION REQUESTED BIMONTHLY UPDATES FROM STAFF ON THE STATUS AND DIRECTION OF THE PLAN. AT THIS TIME, STAFF IS SCHEDULED TO REPORT BACK TO YOUR COMMISSION FOUR MORE TIMES

BEFORE THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS IS INITIATED. IF IT PLEASES YOUR COMMISSION, AT THIS POINT, STAFF WOULD RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT YOU CONSIDER THE POSSIBILITY OF QUARTERLY UPDATES RATHER THAN BIMONTHLY UPDATES GIVEN THE FULLNESS OF YOUR SCHEDULE AS WELL AS THE TIMING OF THE ANTICIPATED DELIVERABLES. TO ORIENT YOUR COMMISSION, I WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE A BRIEF STATUS UPDATE ON THE PROJECT SCOPE AND UPCOMING MILESTONES. TO REVIEW, THE PROJECT IS DEFINED IN THREE MAIN PHASES, THE FIRST PHASE, DATA COLLECTION AND COMPELLATION WAS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED IN FEBRUARY OF THIS YEAR AND CULMINATED IN THE BACKGROUND REPORT THAT WILL BE DISCUSSED MOMENTARILY, WE CURRENTLY ARE EMBARKING UPON STAGE 2 WHICH IS THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN WHICH IS SCHEDULED TO BE COMPLETED IN AUGUST OF THIS YEAR AND FINALLY REVIEW AND ADOPTION IS THE THIRD PHASE WHICH WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FALL WITH A TARGET COMPLETION OF OCTOBER/NOVEMBER OF THIS YEAR. THE PROJECT'S MAJOR DELIVERABLES AND TARGET DATES OF COMPLETION ARE SUMMARIZED HERE AND FOR TODAY WE'LL BE FOCUSED ON DISCUSSION PAPER NUMBER 2, BACKGROUND REPORT. THE BACKGROUND REPORT WILL ULTIMATELY BE INCORPORATED INTO THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN AND WILL BECOME CHAPTER 3 OF THAT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THE BACKGROUND REPORT CONTAINS DETAILED INFORMATION ABOUT THE AIRPORT INCLUDING ITS LOCATION AND HISTORY, THE STATUS OF AIRPORT PLANS AND ACTIVITY FORECASTS. IT ALSO INCLUDES INFORMATION ON SURROUNDING LAND USES INCLUDING BOTH EXISTING AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS AND FINALLY A

SERIES OF EXHIBITS THAT INCLUDE A NUMBER OF MAPS AND SUMMARY TABLES.THE PURPOSE OF THE BACKGROUND REPORT WHICH WAS PROVIDED TO YOUR COMMISSION ON FEBRUARY 28 IS TO DOCUMENT INFORMATION REGARDING BRACKETT FIELD AND ITS ENVIRONMENTS, AS THE PHYSICAL CONFIGURATION AND OPERATIONS ON THE AIRPORT ARE CRITICAL DETERMINANCE OF IMPACTS OF THE LAND SURROUNDING IT.THE PRIMARY SOURCE OF DATA WAS THE WORKING GROUP WHICH PROVIDED NUMEROUS PLANS, POLICIES AND GIS DATA, THE CONSULTANTS THEN EXTRACTED FROM THAT THE MOST IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR INCLUSION IN THIS REPORT.NEXT STEPS INCLUDE DRAFTING POLICIES AND BEGINNING TO PREPARE THE PLAN AND THE ACCOMPANYING ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.THE WORKING GROUP WILL MEET AGAIN AT THE END OF APRIL AND STAFF WILL HOLD SEVERAL ADDITIONAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS BEFORE REPORTING BACK TO YOUR COMMISSION AGAIN.THIS CONCLUDES STAFF'S PRESENTATION, I'D LIKE TO REMIND YOU THAT MR. BRODY FROM MEET AND HUNT IS STANDING BY AND HE AND I ARE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THAT YOU MAY HAVE.THANK YOU.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?COMMISSIONER HELSLEY?

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: YES.I APPRECIATE YOUR STANDING BY AND MAYBE BEING ABLE TO ANSWER SOME OF THESE QUESTIONS, NOT ONLY THE ASPECT OF WHAT WE HAVE IN THE REPORT, I FIND A COUPLE OF THEM A

LITTLE CONCERNING AS IT LOOKS AT THE USE OF THE LAND AND THE APPROACH AND THE TAKE-OFF ZONES, AND I WOULD LIKE TO GET AN ELEVATION CROSS SECTION MAYBE ON THE TYPICAL APPROACH AND THE TYPICAL TAKE-OFF.

>> MR. BRODY: THE ALTITUDE OF THE AIRCRAFT OR THE AIR SPACE PROTECTION SERVICES YOU'RE REFERRING TO?

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: WELL, AT ONE END, WE HAVE A DAM IT APPEARS THAT IS WITHIN THE -- DEPENDING ON THE WAY THE WIND BLOWS WITHIN THE FLY ZONE, AND I REALIZE YOU'RE NOT ON THE GROUND AT THAT POINT BUT HOW FAR DO YOU HAVE TO COME UP? I CAN REMEMBER LANDING AT SIMI AND YOU HAVE A SET OF HIGH TENSION LINES RIGHT BEFORE YOU GET TO THE APPROACH AND YOU'VE GOT TO BE SURE YOU'RE ABOVE THOSE, AND WHAT DO WE HAVE IN RELATION TO THE DAM STRUCTURE THAT'S OFF TO I BELIEVE THE WEST?

>> MR. BRODY: THE DATA THAT WE OBTAINED REGARDING THE AIRPORT IS THERE ARE THE DISPLACED FLESH HOLD AT THE EAST END TO ACCOUNT FOR THE ROAD, AT THE WEST, I DON'T RECALL THAT THERE'S ANY OBSTACLES THAT ARE AFFECTING WHERE THE END OF THE RUNWAY OR THE LANDING THRESHOLD WOULD BE.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: I WOULD IMAGINE THAT THERE ARE NOT ANY, BUT IF IT'S -- IT'S SOMETHING THAT I WOULD LIKE TO BE AWARE OF.

>> MR. BRODY: CERTAINLY, YEAH, AND OBVIOUSLY OUR CONCERN IS TO MAKE SURE THAT NO NEW CONSTRUCTION OR NEW OBJECTS WOULD BE PUT IN PLACE AROUND THE AIRPORT THAT WOULD AFFECT THE AVAILABILITY OF AIRCRAFT TO LAND.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: IF THAT RESERVOIR IS USED IN RELATION TO WATER SUPPLY, A LOT OF TIMES, THEY'LL HAVE STATIC INFORMATION OR STATA EQUIPMENT THAT THEY MAY HAVE AN EQUIPMENT THAT THEY MAY WANT TO PUT UP IN THE FUTURE. I'M FAMILIAR WITH A COUPLE OF THOSE AT A COUPLE OF RESERVOIRS THAT WERE FAIRLY HIGH AS ANTENNAS.

>> MR. BRODY: YEAH, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT -- OBVIOUSLY THAT STATA IS A TYPE OF CONCERN THAT THIS PLAN WOULD ADDRESS BUT IT'S ALSO SOMETHING THAT'S BROADLY PART OF THE WHOLE FAA PROCEDURE OF LOOKING AT PROPOSED OBSTRUCTION THAT IS THE AIRPORT STAFF IS WELL AWARE OF.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: THE ASPECT OF GOING TO THE EAST, WE DON'T HAVE NOISE PROBLEMS THERE BECAUSE THAT'S BASICALLY THE SPEEDWAY, ISN'T IT? IT HAS ITS OWN NOISE CHARACTERISTIC.

>> MR. BRODY: FOR THE MOST PART, THAT'S CORRECT, YES.THE CONCERNS WE WILL BE LOOKING AT MORE TO THE EAST IS THE HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF PEOPLE THAT COULD BE AT RISK IN SOME AREAS, SO THAT'S OUR BIGGER ISSUE ON THE EAST SIDE.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR BEING HERE TO RECEIVE OUR COMMENTS AND TO FIELD SOME QUESTIONS.THANK YOU.

>> MR. BRODY: CERTAINLY.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU.ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION?MS. SINCLAIR, THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. BRODY, THANK YOU VERY MUCH, THAT ENDS OUR UPDATE AND OUR DISCUSSION ON THE -- YES, SIR?

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: STAFF REQUESTED THAT WE CHANGE THIS FROM A MONTHLY REPORT TO A QUARTERLY REPORT.IS THERE ANY FEELINGS ONE WAY OR ANOTHER ON THAT?

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK PART OF THAT IS ON THE CONDITION THAT OUR SCHEDULE WAS OVERLOADED AND AT THE PRESENT TIME, I DON'T THINK WE ARE OVERLOADED SO I WOULD LIKE TO BE KEPT UP TO DATE MORE FREQUENTLY.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: WE'LL CONTINUE WITH THE CURRENT SCHEDULE, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: YES, WITH RESPECT TO THAT, WE DON'T NEED AN HOUR LONG OR A VERY LONG PRESENTATION, BUT WE DO JUST NEED AN UPDATE AS TO WHERE THINGS ARE GOING, ESPECIALLY YOU'RE GOING TO BE DEALING WITH STAKEHOLDERS, AM I CORRECT?WE'D LIKE TO HEAR FROM THE STAKEHOLDERS AND ALSO WHEN YOU WERE PROVIDING THIS DATA FOR U IT'S COLOR SENSITIVE AND THE TONES OF GRAY KIND OF START TO BECOME THE SAME, SO IF WE COULD JUST BE SURE TO PROVIDE US COLOR COPIES OF THESE BECAUSE THEY MEAN NOTHING IN THIS COLOR, SO THANK YOU.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: IF FAA DOES THE FORECAST.HOW ACCURATE ARE THOSE GUYS?I NOTICE THAT FROM 1990 TO TODAY, THERE'S BEEN A HUGE REDUCTION IN OPERATIONS.DO THEY PREDICT THAT, DO THEY SEE THE DECLINE COMING?

>> MR. SINCLAIR: I'M GOING THE LET KEN ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF FORECASTING, HE CONSIDERED MULTIPLE SOURCES, I KNOW IT'S MORE COMPLEX AND I KNOW HE COULD EXPLAIN IT MORE CLEARLY THAN I COULD.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: MR. BRODY, ARE YOU STILL WITH US?

>> MR. BRODY: I AM, THE LEVEL HAS INDEED DROPPED OFF SIGNIFICANTLY AT THE AIRPORT, EVEN IN THE LAST FEW YEARS, THAT'S STIPULATE CAL OF MOST CHANNEL AVIATION REPORTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY IN REGARDS TO THE NATIONAL ECONOMY.WE LOOKED AT A VARIETY OF SOURCES OF FORECASTS FROM THE FAA'S, STATE, REGIONALLY FROM SCAG, THERE'S NO RECENT FORECAST THAT DPW AVIATION DIVISION HAS DONE SPECIFICALLY FOR THE AIRPORT, SO LOOKING AT THE VARIOUS DATA AND SO FORTH, WE CAME UP WITH A FORECAST THAT WOULD POTENTIALLY ROUGHLY DOUBLE THE ACTIVITY FROM WHAT IT IS TODAY, WHICH WOULD STILL BE ONLY 2/3 OR SO OF WHAT ITS HISTORIC HIGH HAS BEEN.IN GENERAL, FOR LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLANNING PURPOSES, WE TRIED TO DO FORECASTS THAT ARE ON THE HIGH SIDE OF A PLAUSIBLE RANGE, THE IDEA THERE BEING THAT YOU DON'T WANT TO NOT ADEQUATELY PROTECT THE AIRPORT SHOULD ACTIVITY GROW MORE RAPIDLY IN THE FUTURE.SO, WE LOOKED AT THE DIFFERENT FORECAST POSSIBILITIES, PRESENTED THOSE TO DPW AND GOT THEIR FEEDBACK AND ALSO TO THE WORKING GROUP WHICH HAD REALLY VERY LITTLE COMMENT ON IT.PRIMARILY, THE FORECAST AFFECTS THE NOISE CONTOURS WHICH AS WE WERE DISCUSSING A FEW MOMENTS AGO IS NOT LIKELY TO BE THE MAJOR ISSUE AT THE AIRPORT IN THE AREAS WHERE ANY DEVELOPMENT MIGHT OCCUR IN THE FUTURE TO THE EAST ESPECIALLY.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: I WILL ASSUME THAT THAT ANSWER IS THAT LET THE RECORD SPEAK FOR ITSELF AS FAR AS THEIR FORECAST? THANK YOU, MR. BRODY.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: A QUESTION TO TACK ON TO THAT IF I MIGHT, AND THAT IS, WE DON'T DEAL WITH THE OPERATIONS BUT IF THEY WERE TO TAKE INTO TO DOUBLE THEIR JET ACTIVITY, WHAT WOULD THAT DO TO OUR NOISE FACTOR IN THE TAKE-OFF AND LANDING PATTERNS?

>> MR. BRODY: WE DID ACTUALLY MODIFY WHAT THE CURRENT TYPE OF AIRCRAFT IS THERE TODAY IN OUR FORECAST, WE LOOKED AT A HIGHER PERCENTAGE OF JET AIRCRAFT IN THE FUTURE. BASICALLY, IT ENDED UP NOT HAVING A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT BECAUSE THE JETS THAT ARE OPERATING AT BRACKETT AND OTHER AIRPORTS TODAY TEND TO BE NOISIER THAN THE QUIETER TECHNOLOGY THAT'S NOW AVAILABLE AND WILL BECOME MORE PROMINENT IN THE FUTURE, SO WHILE THERE'S AN INCREASE IN THE PERCENTAGE OF JETS AND TURBAN POWERED AIRCRAFT IN THE FLEET MIX THAT WE PROJECTED, THE RESULTS THAT WE SHOWED IN OUR ANALYSIS WAS THAT THE NOISE CONTOURS WOULD BE ABOUT THE SAME SIZE AS IF THEY HAD THE CURRENT FLEET MIX.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: THE SECOND PART OF THAT IS, DO WE HAVE VERY MUCH IN THE LINE OF EXPERIMENTAL AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT IN THIS FIELD?

>> MR. BRODY: AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT, I'M NOT AWARE OF THEM, IF THERE'S VERY LIKELY -- AND YOU WOULD MAYBE BE MORE FAMILIAR THAN I AM, BUT PROBABLY AN EXPERIMENTAL AIRCRAFT ASSOCIATION GROUP OR OTHER GROUPS, THAT IS AGAIN NATIONALLY AN AREA IN TERMS OF SMALL AIRCRAFT THAT IS ONE OF THE FEW THAT IS GROWING IS THIS SMALLER SIZE THAT ARE CALLED EXPERIMENTAL AIRPLANES.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: YES, OR SOMETIMES IT'S AIRPLANE REPAIR, CERTIFIED WELDERS AND THIS TYPE OF THING. YOU HAD A LIGHT OUTAGE.

>> MR. BRODY: YEAH.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: THAT'S OKAY. ACTUALLY, YOUR VISIBILITY WAS PROBABLY BETTER WITHOUT THAT LIGHT THAN WITH IT.

>> MR. BRODY: OH, WELL.

>> COMMISSIONER HELSLEY: OKAY, THANK YOU.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU, MS. SINCLAIR, MR. BRODY, THANK YOU.

>> MR. BRODY: I LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING EVERYBODY IN PERSON.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: WE AS WELL, AND WITH THAT, I THINK THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION IS IN ADJOURNMENT, ALTHOUGH I DO HAVE A BIT OF HAPPY BUSINESS TO CONDUCT.MR. SLAVIN, COULD YOU COME FORWARD.YOU LOOK LIKE A PRETTY HAPPY GUY.

>> THAT'S WHAT I GET FOR STICKING AROUND.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: YEAH, THAT'S WHAT HAPPENS.I UNDERSTAND IT'S YOUR BIRTHDAY, OR TOMORROW, YES, HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO YOU.DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL PLANS FOR TOMORROW?

>> JUST TO GO HOME AND FEED MY KIDS.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THAT'S ALWAYS AN ADVENTURE, STAY STANDING IF YOU WOULD, ESTHER, COMMISSIONER VALADEZ, COULD YOU ALSO STAND, I UNDERSTAND NEXT WEEK, WE HAVE A BIRTHDAY FOR YOU AS WELL.

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: YES, WE DO.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: AND DO YOU HAVE SPECIAL PLANS FOR YOUR BIRTHDAY?

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: YES.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: EXCELLENT.AND COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN, PLEASE,
COULD YOU STAND.YOU TOO HAVE A BIRTHDAY, I UNDERSTAND.

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: YES.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: AND IT'S THE SAME BIRTHDAY?

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: NO, I DON'T THINK SO, IT'S THE 25TH.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: SAME DATE, SO POTENTIALLY, YOU GUYS ARE
IDENTICAL TWINS SEPARATED AT BIRTH OR SOMETHING.

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: IT'S CLOSE, IT COULD BE.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THAT'S EXCELLENT, FROM MYSELF AND ALL THOSE IN
ATTENDANCE AND THE STAFF, WE WANT TO WISH YOU A VERY, VERY HAPPY
BIRTHDAY.

>> COMMISSIONER PEDERSEN: WELL, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> CHAIR LOUIE: THANK YOU.[APPLAUSE].

>> CHAIR LOUIE: AND WE ARE ADJOURNED, WE'RE HAPPY BUSINESS IS
OVER AS WELL.

>> VICE-CHAIR VALADEZ: THANK YOU, THAT WAS VERY SWEET. (MEETING
IS ADJOURNED).