

>> GREETINGS AND SALUATIONS.WELCOME IF SHE WOULD LEAD US IN THE PLEDGE THIS MORNING

>> PLEASE STAND.

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

>> GOOD MORNING. WE HAVE GOT TWO ITEMS TO ATTEND TO AND THE FIRST IS A REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION. I WILL CONVENE A MEETING AND ASK FOR APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA. SECONDED AND MOVED. THAT AGENDA IS APPROVED. GOOD MORNING COUNTY COUNSEL. ANY REPORTS FOR THIS MORNING?

>> NO.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH. DEPUTY DIRECTORHAVE A REPORT. THIS IS REGARDING THE DON'T KNOW IF YOU WANT ME TO DO THIS AS PART OF JUST WANT TO TOUCH YOU KNOW THAT THE BOARD ADOPTED AN ORDINANCE AMENDMENT YESTERDAY RELATED TO AMBULANCE SERVICES AND IT WILL COME BACK FOR THEM FOR A SECOND READING AFTER REVIEW BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL. THE SECOND ONE WAS A TWO LOT SUBDIVISION BECAUSE OF NOTICE AND ISSUES.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I KNOW THIS IS THE SUPERVISORS APPROVED A RAISE FOR THE FIREFIGHTERS AND THE NUMBER OF OTHER INDIVIDUALS. WAS THERE AN INCREASE OF COMMISSIONERS, DID YOU NOTICE THAT? I DID NOT NOTICE EITHER. THIS MORNING THERE WAS AN ARTICLE IN THE US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN THE LOS ANGELES RIVER. BURIED DEEP IN THERE WAS A COMMENT THAT THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY MASTER PLAN FOR THE RIVER WAS IN CONFLICT WITH THE CITY MASTER PLAN. IS IT POSSIBLE THAT MAYBE THIS IS NOT THE RIGHT TIME TO ASK – BUT MAYBE JUST A QUICK

>> YESTERDAY WILL TELL YOU IF THERE'S A CONFLICT CONFLICT. WE HAVE A – IN THE PAST VERY CLOSELY IN THE CITY AND THE LA RIVER COALITION. SO, I WOULD BE SURPRISED TO SEE WHAT THAT IS, BUT WILL COME BACK WITH A REPORT AND LET YOU KNOW IF THERE'S ANY CONFLICT.

>> I WOULD APPRECIATE THAT. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL. I GUESS I NEED TO TAKE EACH ONE OF THESE SEPARATELY ONE AT A TIME. SO I WOULD SEEK APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 12, MOVED AND SECONDED. THOSE IN FAVOR,, I.

>> I RECUSED MYSELF. I WAS ABSENT

>> SO NOTED. THE MINUTES OF JUNE 19. NO OBJECTIONS. MINUTES OF THE 19TH ARE APPROVED. AND MOVED NO OBJECTIONS. THOSE I NEED TO ASK, ARE THERE ANY POSSIBLE CAUSE FOR REVIEW OF DECISIONS BY HEARING OFFICERS? NONE. ANY REPORTS EITHER FROM THE COMMISSION COUNSEL OR DIRECTOR? NONE. MR.

>> I MOVE THE – WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7 AND AUGUST 14. IN TAKE THOSE OFF THE APPROVED MEETING SCHEDULE.

>> MOVED AND SECONDED. JUST A MOMENT OF DISCUSSION. I HAVE NOTED THAT ON A SCHEDULING BASIS WITH PERIODS OF TIME WHERE WE HAVE NOTHING AND THERE ARE OTHER MEETINGS WHERE WE ARE BACKED UP. I WOULD ASK IF A STAFF COULD LOOK AT THAT CAREFULLY, CHECK CALENDARS TO MAKE SURE AVAILABILITY OF COMMISSIONERS, SO THAT WE CAN TRY TO SMOOTH THAT OUT FOR THE MILDLY COMPETENT AND OVERCOMPENSATED COMMISSIONERS. SO, MOVED AND SECONDED. NO OBJECTIONS. WE WILL REMOVE AUGUST 7 AND THE 14TH FROM THE REGULAR CALENDAR. WITH THAT SAID, WE WILL ADJOURN THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING UNTIL WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21 AT 9 AM. I AM NOW CONVENED THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION MEETING ON JULY 24, 2013. AS FOR APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA. MOVED AND SECONDED. NO OBJECTIONS. THE AGENDA IS APPROVED. COUNTY COUNSEL.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH DEPUTY DIRECTOR. NO REPORTS.

>> THANK YOU. NOW I SEEK APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 26. MOVED AND SECOND. NO OBJECTIONS. THOSE MINUTES ARE APPROVED. PUBLIC LAND-USE COMMISSION COMMITTEES – PROJECT NUMBER R 2013 – 01680. MS. LEE.

>> MR. SHERMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION, GOOD MORNING. MY NAME IS JENNIFER LEE AND HIM WITH THE COMMUNITY STUDIES EAST AND SERVICES STAFF TO THE –. I'M PRESENTING TODAY ON

AVIATION CASE NUMBER 2013 0003. THIS PROJECT IS FOR THE – COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT. UPDATE WILL TO BE FOR TWO GOING FORWARD AS THE CSD UPDATE. THIS IS A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF WHAT WE'LL BE COVERING ON HIS TELE-HEARING TODAY. LOCATION AND CONTEXT OF THE AREA AND THE AIRPORT. THE AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA, THE ALUC EMPOWERED ABILITY CONCERNS COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT DEFINED, A BRIEF PROJECT SUMMARY OF THE CSD UPDATE, CURRENT PROJECT STATUS, IT LOOKS THAT REPLICATIONS AND WILL END UP WITH ANY REMAINING QUESTIONS. THE CSD AREA IS LOCATED IN THE FIFTH SUPERVISOR -- -- IN THE UNCOVERED COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES. THE COMMUNITY OF -- IS NORTHERN PORTION OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY WEST OF ACTING AND NORTH OF SANTA CLARITA. THE ECHO THOSE HE AIRPORT IS THE CENTER OF THE CSD AREA. THE AGUA DULCE COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT BOUNDARY HAS BEEN REVISED. THE COMP CURRENT THE PROPOSED CSD BOUNDARY WOULD EXPAND THE CURRENT BOUNDARY TO INCORPORATE THE GREAT PARCELS. THE AGUA DULCE THE AIRPORT REMAINS IN THE CENTER SHOWN HERE IN RED. THE CSD UPDATE PROJECT SITE ENTIRELY ENCOMPASSES THE AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA FOR THE AGUA DULCE THE AIRPORT. THE AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA IS THE BOUNDARY FOR THE AIRPORT THAT THE ALUC REVIEWS FOR LAND-USE COMPATIBILITY AGAINST THE FOUR COMPATIBILITY CRITERIA. THE AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA IS OUTLINED IN RED ON THE MAP TO THE LEFT AND OUTLINED IN BLUE ON THE AERIAL IMAGE TO THE RIGHT. THE A ALUC STAFF DOES NOT SEE ANY ISSUES OF COMPATIBILITY WITH THE AGUA DULCE THE CSD UPDATE WITH WHAT THE AGUA CSD UPDATE PROPOSES. AS A REMINDER, THE ALUC -- OF THESE PROJECTS THAT FOUR MAIN TYPES OF COMPATIBILITY CONCERNS. NOISE, SAFETY, AIRSPACE PROTECTION, AND OVERFLOWING OVERFLIGHT ANNOYANCE. AS A FINE BY THE FINITE TITLE 22 OF THE COUNTY CODE COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICTS ARE ESTABLISHED AS SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRICTS TO PROVIDE A MEANS OF IMPLEMENTING SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS CONTAINED IN ADOPTED NEIGHBORHOOD, COMMUNITY AREAS SPECIFIC AND LOCAL COASTAL PLANS WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY WERE TO PROVIDE A MEANS OF ADDRESSING SPECIAL PROBLEMS WHICH ARE UNIQUE TO CERTAIN GEOGRAPHIC AREAS THAN THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY. THIS CSD UPDATE REGULATIONS SUPPLEMENT THE COUNTYWIDE ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS. THE CSD UPDATE REQUIRES AN AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22.4 4.090 OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE. THIS CSD UPDATE DOES NOT KNOW PROPOSE ANY ZONE OR LAND-USE CHANGES WERE ANY NEW HOUSING BUSINESSES OR ROAD EXTENSIONS OR OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS THAT REDUCE SUBSTANTIAL POPULATION GROWTH. THEREFORE, THIS CSD UPDATE DOES NOT PROPOSE ANY STANDARDS THAT PRESENT AN ISSUE WITH THE LAND-USE COMPATIBILITY THAT THE ALUC REVIEWS. THE CSD UPDATE IS AN UPDATE OF THE ORIGINAL AGUA DULCE A COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT ADOPTED ON JULY 30, 1985. THE INTENT AND PURPOSE OF THIS CSD UPDATE IS TO MAINTAIN A DISPERSED LOW-DENSITY DEVELOPMENT PATTERN TO PRESERVE THE SECLUDED RURAL NATURE OF THE AGUA DULCE A COMMUNITY. TO ENSURE THE DEVELOPMENT FITS WITH THE CHARACTER OF THE COMMUNITY. THE CURRENT PROJECT STATUS FOR THE CSD UPDATE IS SHOWN HERE BEFORE YOU. FEBRUARY 22, 2012 REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE CSD UPDATE WITHOUT ALONG WITH A NEGATIVE ALONG WITH A NEGATIVE DECLARATION. MAY 22, 2012 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVED THE CSD UPDATE SUBJECT TO COUNTY COUNSEL REVIEW. HERE TODAY, JULY 24, 2013 THE AIRPORT COMMISSION WILL MAKE THEIR DETERMINATION. AT SOME FUTURE DATE THAT IS STILL TO BE DECIDED THE CSD UPDATE WILL GO BACK TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR FINAL ACTION. STAFF

RECOMMENDS THAT AIRPORT WHEN USE COMMISSION FIND THE AGUA DULCE A COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT UPDATE CONSISTENT WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY AIRPORT LAND-USE COMPELLED ABILITY PLAN. THIS CONCLUDES STAFF PRESENTATION. I WELCOME ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE AT THIS TIME. THANK YOU.

>> MS. LEE, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION? THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> THANK YOU.

>> ITEM 6, COMMISSION TRAINING. MR. CHILD

>> AFTER THIS EMOTION ON THAT BUT I DON'T THINK THERE'S A COMMENTS.

>> I BEG YOUR PARDON. PUBLIC COMMENT?

>> YES, WE HAVE – TO PEOPLE THAT SIGNED UP TO TESTIFY AND I ASSUME IT IS REGARDING THE CSD AND COMPATIBILITY STUDY THAT WAS CONDUCTED AND THAT IS BEFORE YOU. THE FIRST PERSON IS DANNY SNYDER. THE SECOND PERSON IS BARBARA LEACHMAN.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH. IF YOU COULD STEP FORWARD AND REMAIN STANDING. IS BARBARA AVAILABLE? PLEASE, COME ON UP. I'M GOING TO SWEAR YOU ALL IN. SO IF THERE ARE FOLKS THAT PLAN TO SPEAK ON THIS OR ANY OTHER MATTER BEFORE THE COMMISSION, WOULD YOU PLEASE STAND AND RISE. OKAY. VERY GOOD. IF YOU COULD RAISE SWEAR AND AFFIRM HAVE A SEAT. YOU WILL HAVE 3 MIN. EACH HAVE 3 MIN. AND THEN YOU CAN BEGIN WITH A STATEMENT APPEARING.

>> I'M DENNY SCHNEIDER PRESIDENT OF ALLIANCE FOR REGIONAL SOLUTION AIRPORT CONGESTION DID AMERICA TAKE THE

>> I HAVE BEEN IN THIS FOR ABOUT 15 YEARS. OR 18 YEARS NOW ON MY WAVE WATCH TWO 747 NEARLY COLLIDED AT LAX. THE ORGANIZATION ITSELF PRECEDED ME IN THE 90S WHEN THEY PUSHED

FOR MODERNIZATION WITHOUT EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE REGIONAL NETWORK OF AIRPORTS. WHAT YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU WITH THIS WHOLE EXERCISE IS NOT JUST A PAPERWORK EXERCISE. IT'S REALLY CRITICAL TO ALL OF US. IN THE PREVIOUS PRESENTATION YOU HEARD THE FOUR THINGS THAT WERE CRITICAL NATURE BOTH TO ME AND TO YOU. THAT WAS, IF I CAN QUOTE THEM, NOISE, SAFETY, AIRSPACE, AND OVERFLIGHT ANNOYANCE. WHAT I WANT TO EMPHASIZE IS THAT THIS IS NOT JUST A PAPERWORK ISSUE WHERE YOU'RE ASKED TO APPROVE SOME DOCUMENTS. THE PLAN TO MOVE RUNWAYS AND DO ALL OF THESE OTHER THINGS HAS ALREADY BEEN APPROVED

>> MR. CHAIRMAN – AS A POINT OF REFERENCE, WE'RE SPEAKING ABOUT THE AGUA DULCE THE AIRPORTS. MANY STANDARDS DISTRICT.

>> KNOW WE ARE WERE ON NUMBER SIX.

>> THAT WAS MY AREA.

>> WE'RE STILL ON NUMBER FIVE. WE ARE SORRY.

>> STANDBY. IF YOU GO TO SITE

>> ONCE YOU HAVE THEM REMAIN THERE. IF THERE'S NO SPEAKERS JUST GO AHEAD AND MAKE THE MOTION.

>> NO PUBLIC COMMENT ON

>> I MOVE MR. CHAIRMAN, THE AIRPORT WHEN USE COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING BASED ON DULCE THE STANDARDS OF THE PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH THE DOCKET LOS ANGELES COUNTY AIRPORT LAND-USE BILL CAMP AT ABILITY PLAN.

>> MOVED AND SECONDED. DISCUSSION? THOSE IN FAVOR I.

>> I APOLOGIZE I THINK WE CAN GO BACK NOW TO ITEM 6.

>> PLEASE, WE CAN CONTINUE.

>> I'VE BEEN THERE WITH MYSELF, THANK YOU. I JUST WANT TO RESTATE THREE THINGS. YOU'VE RECEIVED SEVERAL DOCUMENTS FROM US IN THE PAST.

>> SEQUENTIALLY WE NEED TO HAVE THE STAFF MAKE A PRESENTATION. THIS IS ON COMMISSION TRAINING, YES?

>> YES. PLEASE.

>> THANK YOU COMMISSIONER. THANK YOU MR. SHERMAN AND GOOD MORNING COMMISSIONERS. MY NAME IS CARMEN SIGNS STOMACH. I'M WITH A COMMUNITY CENTER WHICH ALSO SERVES AS STAFF TO BE A LOCK. WHICH IS THE AIRPORT LANDINGS COMMISSION. I AM HERE BEFORE YOU THIS MORNING ON AN AGENDA ITEM NUMBER SIX. THAT'S COMMISSION TRAINING ON IMPASSE APPEALS. THE PURPOSE FOR THIS TRAINING IS TO PROVIDE THE COMMISSION WITH THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION RELATED TO A LOCK DUTIES AND THE SPECIFIC DUTIES THAT ARE REQUIRED IN IMPASSE SITUATIONS. IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY THE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION HAS A RESPONSIBILITY OF ACTING AS THE AIRPORT LAND-USE COMMISSION. AND FOR COORDINATING THE POOR PLANNING OF PUBLIC AGENCIES WITHIN THE COUNTY. THAT IS STATE AERONAUTICS ACT. PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE, SECTION 21670. THE PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE ASSIGNS THE A TO BE – THE ABILITY COMPATIBILITY PLANNING. THE FIRST ONE WHICH IS A PRIMARY ROLE IS TO PREPARE AND ADMINISTER AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLANS FOR THE PUBLIC USE AIRPORT WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION. THIS IS GOAL IS TO PEER IMPASSE SITUATIONS THAT DEVELOP BETWEEN PUBLIC AGENCIES RELATING TO AIRPORT PLANNING. THIS ROLE IS SPECIFIC TO LA COUNTY. LA COUNTY, ALUC IS THE ONLY A LOCK THAT OR ADDITIONAL DUTY. THE PRIMARY ROLE INCLUDES TO COORDINATE PLANNING AT THE STATE, REGIONAL AND LOCAL LEVELS. SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR THE ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT OF AIR TRANSPORTATION WHILE AT THE SAME TIME PROTECTING THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE. THE OTHER ROLE IS TO PREPARE AND ADOPT AN AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN PURSUANT PLANS AND REGULATIONS AND OTHER LAND-USE ACTIONS OF LOCAL AGENCIES IN AND OFF AIRPORT OPERATORS. SO THESE ARE ALL ROLES THAT ALL IT LOOKS THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA ASSUME. THE SECONDARY ROLE IS TO HEAR HIM PASS APPEALS. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER THIS IS UNIQUE TO LA THE

LOS ANGELES COUNTY AIRPORT AND USE COMMISSION HAS A RESPONSIBILITY TO REVIEW IMPASSE APPEAL AND THESE ARE HIM PASS APPEALS THAT ARE SUBMITTED BY LOCAL AGENCIES WHEN THERE IS SOME DISAGREEMENT RELATING TO AIRPORT PLANNING. IN ESSENCE, THE ALUC ACTS AS A AS A MEDIATOR. PURSUANT TO PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE 21670.2, IT STATES THAT IN INSTANCES WHERE IMPASSE RESULTS RELATIVE TO THIS PLANNING AN APPEAL MAY BE MADE TO THE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION AND IN THIS CASE IS THE A ALUC THAT DESERVES – DESERVES AS THE LANDING COMMISSION. BY ANY PLANNING AGENCY INVOLVES THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ON AN APPEAL MAY BE OVERRULED BY HER POOR FIFTH VOTE OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE PUBLIC AGENCY WHOSE PLANNING LED TO THE APPEAL. JUST TO CLARIFY, THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO RULES, IN THIS TRAINING, I WANT TO EXPLAIN WHAT THE A LUX ROLE AND ADMINISTRATION THE PLAN. THE – MUST PREPARE OF LOCAL AGENCIES SPECIFIC PLANS OR GENERAL PLANS,. IF THERE'S AN UPDATE TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE, THAT REQUIRES A LAW REVIEW AS WELL. THE SECONDARY GOAL FOR THE A LOCK IS TO ARBITRATE IMPASSE SITUATIONS. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, THAT IS UNIQUE TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY A LOCK. IN INSTANCES WHERE PUBLIC AGENCY REACHES AN IMPASSE RELATED TO IT PLANNING DECISION OF ANOTHER PUBLIC AGENCY THE A LOCK MAY BE CALLED UPON TO HEAR AN APPEAL. IT IS IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER ITS MEANING IN THIS CONTEXT AS IT AFFECTS THE SCOPE OF THE TERM AIRPORT PLANNING. AND HOW A ALUC MUST REVIEW THE MATTER. AN APPEAL CAN MEAN A PLEA OR TO PLEAD WITH. ESPECIALLY IN ORDER TO PERSUADE HER TO ASK URGENTLY. THEY CAN ALSO MEAN A LEGAL PROCEEDING BY WHICH A CASE IS BROUGHT BEFORE A HIGHER COURT FOR REVIEW OF A DECISION OF A LOWER COURT. AS A LAND-USE AS AN IMPORT LAND-USE COMMISSION, THE A ALUC ISRAEL'S FAMILIAR WITH THE REVIEWING OF THE LEGAL PROCEEDING TYPE APPEALS. THIS IS NOT HOWEVER, ITS ROLE IN IMPASSE SITUATIONS. THE PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE DOES NOT INTEND THE TYPE DESCRIBED AS A LEGAL PROCEEDING BECAUSE A ALUC DOES NOT HAVE A HIGHER REVIEW BODY. NOR A LOWER DECISION-MAKER. A ALUC DOES NOT REVIEW NOR IS THAT HOW APPEALS FUNCTION IN THE TRIGGER FOR A ALUC IMPASSE HEARING IS NOT AN UNDERLYING A LOCK ACTION. RATHER IT'S AN AGENCY PLANNING ACTION. IN IMPASSE SITUATIONS IN APPEAL IS A PLEA. WHICH PLACES THE ROLE OF MEDIATOR. SO WE MEDIATE BETWEEN THESE LOCAL AGENCIES HAVE NOT COMMISSION, FOR EXAMPLE. IT IS A FORM OF PLEA THAT IS APPROPRIATE USE OF THE WORD, APPEAL, IN THIS CONTEXT. BECAUSE OF THE A LUX ROLE IN THE IMPASSE SITUATION. THE A ALUC COORDINATE PLANNING OF A STATES AND LOCAL LEVEL FOR EXAMPLE, REVIEW OF AIRPORT MASTER PLANS, CITY GENERAL PLANS, ZONING ORDINANCES. AND IMPASSE APPEAL CAN BE DESCRIBED AS A REQUEST TO REVIEW AND AIRPORT PLANNING DECISION THROUGH THE OF THE AIRPORT LANDING WINNING COMPATIBILITY TO WHICH THE A ALUC HAS EXPERTISE. A REVIEW IN THIS CAPACITY CAN PROVIDE A VALUABLE THIRD PARTY OPINION ON AN AIRPORT PLANNING MATTER AND OFFER A PERSPECTIVE THAT MAY NOT HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED TO THE REQUIRED PLANNING IT IS IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER THAT FOREIGN IMPASSE TO EXIST THE PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE IMPLIES THAT A DECISION OF A LOCAL AN IMPASSE. 21670.28, IT STATES, IN INSTANCES WHERE IMPASSE IS TO THIS AIRPORT PLANNING AN APPEAL MAY BE MADE TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION. IT GOES ON TO STATE THAT THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ON AN APPEAL MAY BE OVERRULED BY A FOURTH FIFTH VOTE. OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE PUBLIC AGENCY WHOSE PLANNING LED TO THE APPEAL. PLANNING IN THIS MEANS PLANNING DECISION. THIS IS THE CASE BECAUSE THE OVERLOOKED PROCESS CAN ONLY

APPLY TO A DECISION THAT IS MADE BY ANOTHER AGENCY. IT NEED NOT BE A DECISION WHICH THE A ALUC HAS ANY PAST INVOLVEMENT. SO THE APPEAL THAT THE LOCAL AGENCY SYSTEM MET, IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY HAVE TO BE AN APPEAL THAT WAS TAKEN BEFORE THE ALUC. FOR EXAMPLE, THE BURBANK GEN. PLAN UPDATES, IT WAS ADOPTED BY THE LOCAL CITY OF BURBANK PLANNING COMMISSION BUT DID NOT COME TO BE A LOCK, THEN THERE'S LOCAL AGENCIES THAT DISAGREE WITH THE DECISION, THEY CAN STILL SUBMIT THE APPEAL TO THE A ALUC EVEN THOUGH IT DID COME BEFORE THE A LOCK. SO, THE APPEAL ISSUES DO NOT NECESSARILY HAVE TO BE SOMETHING THAT CAME IN BEFORE THE ALUC. THE A ALUC EXPERIENCE TO GIVE YOU BACKGROUND SINCE ITS FORMATION IN 1991, THE LA COUNTY ALUC HAS REVIEWED ONLY ONE IMPASSE APPEAL. THAT WAS BACK IN 2005 AND IT RESULTED FROM DISAGREEMENTS OVER THE LONG-RANGE PLANNING FOR LAX AIRPORTS. WERE FOUR ISSUES . EXAMPLE, CAPACITY LIMITS OF LAX, REGIONAL APPROACH TO AIRPORT PLANNING, CONSISTENCY WITH THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN, THE CAPACITY ORIGINAL ISSUES WERE CONSIDERED, LAND-USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN – ISSUES WERE NOT BECAUSE THEY WERE OUTSIDE OF LUX PURVIEW. OR AREAS THAT MAY BE CONSIDERED TO AN IMPASSE APPEAL. IN THIS APPEAL RELATED TO THE AIRPORT LAND-USE COMPATIBILITY CONSISTENCY, THE APPEALING PARTIES ASKED THE LOCK TO OPINE IN DECISION MADE BY THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES. THE REQUEST WAS DENIED BECAUSE THE OVERLOOKED PROCESS USED BY THE CITY FOLLOWED CORRECT PROCEDURES. AS STIPULATED IN THE PUBLIC UTILITY CODE. THE SECURITY ISSUE WAS DENIED BECAUSE IT WAS NOT WITHIN THE PURVIEW. SO THE APPEAL HAS TO BE WITHIN LUX PURVIEW. IT DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION OVER AIRPORT OPERATIONS. IF THE APPEAL ISSUES ARE RELATED TO THE OPERATIONS OF THE AIRPORT, THE LOCK WILL NOT CONSIDER THEM. THE SAME EXAMPLE THE AFFECTED PARTIES FILED A LAWSUIT ON THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES WHICH LED TO THE NEGOTIATIONS ENDED IN STIPULATED SET SETTLEMENT AND JUDGMENT AGREEMENT THE AGREEMENT. THE AGREEMENT RESOLVE THE IMPASSE SITUATION AND THE LOCK WAS ABLE TO RESCIND ITS DETERMINATION. THIS MEANT THE CITY DID NOT NEED TO OVERRULE OVERRULED BE LOVED TO BE ABLE TO MOVE AHEAD WITH THE PROJECT. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT FOR IMPASSE SITUATIONS THE SCOPE OF AIRPORT PLANNING THAT ALUC MAY REVIEW IS WHAT IT PREPARING AND ADMINISTERING AIRPORT LAND-USE COMPATIBILITY PLANS. SO THERE IS THE OVERRULE REGARDING ISSUES OR DISAGREEMENTS WITH THE LOCAL AGENCIES UNCERTAIN AIRPORT THERE IS THE OVERRULE OF A VAN USE ACTION THAT WAS REVIEW. THAT CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION. DOES ANYONE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> IN YOUR PRESENTATION, I THOUGHT I HEARD YOU TWICE SAY A FOURTH FIFTH VOTE OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY WOULD OVERRIDE US. I BELIEVE IN THE LA CASE THAT WE HAD IN 2005 THERE WAS ANOTHER PROCEEDING THAT WAS A TWO THIRDS VOTE. HAS A LAW CHANGED? BECAUSE WE WENT THROUGH AND INITIALLY THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES REQUIRED A MAJORITY VOTE. IT WAS THEN APPEALED AND WE WERE THE APPELLANT BODY. THEN, ONCE WE FOUND IT INCONSISTENT IT WENT BACK TO CITY WHICH WAS REQUIRED,. THEN IT CAME BACK TO US A SECOND TIME. WE

CONTINUE TO FIGHT FIND IT INCONSISTENT. THERE WENT BACK TO A FOURTH FIFTHS VOTE OF THE CITY COUNCIL AND THAT CONCLUDED OUR ROLE. AS WE WERE OVERRIDDEN AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PLAYED NO ROLE IN THIS MATTER WHATSOEVER. THAT'S WHAT LED TO THE LAWSUIT. SO IT'S A TWO THIRDS PEACE NOW MISSING?

>> THE LAW HAS NOT CHANGED. YOU ARE CORRECT THAT THERE WAS AN OVERRULE VOTE OF TWO THIRDS, BUT THAT WAS FOR A LAND-USE ACTION THAT WAS MADE. SO WE HAVE AN OVERRULE FOR A LAND-USE ACTION, FOR EXAMPLE REVIEW OF THE LAX MASTER PLAN, BUT THEN YOU HAVE THE SECOND OVERRULE PROCESS FOR IMPASSE APPEALS. IMPASSE APPEAL OVERRULES OUR 4/5 VOTE. THEY'RE TWO SEPARATE – YOU CAN SEE IT AS TWO SEPARATE OVERRULES. ONE IS AN OVERRULE OVER LAND-USE ACTION FOR EXAMPLE AN UPDATE TO THE GENERAL PLAN OR ZONING ORDINANCE. THAT OVERRULE WOULD TRIGGER A TWO THIRDS VOTE. FOREIGN IMPASSE APPEAL, IT IS FOR THIS VOTE. THAT IS A SEPARATE APPEAL PROCESS.

>> IT DOES GET CONFUSING. LAX IN THE LAST 25 IS PROBABLY ONE OF THE WORST – [INAUDIBLE]. THE FIRST TIME THAT YOU GUYS HEARD THAT IT WAS TO CONSIDER THE MASTER PLAN AND CONSISTENCY WITH THE AIRPORT LAND-USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN. IT WAS JUST A CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION, NOT THAT IS WITH THE TWO THIRDS COUNT. THE IMPASSE APPEAL IS A SEPARATE PROCEDURE ENTIRELY. I WANTED TO ACTUALLY EXPAND THAT CARMEN SUGGESTS. IT MAY HELP A COMPLETE HYPOTHETICAL. USING BURBANK. BURBANK GEN. PLAN DID HALF TO COME TO THE LOCK UNDER STATE LAW ANY TIME A GENERAL COME TO THE ALUC. THAT IS THE ALUC HEARING CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION WITH OUR AIRPORT AN INCONSISTENCY, IT WOULD REQUIRE TWO THIRDS THE LOCAL JURISDICTION. ONCE THAT PLAN IS IN PLACE THE A ALUC LOSES JURISDICTION OVER PARTICULAR PROJECTS. BECAUSE THERE'S ALREADY – SO LONG AS A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN BE A ALUC IS CAN FOUND CONSISTENT WITH LAND-USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN WE HAVE AN INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, IT ENTITLE THAT PROJECT. IF YOU HAD A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN THE AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA THAT DID NOT NEED TO OTHERWISE COME TO THE A ALUC, AND, SAY, IT WAS JUST UNDER THE UNDER THE HEIGHT THE FAA SAYS IT NEEDS TO BE AN BURBANK SAYS WE THINK THIS PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH OUR GENERAL PLAN, MET A NEIGHBORING JURISDICTIONS A CITY OF LA THAT SAYS ACTUALLY, WE THINK IT'S TOO HIGH AND IT'S GOING TO AFFECT THE SAFETY OF OUR PASSENGERS IN OUR PASSENGERS AND USE BURBANK AIRPORT AS WELL, OUR CITIZENS USE THAT AIRPORT, THE CITY OF LA COULD, AT THE POINT THE BURBANK TAKES AN ACTION ON THAT ENTITLES THE PROJECT, THAT COULD TRIGGER AN IMPASSE HEARING. CITY OF LA COULD FILE WITH THE A ALUC AND SAY WE WANT YOU TO GET INVOLVED BECAUSE IT IS IN THE AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA. WE THINK BURBANK IS MAKING A POOR DECISION, POOR PLANNING DECISION THAT WILL AFFECT THINGS THAT BE A ALUC CARE SUPPORT. THAT WOULD COME AN IMPASSE HEARING. IT WOULD BE ACTING AS A MEDIATOR, PLANNING AND I THINK THAT'S THE INTENT OF PUC WAS TO PUT THE ROLE OF THE LOCK WITH A PLANNING COMMISSION BECAUSE YOU ALL HAVE EXPERTISE IN PLANNING. LA IS SO MASSIVE THAT YOU HAVE SO MANY DIFFERENT JURISDICTIONS. SO WITH YOUR

EXPERTISE YOU GET TO PLAY IF YOU SAID AND THIS IS ONLY HYPOTHETICAL – WE CAN DO [INAUDIBLE] WITH A CITY. WE THINK THE BUILDING IS TOO HIGH. WE THINK IT AFFECTS – WE DON'T THINK BURBANK SHOULD CONTINUE FORWARD WITH THAT PROJECT, HAVE TO DO FOR THIS VOTE INSANE AT FINANCING NO, THIS IS A GOOD IS NOT ACTUALLY IN THE FLIGHT PATTERN OR WHATEVER. THAT'S WHERE THE FOURTH THIS VOTE WOULD COME.

>> MANAGES FOLLOW-UP. THIS AGAIN THIS HYPOTHETICAL. BURBANK INDEED DID MAKE A RECENT GENERAL PLAN CHANGE THAT THEY COME TO US FOR COMPATIBILITY. WE GOT A CONSISTENCY AND THAT WAS DONE. LET'S SAY IN THAT CASE THAT IT WASN'T THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES THAT HAS NEIGHBORING JURISDICTION, BUT I WIFE I WIFE TAUGHT FOR 3032 YEARS AT SUN VALLEY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL. WHY DIDN'T THE FLIGHT PLANE OF THE BURBANK AIRPORT. SHE'S JUST IN THEIR SHAKE YOUR FIST WHEN THE 747 727S WHICH WERE QUITE LOUD, WENT OVER UNTIL THEY LESSEMED THE NOISE. WOULD IT LOS ANGELES SCHOOLS HAVE JURISDICTION TO FILE OR TO COME AT AN IMPASSE OF SAY, SOME PEOPLE WOULD HAVE TO BE A MUNICIPALITY LIKE THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES? A LOCAL AGENCY IS [INAUDIBLE] AND I DON'T RECALL

>> IF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IS A ADJUNCT OF THE CITY, BUT ITSELF A AGENCY.

>> YOU KNOW WHERE IS IT BEST?

>> ACTUALLY, RATHER THAN TAKE THE TIME TO LOOK AT IT, BECAUSE AGAIN REDOING WITH HYPOTHETICALS. THE SCHOOL DISTRICT WHETHER AS A SCHOOL DISTRICT SEPARATELY OR AS PART OF CITY OF LOS ANGELES, AS A BODY THAT FLIGHT PATH, SO WE FOUND COMPATIBILITY FROM THE ONE SIDE OF OUR JOB, BUT THEN IF THERE WAS A AN IMPASSE OR SOMETHING BEFORE THEY SOUGHT ACTION TO THE COURTS THEY COULD THEN BRING AN APPEAL AND WE WOULD SIT AT THE APPELLANT ON THAT ISSUE IF WE AGREED. IF WE AGREE WITH THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES OR LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DESERVES THERE WAS ANNOYED NOISE ISSUE THAT WE NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT AND NOW FOUND THAT TO BE INCONSISTENT THEN IT WOULD GO BACK TO THE CITY OF BURBANK FOR 4/5 VOTE. IF THAT 4/5 VOTE WAS HAD AND THE OTHER JURISDICTIONS STILL FELT THEY WANTED FURTHER REMEDIES, THEN THE RECORDS WOULD GO TO THE COURTS.

>> YES, THAT IS RIGHT. THE ISSUES YOU CAN LOOK AT ON AN IMPASSE HARDER THAN THOSE YOU AT IT COMPATIBILITY HEARING YOU REALLY JUST HAVE THE TWO ITEMS IN FRONT OF YOU. WHEN IT IS AN IMPASSE APPEAL IT'S MORE OF THE INTENT OF THE A ALUC. IT STILL SAFETY AND NOISE, BUT YOU'RE NOT CONFINED TO THOSE ELEMENTS [INAUDIBLE].

>> MR. PATTERSON

>> USE . SOME WOULD USE THE TERM OF US ACTING IN THE ROLE OF AN ARBITER. THEY'RE TWO SEPARATE THINGS. WHAT ARE WE? AS AN ARBITRATION YOU COME UP WITH A SETTLEMENT. IT'S MORE OF A BINDING SITUATION THAT MEDIATION AS WE TRY TO BRING TWO TOGETHER. SO, –

>> ULTIMATELY, THE STAFF WILL COME WITH A RECOMMENDATION AND THE LOCK WILL

>> IT'S MORE THAN ARBITRATION AND MEDIATION? I'M TRYING TO GET IT CLEAR IN MY HEAD. I HAVE DONE BOTH.

>> YES, – IS PROBABLY THE PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE DOESN'T USE EITHER WORD. IT USES A COORDINATING, PLANNING BODY. HE USES THE WORD CORONATION AND PLANNING.

>> OKAY.

>> ULTIMATELY THE LOCK WILL MAKE A DETERMINATION SO I YES, IN THAT SENSE IT BE MORE AN ARBITER

>> SECOND, WE HANDED AND IF WE WERE, I CAN'T LOCATE MY COPY OF THE APPEAL, OR WE GET A COPY OF THE ACTUAL [INAUDIBLE] . NOT YET? OKAY. SO WILL HAVE SOME TIME TO LOOK AT THAT PRIOR?

>> QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION? THANK MUCH. PUBLIC COMMENT. PEOPLE SIGNED UP. IT'S MR. MS. BARBARA LEACHMAN.

>> OKAY. YOU HAVE BEEN SWORN IN. YOU HAVE 3 MIN. EACH AND YOUR TIME WILL BEGIN WITH A STATEMENT OF YOUR NAME.

>> I'M DENNY SCHNEIDER PRESIDENT OF ALLIANCE FOR REGIONAL SOLUTION TO AIRPORT CONGESTION. THERE ARE THREE THINGS THAT ARE REALLY WANT TO RAISE AS ISSUES FOR YOU WITH THE FACT THAT THE CURRENT PLAN THAT HAS BEEN PASSED AS A CONCEPTUAL PLAN BY THE LA CITY COUNCIL AND SIGN UP AS AN ORDNANCE AND INCORPORATED CALLS FOR NO CHANGES IN THE RUNWAY PROTECTION ZONE EVEN THOUGH THEY MOVED THE RUNWAY FURTHER NORTH AND IT DOES ENVELOP MORE OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE BUSINESS DISTRICT. THEY'RE GOING TO BE SOME BUILDINGS WHERE THEY'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO TELL WHAT COLOR THE EYES ARE THE PILOT AND PASSENGERS.

>> I'M GOING TO INTERRUPT YOU. THE MATTER BEFORE US IS TRAINING IMPASSE. IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU ARE –

>>, TALK SPECIFICALLY ABOUT

>> RIGHT. I WANT TO RAISE THESE THREE ISSUES SO THAT YOU CAN KEEP THEM IN CONTEXT WHEN YOU'RE LOOKING AT THE QUESTION.

>> HEADS UP. THERE MAY NOT BE ANY DISCUSSION ON THAT MATTER BUT GO AHEAD AND PROCEED

>> I DON'T EXPECT ONE TODAY. I JUST WANT TO RAISE THIS FOR YOUR BENEFIT.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THE SECOND HAS TO DO WITH THE ARTICLE FLOOD CHANNEL WHICH MOVED TO ACCOMMODATE THE MOVEMENT OF THE RUNWAY. THEY PLAN TO BURY THAT AND PUT IT UNDER THE RUNWAY AND PORTIONS OF IT AND PUT IT UNDERGROUND. THE SIZE THE CULVERT WHICH IS CURRENTLY OPEN AND CAN HANDLE A LOT OF WATER, IT WOULD BE SIZED ONLY FOR TENURED STORM INSTEAD OF A 50 OR 100 YEAR STORM. WHEN I WAS EITHER TO THE OUT THE AIRPORT OR THE CITY NEXT TO IS THE NEWLY PLAN TUNNELING OF LINCOLN BOULEVARD WHICH ALSO WILL CREATE ALL KINDS OF HIGH TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND POLLUTION AND NOISE AND THINGS OF THAT NATURE. SO, IS THE QUESTION,, I HOPE YOU UNDERSTOOD WHAT THEY TOLD YOU BECAUSE QUITE FRANKLY, I DON'T. WHAT I'M CONCERNED

ABOUT IS THAT IF EVERY TIME WHEN OF THE ADJOINING CITIES WERE EVEN AN IMPASSE IMPACTED CITY IS IMPACTED BY ONE OF THE PLANS WITHIN THE PLAN AS THEY KEEP GOING THROUGH EACH OF THE SUBPROJECTS, ARE YOU GOING TO HEAR AN IMPASSE FROM EACH ONE OF THOSE FOLKS? I DON'T KNOW. I AM VERY CONCERNED BECAUSE I WANT TO SEE THIS AIRPORT FIXED, ALREADY. IT'S JUST A TRAVESTY THE WAY THEY'RE GOING THROUGH THIS, QUITE FRANKLY. SO, I'M VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THAT. IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE SOMEBODY ADJACENT TO IT EXACTLY. IT COULD BE SOMEBODY LIKE THE CITY OF LA HABRA HEIGHTS WAS IMPACTED BY CURRENT PLANS. THERE'S ALSO PLANS TO CHANGE THE FLIGHT AS BECAUSE THAT WAS ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WAS DISCUSSED IN THE PREVIOUS. THE FAA SETS THOSE FIGHT PLANS SO NOT SURE HOW

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH. MAN.

>> MY NAME OF THE COMMISSION. COUNSEL TO THE CITIES OF COLORADO CITY AND ONTARIO AND THE COUNTY BERNARDINO YOU KNOW. WHO ARE PARTIES IN THE IMPASSE APPEAL THAT WILL BE HEARD ON SEPTEMBER 11 BEFORE YOU. I AM HERE, FIRST, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO CLARIFY WHAT I THINK I HEARD FROM YOUR STAFF CONCERNING THE BREATH OF YOUR JURISDICTION. YOU WILL HAVE TO AGREE WITH YOUR COUNSEL. YOUR JURISDICTION IS CONSTRAINED BY THE FOUR CORNERS OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE. YOU ARE NOT SERVING AS MEDIATORS OF ANY LAND-USE DECISION MADE BY ANY LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCY. I JUST WANTED TO DISPEL ANY MISAPPREHENSION I DON'T THINK YOU HAVE, I WANT TO IS A DISPUTE CONCERNING ISSUES RAISED BY THE FOUR CORNERS OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE, THOSE ISSUES ARE THE PROPER ISSUES FOR AN IMPASSE APPEAL. NOT OTHER PLANNING ISSUES THAT FALL EXCLUSIVELY UNDER THE GOVERNMENT CODE WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY. ENOUGH SAID ON THAT SUBJECT. WE ARE HERE BECAUSE WE HAVE AN INTERESTING IN YOUR TRAINING. SPECIFICALLY, WITH CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE THAT WERE MENTIONED IN YOUR TRAINING MATERIALS, BUT NOT FULLY EXPLICATED. THEY NEED SERIOUS EXPLANATION. AGAIN, I HAVE TO AGREE WITH YOUR COUNSEL, WHO RAISED THIS ISSUE AND I WILL GET TO IT IN A MOMENT. BUT AS A PREFACE, I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND YOU THAT WHEN YOU FOUND CONSISTENCY OF THE VARIOUS OMISSIONS OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES WITH RESPECT TO THE PENDING AIRPORT PROJECT, YOU CONSISTENCY WITH THE CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE GEN. PLAN AND CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFIC PLANS AFFECTING LAX. THESE WERE GENERAL PLANS AND SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS. THAT CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT ALTERNATIVES IN THE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT STUDY. THE NUMBER THAT AS WELL. YOU JUST SAID, WELL WE ARE GOING TO FIND CONSISTENCY OF THESE PERMITS, BUT WERE NOT THE PROJECT COMPONENTS WHICH YOU LEFT OUT THE MEAT AND JUST AT THE TIME. ON THE GROUND, AND I MAY ADD – THE GROUNDS FOR YOUR DECISION WAS THAT ULTIMATELY, THE UNDERLYING PROJECTS, THE COMPONENT PROJECTS, WOULD BE BROUGHT BEFORE YOU AT THE TIME THEY WERE GOING TO BE IMPLEMENTED. THEN THEY WOULD HAVE SEPARATE EIS AND SO ON AND SO FORTH. NOT EXACTLY. YOU FOUND CONSISTENCY OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS

>> YOU'RE TRYING YOUR CASE RIGHT NOW. I WANT TO BE CLEAR THAT WE ARE NOT HEARING THE LAX IMPASSE APPEAL RIGHT NOW. THESE ARE SUPPOSED THE COMMENTS GENERIC

>> I'M GOING TO READ YOU WHY THE LEADING OUT OF THE MEAT IS IMPROPER. BECAUSE PUBLIC UTILITIES SECTION 2167.5, B SAYS WHATEVER THE LOCAL AGENCY HAS REVISED ITS GENERAL PLAN OR SPECIFIC PLAN OR HAS OVERRULED, MEANING IT HAS REACHED CONSISTENCY, THE COMPONENT PLANS ARE OUTSIDE YOUR JURISDICTION. IN OTHER WORDS, YOU MAY HAVE BEEN MISINFORMED ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT LA HAS TO BRING BACK THOSE COMPONENT PLANS. YOU MAY NEVER SEE THEM AGAIN.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> I WAS NOT TRYING TO SUGGEST THE LOCK HAS GENERAL POLICE POWERS OVER GENERAL PLANNING DECISIONS OF OTHER JURISDICTIONS. SO I THINK IT'S BEST JUST TO INVEST, READ STRAIGHT FROM THE CODE WHAT YOUR ROLE IS. RATHER THAN TRY TO ADD NEW WORDS IN. IT SAYS, THE A ALUC SHALL COORDINATE THE AIRPORT PLANNING A PUBLIC AGENCIES WITHIN THE COUNTY. IN INSTANCES WHERE IMPASSE RESOLVED RELATIVE TO THIS PLANNING AN APPEAL MAY BE MADE TO THE ALUC BY ANY PUBLIC AGENCY INVOLVES. THEN IT GOES ON TO DEFINE PUBLIC AGENTS WHO DOES – SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

>> [INAUDIBLE]

>> THAT IS PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE

>> [INAUDIBLE]

>> THAT IS PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION 21670.2 SECTION SUBSECTION 8. 21670.2, SUBSECTION A. THEN IT'S ALSO IN OUR ALUC PROCEDURALS GUIDELINES REVIEW PRESENTERS AT 5.1.

>> THANK YOU COUNTY COUNSEL. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. YOU CAN TAKE A SEAT IN THE AUDIENCE. DEPUTY DIRECTOR, ANY OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT?

>> THERE ARE NO OTHER COMMENTS.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION?

>> MR. CHAIRMAN, AS WE WENT THROUGH THE LAST APPEAL WITH LAX, AS PLANNERS I THINK OUR TEMPTATION IS TO TRY TO GET INVOLVED INSERT OURSELVES IN THE PLANNING. I THINK THIS TRAINING HAS BEEN HELPFUL. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK STAFF, WHEN THEY DO COME BACK TO US, IN ANY IMPASSE IS TO PREFACE AND BEGIN WITH WHAT OUR ROLE IS. TO MAKE SURE WE UNDERSTAND THE CONFINES OF THAT ROLE,, BECAUSE, AGAIN, IT WAS VERY DIFFICULT FOR ME NOT TO COMMENT ON MULTIPLE THINGS THAT WERE NOT ASKED TO COMMENT ON JUST BECAUSE IT WAS BEFORE US. THAT IS NOT REALLY THE INTENT. I THINK THE INTENT IS TO LOOK AT THE VERY NARROW SPECIFICS OF WHAT OUR ROLE IS. I PROBABLY MORE THAN ANYBODY ELSE NEED TO BE SLAPPED ON THE , IF WE ARE BEARING AWAY FROM THAT. BECAUSE I THINK THERE'S GOING TO BE A GREAT EXPECTATION OF THE PUBLIC AS THEY COME IN THAT WE MAY HAVE AN OVERRIDING ROLE OF THE LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL OR THE PLANNING AUTHORITY – LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS IN TERMS OF PLANNING AND THAT'S WITH IN THEIR POWER AND OUR ROLE IS VERY NARROW. AGAIN, NOT PROBABLY HAVING BEEN PROPERLY TRAINED 2005, I THINK WE WERE TEMPTED TO GET A LITTLE BIT CARRIED AWAY. START ADDRESSING A NUMBER OF ISSUES THAT WERE NOT OUT OF OUR – WERE OUTSIDE OF OUR DOMAIN AND MAYBE IT WAS BECAUSE OF A SORT OF DOUBLE PIECE OF THAT OF FIRST COMMENTING AND DEALING WITH SOME THINGS THROUGH ROLE. OF COMPATIBILITY. WHICH I THINK THERE'S AN APPROPRIATE IS THERE PERHAPS – PIECES OF SUGGESTS MAYBE THIS NEEDS TO CHANGE BECAUSE WERE LOOKING AT SAFETY NOISE, BUT WHEN IT GETS TO THE IMPASSE — THAT'S WHY THE GUY WAS CONFUSED BY THE TWO THIRDS AND 4/5. THERE ARE SEPARATE FUNCTIONS THAT WE ARE DOING. AS LONG AS WE ARE KEPT IN PACE AND REMINDED BY COUNSEL, AND BY STAFF, WHAT OUR SPECIFIC ROLE IS THAT AND PERHAPS NOT BEING EXPLAINED AT THE VERY BEGINNING SO THAT IF WE HAVE A LOT OF PUBLIC COMMENT AS WE HAD LAST TIME AROUND, THAT THERE MAY OF THE PUBLIC IS TO COME FORWARD WITH. THAT YOU REALLY RIGHTFULLY HAVE GONE TO OF LOS ANGELES.

>> THANK YOU. CLEARLY THIS IS BENEFICIAL FOR THE COMMISSION AS A WHOLE. WE HAVE THREE MEMBERS WHO ACTUALLY WENT THROUGH THAT IMPASSE HEARING ACT IN 2005. SO AS SORT OF THE ALUCY GUY ON THEIR COMMISSION, THIS IS VERY HELPFUL TO ME. SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> THANK YOU.

>> WITH THAT, I THINK WE HAVE ARRIVED AT THE END OF OUR AGENDA AND WE ARE NOW  
ADJOURNED UNTIL 9:00 AM WEDNESDAY, JULY 31. THANK YOU.

>>COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES