

the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 4

Donald Clem stated that he owns 113 acres and was concerned about the proposed Area Plan's land use designation for his property.

Response 4

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 5

Matt Beneviste, with Sikand Engineering and representing Saugus Properties, was concerned about the Area Plan's proposed designation of Rural Land 2 (RL2). He stated that he originally made a request on behalf of the client to amend the entire 113 acres known as Saugus Properties from RL2 to Residential 2 (H2). He stated that this request was later scaled back and formalized in a letter in October 2010 to include only that portion of Saugus Properties consisting of 40 acres located in Val Verde. He stated that as of the date of the hearing, there was a pending application for a Zone Change and Plan Amendment but if the request to change the proposed land use designation to H2 is granted and adopted, they would not need to get the Zone Change or Plan Amendment.

Response 5

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 6

Lynne Plambeck, with Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE), noted that there was an outreach hiatus between 2001 and 2008 so people who participated in 2001 may no longer be around to be involved. She noted that not many members of the general public were in attendance and she expressed concern that presentations made about One Valley One Vision (OVOV) made it seem like the project was a done deal. She stated that SCOPE understands concepts of how mixed use and transit oriented development will idealistically help reduce greenhouse gas emissions but is skeptical that it will work on the ground. She expressed the opinion that the density will end up in the City of Santa Clarita

and reduced densities won't happen in County areas and she suggested that there be a way of finding checkpoints, or not approving more than mid-point densities, or instituting 5-year reviews to make sure the Plan is really working. She stated that there are examples in the Inland Empire area to address groundwater recharge, such as requiring permeable paving or conservation of recharge areas, and would like to see similar mitigations incorporated into OVOV.

Response 6

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required. Nonetheless, further response regarding groundwater recharge areas is provided in **Response to Comment Letter E1, SCOPE, February 7, 2011.**

Comment 7

Mark Gates, operating partner of Elsmere Canyon LLC, represents the 860-acre property located at the split of Interstate 5 and State Route 14. He stated that he sold 820 acres of the property to the City of Santa Clarita, the County of Los Angeles, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy for open space. He stated that he retained 41 acres, 20 acres of which are located in the County. He stated that access to the County portion is provided by the remaining acreage located in the City of Los Angeles, which accesses Sierra Highway, a major 4-lane highway. He described the area as being contiguous to existing industrial uses which have been recognized as such by the proposed Area Plan. He requested the same proposed land use designation as the adjacent industrial property because the property does not include any major ridges and is on the periphery of the 820 acres of open space.

Response 7

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 8

Tom Clark, with Bee Canyon LLC, indicated that he wanted to develop a large lot subdivision and requested leaving the land use designation on his property "as is." He stated that the property consists of 211 acres adjacent to State Route 14 at the border of the City of Santa Clarita and Agua Dulce. He stated that he got a General Plan Amendment approved in 1991 for residential. He stated that he plans to develop 88 residential lots on the 211 acres.

Response 8

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 9

Cheryl Hawkins, with the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association, expressed concern with the extension of McBean Parkway into the San Francisquito Canyon community. She stated that the concerns of community members were heard at a meeting and that the County will look into ways to remediate those concerns. She stated that she is satisfied that they will work to produce a plan for the McBean Parkway extension that incorporates sufficient safety features for the equestrians and provides safety requirements and guidelines for County personnel and residents.

Response 9

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 10

Judy Resima, with the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association, expressed concern with the Residential 2 (H2) land use designation due west of the San Francisquito Canyon community. She stated the proposed H2 land use designation covers the Tesoro Del Valle development and would drastically increase density allowance. She stated that since this area is on hillsides, it would require clustering which is not a natural transition to a rural landscape and that development in the area could have a negative effect on San Francisquito Canyon depending on how it is configured. She stated her opposition to the proposed H2 land use designation in this area and requested it be changed to Rural Land 5 (RL5).

Response 10

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 11

Roger Van Wert, with Van Wert Inc. and representing Norman and Tricia Howell, stated that the properties at 30701 Sloan Canyon Road would create an island of downzoning with the proposed Rural Land 5 (RL5) land use designation. He stated that there were changed circumstances at the property which warranted review by the Regional Planning Commission: 1) The Hart School District designated Romero Canyon for a high school site just north of the Sloan Canyon properties; 2) Staff's recommendation may have been based on incomplete data in that the parcel is served by water; 3) North-south access west of the freeway and frontage road is on Sloan Canyon, so to downzone the direct route for this community would not be the correct approach; and 4) Properties just east of Sloan Canyon designated as Rural Land 2 (RL2) have greater constraints. He stated the proposed RL5 land use designation creates a donut hole in the midst of the proposed RL2 designated lands.

Response 11

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 12

Jennifer Carter, with Van Wert Inc. and representing Norman and Tricia Howell, was concerned with the donut hole land use designation on Sloan Canyon. She stated that it would reduce property values and restrict existing property rights. She stated that she did not feel there has been appropriate justification for the lowered density.

Response 12

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 13

Karl Mallick, with CCL Engineering stated that he is representing the Santa Clarita Valley Facilities Foundation, which assists the William S. Hart Unified School District by planning and developing school sites and surrounding housing. He voiced concern regarding the proposed Area Plan's Rural Land 2 (RL2) land use designation, which would impact the planning and design work for the school. He was

concerned with inability to cluster but with verification from staff that clustering would be allowed, he is satisfied with the proposed Area Plan that is going forward.

Response 13

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 14

Teresa Mason, with the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association, was concerned with the proposed zoning affecting San Francisquito Canyon. She stated that she opposed clustering, stating that it does not fit into the rural setting. She stated water has been an issue and that the Tesoro del Valle development project was opposed by the Los Angeles County Water Department and the Fire Department.

Response 14

The portion of the comment regarding water addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the Revised Draft EIR, specifically in Section 3.13, Water Service. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, a more specific response cannot be provided nor is required. The remainder of the comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The remainder of the comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the remainder of the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 15

Winifred Boren, with the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association, opposed the proposed Residential 2 (H2) land use designation on the Tesoro del Valle development project. She stated that the proposed H2 land use designation will allow for high density in phases A, B, and C. She stated that the proposed land use designation for this property should be changed to Rural Land 5 (RL5) to match surrounding properties. She stated that she also opposed the extension of McBean Parkway as a Limited Secondary Highway because she felt it is already overburdened.

Response 15

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 16

Robert Lee, consultant for the Santa Clarita Facilities Foundation and former superintendent of William S. Hart Unified School District, stated that he echoes comments made by Mr. Karl Mallick regarding the need for density and the flexibility to cluster around the proposed school site. He stated that he suggested that the proposed Area Plan consider the impacts that a high school and junior high school brings to circulation.

Response 16

The portion of the comment regarding school traffic addresses the general subject area of traffic and circulation, which received extensive analysis in the Revised Draft EIR, specifically in Section 3.2: Transportation and Circulation. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, a more specific response cannot be provided nor is required. The remainder of the comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The remainder of the comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the remainder of the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

**Letter No. F2 Public Hearing Comments from the Regional Planning Commission Hearing
of March 23, 2011**

Comment 1

Lynne Plambeck, representing the Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE), stated that SCOPE already submitted extensive comments on the proposed Area Plan. She stated that SCOPE arrived at these comments by holding community meetings in the Santa Clarita Valley and that the comments were not just from the members of SCOPE. She stated that the State Attorney General's letter (dated March 17, 2011) reflected many of concerns raised in the SCOPE letter. She stated that although she thought the mitigation measures had strong language, she is concerned with the strength of the language in the goals and polices in the proposed Area Plan. She stated that the goals and policies in the proposed Area Plan say "encourage," "promote," or "when possible." She stated that in SCOPE's letter, SCOPE cited some stronger policy language from the previous Area Plan for comparison with the proposed Area Plan. She stated that without strong goals and policies, the proposed Area Plan is not defensible. She stated that, for example, the County had previously stated they would increase Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) but developments within these areas decreased SEAs. She stated that the Santa Clarita Valley is a non-attainment zone for ozone and particulate matter. She stated that this particulate matter affects children and that there are an increasing number of children and people with asthma in the Santa Clarita Valley. She stated the existing air quality is not acceptable and, that just because pollution comes from elsewhere, does not mean that we can add pollutants to it. She stated that doubling the population in the area is unacceptable because worse air quality will hurt people. She asked that if a tract map is not built, provide an expiration date on that so it remains undeveloped.

Response 1

Response is provided in **Response to Comment Letter E1, SCOPE, February 7, 2011.**

Comment 2

Reid Alexander stated that he purchased 38 acres from the County in 2004. He stated the zoning for the property was A-1-10,000, which he equated to 152 houses that would be allowed on that property. He stated that the proposed Area Plan reduces his density to two homes per acre, yielding 76 homes on the 38-acre property. He stated that the County, without notifying him, is trying to further decrease the density to one house per 2 acres, yielding 19 homes on the 38-acre property. He expressed concerns with the value of his 38 acres due to the density reduction. He stated that he had a meeting with Mr. Glaser who said it is too late to change the most recent proposed land use designation but that the request could be made to the Regional Planning Commission to change the proposal back to the first proposed land use designation of two homes per acre.

Response 2

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 3

Kent Alexander, Reid Alexander's son, reiterated that they were never notified of the new revision of the proposed land use designation. He stated that as soon as they learned of the revised proposed land use designation change, they sent a letter to Mitch Glaser, expressing concern with the revised proposed land use designation. He stated that they had begrudgingly accepted the first draft of the proposed Area Plan land use map that changed the land use designation to UR-1, which allowed two homes per acre. He stated they had worked to get easements for their property to Sierra Highway in anticipation of future development. He expressed concern that if density is cut to the revised proposed land use designation, it would be economically infeasible to develop their property. He requested that the proposed land use designation revert back to the first draft of the proposed Area Plan land use map allowing 2 homes per acre.

Response 3

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 4

Ron Druschen, President of SRC West, represents Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 52796, which is a project of 229 acres located in Pico Canyon adjacent to Stevenson Ranch. He expressed concern that the latest land use designations proposed under the proposed Area Plan would significantly reduce the allowable density on the property. He stated that neighboring developments have up to 30 units per acre and are within a half mile of the property of concern. He stated that the latest proposed land use designation of Rural Land 20 (RL20) reduces maximum allowable density from 269 to 11 units. He stated that the adjacent neighbor to the east has a proposed land use designation of Residential 5 (H5), a density 100 times greater than what the proposed Area Plan shows for the property of concern. He requested a less abrupt change in density from neighboring properties by modifying the proposed land use designation to Residential 2 (H2) for those areas closest to Stevenson Ranch and Southern Oaks and to Rural Land 5 (RL5) for the remaining balance of the site. He stated that staff may not have used site-

specific data when determining the proposed land use designation for the property. He also requested that the project be removed from the proposed Significant Ecological Area. He expressed concerns that the property may be in jeopardy of any economically viable use.

Response 4

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

F3

Public Hearing Comments from the Regional Planning Commission Hearing of May 25, 2011

Comment 1

Norm Haynie, representing Jeff McHaddad, was concerned that the proposed land use designation of Rural Land 10 (RL10) on his client's 255-acre property north of the Interstate 5 and State Route 14 intersection would hinder their ability to develop an environmentally sensitive project. He stated that half of the property is severely disturbed and does not contain ecologically sensitive habitat. He contended that the reduction in density on the property would restrict the Regional Planning Commission from developing a plan that would benefit both the environment and the property owner with an economically viable use of land. He expressed their objective to build 60-65 homes clustered on the disturbed portion of the property and to dedicate the remainder as open space.

Response 1

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 2

Jeff McHaddad expressed his desire for flexibility in the design of his project, a 255-acre property north of the Interstate 5 and State Route 14 intersection, to meet the open space requirement for developing in a Significant Ecological Area. He stated that with the proposed Rural Land 10 (RL10) land use designation, he would have to disperse the homes rather than clustering them in the previously disturbed portion.

Response 2

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Revised Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

F4 Public Hearing Comments from the Regional Planning Commission Hearing of September 28, 2011

Comment 1

Dean Paradise, Castaic Area Town Council member, stated his support for maintaining the Sloan Canyon Road designation as it was in 1980 until the high school site is determined. Mr. Paradise explained that the only access to Castaic aside from the freeway is a single two-lane County road, and any emergency would make access very difficult. Mr. Paradise requested access from Valencia into Castaic through Tesoro del Valle. Mr. Paradise requested that density in Charlie Canyon be increased to 2-acre lots.

Response 1

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 2

Patricia Howell, a local resident of Sloan Canyon and Hasley Canyon for over 30 years, stated support for the removal of Sloan Canyon Road from the Highway Plan. Ms. Howell also requested that the Old Road be improved to four lanes to relieve traffic on I-5. Ms. Howell expressed support for the EIR, including the Conservation and Open Space Element, specifically Policy C-01 regarding ridgeline development restrictions, Policy CO-7 regarding scenic resources, Policy CO-8 regarding Open Space and a Master Plan for Trails, Policy LU-1 for maintaining a green belt buffer, Policy LU-1.1 for protecting significant ridgelines and directing growth toward urbanized areas, Policy LU-1.3 to discourage urban sprawl, Policy C-2.26 for designing healthy streets, and Policy CO-7.1 to direct growth towards urban centers.

Response 2

The first comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required. The second comment is in support of the EIR and requires no further response.

Comment 3

Annie Wright, soon to be a local resident, stated support for removal of Sloan Canyon Road from the Highway Plan.

Response 3

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 4

Mikos Wright, Ms. Wright's husband, stated his support for removal of Sloan Canyon Road from the Highway Plan to maintain the rural character of the area.

Response 4

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 5

John Radich, a resident of Sloan Canyon Road, stated his support for maintaining Sloan Canyon Road with its current designation, and to reconsider the designation if Sloan Canyon is required for access to the future high school. Mr. Radich also stated his support for leaving Romero Canyon Road open.

Response 5

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 6

Timothy Collins, a local developer, stated his opposition to the proposed land use designation of Tesoro del Valle. Mr. Collins supports maintaining the designation as H-2, stating that Tesoro is a planned community, and is not undeveloped. Mr. Collins mentioned that the plan calls for a density gradient, with density decreasing towards the National Forest.

Response 6

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and

made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 7

John Evans, representing the owners of Tesoro, reiterated Mr. Collin's statements and stated the owners' opposition to the change in land use for Tesoro del Valle. Mr. Evans requested that the land use designation be kept consistent with the Valencia Master Plan.

Response 7

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 8

Richard Galway, vice president of the Board of the Tesoro Master Homeowner's Association, chair of the Security Committee, member of the land use committee, and homeowner, stated his opposition to the RL-10 and RL-5 land use designations for Tesoro del Valle, and supported one land use for 'similar and compatible' uses. Mr. Galway stated that no horses are present in the area, that the area is non-rural and should be preserved as such. Mr. Galway stated that Tesoro is one master planned community, and that the CC & Rs call for one master planned community, and that CC&Rs are very difficult to change under state law.

Response 8

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 9

Linda Pyburn, a local resident whose family has lived in Oak Canyon and operated a 420-acre ranch since the 1850s, stated her opposition to downzoning, and opposed 'excessive land use restrictions.' Ms. Pyburn's stated that the Environmental Review was not data driven, and mentioned that her family had to defend their agricultural zoning in the 1980s. Ms. Pyburn stated that downzoning would decrease property values, and was concerned that constraints on her property would require the most restrictive zoning, thus precluding most development.

Response 9

The first comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required. The second comment does not identify a specific portion of the EIR that is not data driven. Therefore, a specific response cannot be provided nor is required.

Comment 10

Darrell Lantzy, a resident of Santa Clarita Valley for 28 years, stated his support for the removal of Sloan Canyon Road, and his opposition to any increase capacity of the road.

Response 10

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 11

Jean Cloyd, a resident of Hasley Canyon for more than 20 years, stated her opposition to the removal of Sloan Canyon Road. Ms. Cloyd, an equestrian, stated her support for dedicated equestrian trails, and stated that retaining Sloan Canyon Road as a Limited Secondary Highway would increase equestrian safety.

Response 11

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 12

Lindhahl Lucas, a local resident, stated his support for maintaining the Limited Secondary Highway designation of Sloan Canyon Road.

Response 12

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and

made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 13

Janice Lucas, a resident of Hasley Canyon for 28 years, stated his opposition to removing Sloan Canyon Road, and his support for maintaining the road as a Limited Secondary Highway to provide a safe connection for through-traffic, including bicyclists and pedestrians, with two lanes and a center turn lane.

Response 13

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 14

Richard Landy, a representative of Citizens for Castaic, stated his opposition to removing Sloan Canyon Road, and support for maintaining the road as a Limited Secondary Highway. Mr. Landy requested an independent traffic study, and presented polls of local property owners showing strong support for maintaining the limited secondary highway designation of Sloan Canyon Road. Mr. Landy also stated that the Castaic Area Town Council voted Sept 21 in favor of this.

Response 14

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 15

Jim Nigra, a resident of Castaic who resides on Sloan Canyon Road, stated his opposition to removing Sloan Canyon Road, and his support for maintaining the road as a Limited Secondary Highway. Mr. Nigra stated that Sloan Canyon Road provides an essential connector for the Bicycle Master Plan, and that safe connection requires that Sloan Canyon Road remain a Limited Secondary Highway.

Response 15

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and

made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 16

Bill Davidheiser, owner of a ranch in Oak Canyon, stated his opposition to the Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation. Mr. Davidheiser stated that a recent wildfire that burned all vegetation was not accounted for in the SEA designation.

Response 16

Please see response to **Letter No. G8**.

Comment 17

Roger van Wert stated his support for the proposed Area Plan. Mr. van Wert stated his support for removing Sloan Canyon Road, and stated that the natural drainage and topography make a highway unfeasible, and low traffic volumes make the highway unwarranted.

Response 17

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 18

Ava Wright, Annie and Mikos Wright's young daughter, testified in support removing Sloan Canyon Road.

Response 18

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 19

Kevin Wright, a weekly visitor to the area, stated his support for maintaining the rural character of the Sloan Canyon area.

Response 19

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 20

Norm Haynie stated his opposition to the Significant Ecological Area (SEA), and his support for an RL-2 land use designation. Mr. Haynie testified that an SEA is unwarranted, as most vegetation has been removed, and the only remaining resource is the oak trees, which can be maintained with responsible development. Mr. Haynie stated that the decision will prevent the Planning Commission from making 'good and fair' decisions regarding land use.

Response 20

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 21

Roselyn Wang, representing the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), testified that the conclusion made by the EIR was illegal. Ms. Wang stated the NRDC's opposition to adoption of the Area Plan, and support for TDR and infill incentives.

Response 21

See response to **Letter No. D85**.

Comment 22

Hunt Braly, representing Tricia Howell, stated his support for the removal of Sloan Canyon Road.

Response 22

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 23

Amy Minter, representing Citizens for Castaic, stated her opposition to the removal of Sloan Canyon Road, and her support for maintaining the road as a Limited Secondary Highway.

Response 23

The comment is directed to the proposed Area Plan, not the Draft EIR, and raises issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Area Plan. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue, no further response is required.

Comment 24

Cam Noltemeyer, representing the Whitaker-Beaumont Citizens Advisory Board, stated her opposition until further information is added to the EIR and requested that the EIR be reconsidered. Ms. Noltemeyer referred letters that had been previously submitted to the Commission, including a letter from Department of Toxic Substance concerning contaminated water in Whitaker-Bermite and a letter from California Department of Public Health. Ms. Noltemeyer stated several concerns about contamination at the Whittaker Bermite site.

Response 24

Please see response to **Letter No. G4**.

Comment 25

Lynn Plembeck, representing the Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment, stated that she is concerned that the EIR has numerous overriding considerations, including air quality and biological resources. Ms. Plembeck stated the Valencia Water Company had found perchlorate pollution in one well, and Ms. Plembeck requested that the Commission look at modeling of perchlorate plume, which had been called for by the Department of Public Health, before approving increased population. Ms. Plembeck also raised concerns about chlorides present in drinking water supplies, and potential problems complying with the Clean Water Act. Ms. Plembeck requested changes to language in the plan, specifically changing 'promote' and 'where feasible' to 'shall'.

Response 25

Please see response to **Letter No. G9**.