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MR. BELLAMY: I would like to welcome you to the Regional Planning Commission meeting. This is October the 5th, 2009, and we always start out with the Pledge of Allegiance, led by Commissioner Modugno.

MR. MODUGNO: We're going to start this meeting with the flag salute, if you'll please stand and join with me in saluting the flag.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

MR. BELLAMY: May I get approval of the agenda.

MR. MODUGNO: Move for approval.

MR. REW: Second.

MR. BELLAMY: So ordered. County Counsel?

MS. LEMKE: Nothing.

MR. BELLAMY: Director?

MS. HAMILTON: No reports.

MR. BELLAMY: Okay. We're going to move on to our public hearing, Agenda Item No. 5.

MR. GLASER: Good evening, Commissioners. Mitch Glaser, with the Countywide Studies Section. This is a public hearing on the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update, commonly known as One Valley One Vision.

MR. REW: They can't hear. They can't hear him.

MR. BELLAMY: He can't hear? It's the acoustics?
MR. GLASER: All right. I guess we're going to try again. Everybody can hear me a little bit better standing up. Okay. Great.

Good evening, Commissioners. Mitch Glaser, with the Countywide Studies Section. This is a public hearing on the update of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, better known as One Valley One Vision.

First of all, on behalf of everyone here tonight, I'd like to thank you for coming out to Castaic on a Monday evening. As you know, it's not the regular place or time. Before we begin, I just want to talk about the purpose of tonight's hearing.

This is a hearing on the County's portion of the One Valley One Vision effort, just for lands within the County's jurisdiction, not those within the City of Santa Clarita's jurisdiction. Just so everyone's clear, this hearing is not regarding annexation or any related matters.

We're not asking that the commission take an action tonight. This is the first of what will be several hearings on this plan. What we are looking for tonight is to get some direction from the Commission as to the drafts that have been presented, any changes or modifications requested of Staff, and Staff will return at a later date with a revised Draft Plan and Draft EIR.

In terms of the presentation tonight, obviously
before you is a very complicated and lengthy Draft Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. In wrestling with how to summarize this plan, we decided to ask the five W's and one H. So the organization of tonight's presentation is Where, Why, Who, When, What, and How.

The first question is: Where? Where is the Santa Clarita Valley Area, which is our current definition of the planning area, and you can see on the map before you it includes several unincorporated communities, including Agua Dulce, Castaic, West Ranch, Val Verde, Hasley Canyon, San Francisquito Canyon, Bouquet Canyon, Forest Park, and Fair Oaks Ranch among others.

The Santa Clarita Valley has a very rich history, with everything from gold strikes to golden spikes. Mining, oil, and transportation all have a key role. The Santa Clarita Valley has been home to several communities, beginning with Newhall -- which you see on the screen before you -- which began in the late 1800s. Over the years other communities have developed, such as Canyon Country and most notably the master-planned community of Valencia, an early concept of which you can see on the lower right. Of course, as we know, Valencia didn't end up looking like that.

Also in the history of the Santa Clarita, with the fantastic natural resources are also natural hazards. So that plays a part in the narrative as well. As we're
usually reminded at this time of year, the Santa Clarita Valley is prone to fire. Most of us will remember the Northridge earthquake and the Sylmar earthquake before that impacted the valley. So in some regards, the valley is also a very vulnerable place.

What is the Santa Clarita Valley today? The Santa Clarita Valley today is a valley of villages. Not only the unincorporated communities that I previously mentioned, but also the communities and the city of Santa Clarita, such as Newhall, Valencia, Saugus, and parts of Canyon Country.

As you can see, it's a mix of development and natural environmental areas. It includes rural communities, which are exemplified on your left by Agua Dulce, suburban communities, such as Canyon Country in the lower photo, and even somewhat urban environments, such as the hustle and bustle of the Valencia Town Center Drive on your right.

The Santa Clarita Valley is recognized for having a great quality of life. It has been one of the fastest growing portions of the county for many years and is expected to continue to be so.

But what is the future of the Santa Clarita Valley? Can the valley maintain its quality of life in the face of natural hazards, in the face of the pressures of growth and the limits to growth? And that's really what this plan is about. That's what this discussion is going to
be about tonight. What is the future of the Santa Clarita Valley?

Which leads us to the next question, which is:

Why? Why are we updating this plan? To give a little bit of perspective, it's important to know the recent history of the valley.

The current Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan was adopted in 1984 when the entire planning area was unincorporated. In 1987 the City of Santa Clarita incorporated. In 1990 the County updated its Area Plan, which was the last comprehensive update. In 1991 the City adopted its General Plan. So as you can see, both jurisdictions' planning documents are out of date, and it's important to update these plans on a regular basis.

But why do a joint effort between the County and the City of Santa Clarita? Going back to the boundary map, it tells the story. You can see that the city of Santa Clarita is very unique in the county as that it's surrounded by unincorporated areas. Driving through the valley, it's not always readily apparent to the naked eye where the county begins and the city ends. The boundaries of the city have grown over the years.

But most importantly, the residents of the unincorporated area and the city have common needs. They have common desires, they share the same services, and it's
important to have a joint plan for their future.

There's other reasons why the Area Plan needs to be updated. There have been many changes since 1990. There's been tremendous growth. There's been demographic changes. There's been changes in the economic situation. All of which needs to be analyzed in a new plan update.

Of course, there's also growth projections. As you know, the Southern California Association of Government maintains planning projections for the North County. They are projecting explosive growth for the North County, not only the Santa Clarita Valley, but the Antelope Valley as well. Both the City and the County are legally required to accommodate this growth and to ensure that there's adequate housing at all income levels.

Another growing concern is climate change. The State of California has required local jurisdictions to respond to climate change. Many of you have heard of AB 32, which is a bill to address the effects of climate change that affects activities throughout California.

This has been followed by a specific implementation action known as SB 375, which requires local jurisdictions to adjust their land use planning strategies to deal with climate change by reducing vehicle miles traveled and to promote more compact forms of development and to reduce the amount of sprawl. By the way, that's the
state capital on that slide.

The next question is: Who? Who is affected by this plan update? Of course, most folks know that this is a plan that will be adopted by both governments. So obviously both governments, the City and the County, are affected. Service providers are affected. The Castaic Lake Water Agency and the local water retailers. The school districts. The fire department. The sheriff's department, et cetera.

There's also the town councils, which serve a very valuable advisory role in the unincorporated area and who have a stake in the future. There's also other advocacy groups ranging from the Santa Clarita Valley Trails Advisory Committee to the Santa Clarita Valley Organization for Planning in the Environment.

But who is most affected? The people that live, work, and play in the Santa Clarita Valley. There's residents. The residents that are here. The new residents that are being born every day. The residents that are yet to be born and that wish to grow up in the Santa Clarita Valley and make it their home. The people that own property here, whether or not they live in the valley. The people that own businesses here, whether or not they live in the valley. And, of course, those that work here. In short, everyone is affected by this plan update.

The next question is: When? What is the time
frame that this new plan looks at? And this looks at the
facts and figures of the matter, the statistics. The Santa
Clarita Valley today, according to our estimates,
approximately 80,000 housing units, housing 252,000 people.
There's 119,588 jobs. As most folks are familiar, there's
not an adequate jobs/housing balance in the Santa Clarita
Valley at the current time.

As I mentioned, plans need to be updated
periodically. Typically, these plans are updated every 10
to 20 years, and we anticipate that will be the case in this
plan. However, this plan is unique because we're looking at
the build-out of the valley. The build-out of the valley is
the point at which the ultimate capacity will be reached.
Based on current growth rates, that could take several
decades, if ever.

The figures before you assume a build-out of the
entire valley, even the rural portions with very low
densities. The City and County have developed projections
that, at the build-out of the valley, there will be an
increase of 70,000 to 75,000 housing units, an increase in
population of 208,000 to 233,000 persons, and most
importantly, an increase in jobs of 98,300 to approximately
129,000.

This is the Santa Clarita Valley at build-out. So
as you can see, there's substantial growth that's projected.
Again, it's important to mention that this is a scenario in which the entire valley would be built-out, all of the vacant lands, even those in the rural designations.

It's also important when you look at the increase in housing units. About half of that increase is going to be due to housing units that have already been approved, mostly by the County, but also by the City. Significantly, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan accounts for a quarter of that growth. So much of the growth that's being projected, again, are housing units that have been approved but have not yet been built.

The next question, and probably the most important question, is: What? What is this Area Plan Update? The Draft Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan before you has five elements: Land Use, Circulation, Conservation and Open Space, Safety, and Noise. I'm going to go through each of these briefly. You will see the topics covered by each on the left side of the screen.

The first and, in some respects, most important is the land use element. The land use element describes the Valley of Villages theme that I had previously described. The valley is currently a mosaic of unique villages with rural, suburban, and urban lifestyles, and we anticipate that that will continue to be the case.

There's also Specific Plans, such as Newhall Ranch
that I had mentioned, demographic characteristics, and economic issues. Other aspects deal with the design of the environment, the effects on health and environmental quality, resources, and coordination with other agencies.

This is probably the most important component of the land use element. This is the proposed Land Use Plan, which is available on our website and also on the map at the back of the room. This is the Land Use Plan by which the projections were developed.

How was this Land Use Plan developed? There were numerous suitability criteria, which include those on the screen. Essentially, City and County staff worked together, not only looking at maps and figures but also doing extensive field work, even taking to the skies in a helicopter to let the land tell us what kind of uses and what intensity of use would be appropriate.

Obviously, slopes are an important suitability criteria, but there are many others, such as significant ecological areas, fire zones, seismic zones, proximity to major roadways on the Highway Plan, and, of course, proximity to existing urban infrastructure and services, such as water lines and fire stations.

The Land Use Policy Map, the concept is essentially, as I described, similar to what's being predicted with SB 375, is to generally concentrate the most
intense growth to areas that are most suitable, near transit
in the existing city centers, by the Metrolink lines, such
as Old Town Newhall and the Valencia Town Center.

The new Land Use Legend is on your right. As
mentioned in the Staff report, the Land Use Plan is
consistent with both the currently adopted General Plan and
the proposed General Plan.

Lastly -- and this is an important point -- it
includes new rural hillside density calculations. These new
calculations necessitate the General Plan and Zoning
Ordinance Amendment that are also before you.

To describe this concept, what you have before you
is the -- is one way that we calculate hillside density in
rural areas. This is the Hillside Management category.
There are slightly different calculations for the Nonurban 1
and Nonurban 2 categories. Again, this is in the current
plan.

There seems to be a common misperception that,
under the current plan, all rural areas are allowed one unit
per two acres. As you can see, that is not the case. It is
based on a complex density formula based on the slope of the
land. The truth of the matter is that if a person were to
come to our public counter and ask how many units could be
built on their property or on the property next door, we
wouldn't be able to answer the question. We would have to
ask the property owner to hire an engineer to do these sorts of calculations.

Under the new plan, the land use designation will determine the maximum density. So instead of what you see before you, it depends on the designation. And here, on the key, you can see there's various rural land designations. RL5, the maximum density is one unit per five acres, regardless of slope. RL10, one unit per ten acres, regardless of slope. And so on.

We believe that this new scheme will provide clear expectations and a better understanding of the development potential of properties in rural areas.

The next element is circulation. Circulation deals with many issues that are important to the valley and are tied to the Land Use Map. Circulation element also includes trails, bikeways, and pedestrian circulation, all of which are important to reducing vehicle miles travel and providing an alternative to the automobile.

But, of course, probably the most important component of the circulation element is the Highway Plan. This is the proposed Highway Plan for the Santa Clarita Valley, showing current and proposed routes, both in the City and the County, the proposed ultimate widths.

Before closing on the circulation element, I should also mention that the Highway Plan includes new
highway cross sections that are consistent with the City
cross sections. So when you're driving in the City and the
County, the roadway doesn't change widths, the bike lane
doesn't add and disappear, and, again, we feel that's an
important step towards consistency.

The next element is conservation and open space,
which is extremely important given all of the natural
resources and natural hazards in the valley. Some of the
topics are seen here. Those of you who may be familiar,
that's Castaic Lake, which is just up the road from us.

Other topics include scenic resources, air
resources, and climate change. Here's where the bulk of the
policies to be responsive to the State mandates of AB 32 are
held.

Two major maps regarded with the conservation/open
space element. The first is the expansion of significant
ecological areas. We're proposing to triple the size of
those in the Santa Clarita Valley. The next is the proposed
Ridgeline Map. This is the Draft Ridgeline Map. As you may
be able to see, it doesn't include ridgelines in Agua Dulce.
We are working to modify this map to have ridgelines for the
entire Santa Clarita Valley. We anticipate that we'll
return with that at the next hearing.

The safety element is also key because of the
natural hazards. Seismic, flood, fire, hazardous materials.
Emergency preparedness, law enforcement, terrorism, accident prevention.

And finally, the noise element provides a means of looking at noise in the planning process, noise that's generated by different land uses, by highways and roadways, by helicopters, by airplanes, et cetera. So this element provides a means to address that.

The last question is: How? And there's really two sub-questions. First of all, how did we develop this plan, and how do we intend to implement it if it's adopted?

The process was a lengthy process, jointly conducted by the City and County. There was initial outreach, which included many activities, such as workshops, community surveys, school activities. There was a valley-wide congress where residents from throughout the valley were invited to ratify a series of guiding principles as well as a vision statement.

This vision and guiding principles, which came from the active involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, are the foundation of this plan. We also conducted a technical background report.

As the plan was developed, we came out with the Poster Plan that you may remember. We had a series of workshops, in which the Poster Plan, which was sort of a general conceptual land use scenario, was presented.
Approximately a year ago, both the City and County released preliminary drafts of their documents. We had, again, a series of open houses throughout the valley to present that.

We were fortunate enough to have extensive media coverage in The Signal newspaper last fall that was rerun in the spring. We also launched OVOV-NET, which is an excellent tool that's available on our website, that for the last year has enabled property owners and other community stakeholders to enter in any address or parcel number in the Santa Clarita Valley and see exactly what is being proposed with this plan.

Now, on to implementation. There's a Zoning Map, which is again on the screen and on the back wall. Staff conducted an extensive zoning consistency analysis. To our knowledge, this was the first time that was conducted. The new Zoning Map is also before you.

In addition to the zoning consistency, the plan will be implemented on an ongoing basis. Obviously, your commission and the Board of Supervisors will review future development projects in the guise of this plan, using the goals and policies as a framework to make decisions. The plan will guide capital improvements, such as roadways and other investments in infrastructure.

There's also an ongoing commitment to continue to collaborate with the City of Santa Clarita on future
planning and implementation of this plan, which may include changes to ordinances in both jurisdictions.

In conclusion, I want to acknowledge the folks that have contributed. In addition to the Department of Regional Planning, our GIS staff as well as the countywide study staff, we've had great involvement from the Department of Public Works. Steve Burger is here tonight from that department. We've had participation from all of our County departments, which has been much appreciated.

Of course, the City staff has been invaluable in this. Paul Brotzman, Lisa Webber, and Jason Smisko are some of the main folks who have helped us there. We've also been very blessed with probably one of the best consultant teams assembled. There's Molly Bowe, who's here tonight, that wrote the plan, the policy document. There's Susan Tebow. She's here tonight representing Impact Sciences that prepared the Environmental Impact Report. Austin Faust conducted our traffic study. Mestre Greve Associates conducted our noise study. And DM Geographics helped with some of the GIS work.

There are several revisions that are presented to you this evening in the correspondence as well as the testimony. Again, Staff is not asking for the Commission to make a decision. Staff is asking for the Commission to provide direction to Staff in how to approach these
revisions before coming back to you.

However, I should mention that there are a few technical revisions in your package. There is correspondence from Beneviste September 9th, Cornev September 14th, Seitz September 17th, and two from Hupsch on September 30th. As indicated in that correspondence, these are minor technical revisions that Staff is willing to make. As I mentioned, the rest of those are before you.

This concludes my presentation for tonight.

Before proceeding with the hearing, it is my understanding that the City of Santa Clarita would like to add a few words. Paul Brotzman, who is the Director of Community Development, I believe he is here this evening. I believe he's going to say a few very brief words here at the speaker's table before we move forward.

Thank you very much.

MR. BELLAMY: Any persons that plan on speaking tonight on this agenda item, would you please stand and raise your right hand and be sworn in.

(Whereupon witnesses were sworn.)

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you. Give your name.

MR. BROTZMAN: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Paul Brotzman. I am the Director of Community Development for the City of Santa Clarita.

I will start over. My name is Paul Brotzman. I
am the Director of Community Development for the City of Santa Clarita, and I would like to start out by acknowledging Mitch, the excellent presentation that's just given, the County Planning Staff and Staff from the other departments in the County that we've worked with on this project. It really has been a partnership, and, I think, through this process, we've come to know each other a lot better and have developed a really outstanding collaborative working relationship between the City and the County. So we're really pleased to have had this opportunity to work together with the County Planning Staff on this project.

I also believe that the effort that was undertaken here, having the City and the County work together, was really a farsighted planning effort. It really has done a lot to bring the planning efforts of the City and the County into sync. And I think overall, the Santa Clarita Valley, into the future, will benefit significantly from this joint effort. So I'd like to acknowledge those who went before who made the decision to have this be undertaken as a joint planning effort. I think it made a lot of sense, and I think as people get to see this plan and understand it, they will understand the value that it brings.

There are, from the City's perspective, a number of major themes that I'd like to mention, and Mitch has discussed some of them in his presentation. A part of what
we've tried to do here in pulling this plan together is to create what we've called the Valley of Villages. It's really to acknowledge an effort to try and create much more walkable communities, communities and neighbors that have a strong sense of place, a strong sense of ownership for the residents who live within them. And so that concept of creating this Valley of Villages and the walkability is an important element of this planning process.

A second major theme that was addressed in this process is one of creating a greenbelt around the Santa Clarita Valley. We have the makings of that with the national forest that exists, the Angeles National Forest that exists to the south and to the east, also the major open space areas that are being donated by Newhall Ranch, and the Castaic Lake and the recreational areas to the north. And I think that by expanding upon that natural base that already exists, we have an opportunity to really preserve the Santa Clarita Valley as a separate, distinct geographic area. And I think that's important. I think the people who have moved here, the residents who live here today, value that distinctive character that we've developed here. So developing and preserving the greenbelt that surrounds the valley is a very important element.

Jobs/housing balance, which Mitch mentioned, is also very critical. For anybody who lives here who commutes
into the valley every day, they drive through this rather
congested pass and travel down some very congested freeways,
moving down into the San Fernando Valley and beyond. And so
to the extent that we are able to enhance the job/housing
balance through this process, I think it's critically
important to the quality of life of the residents within the
valley. But it's also critically important in addressing
the environmental issues that were mentioned.

We are faced with responding to the requirements
that have come out of SB 32 and AB 372 -- 375 -- or SB 375,
AB 32 and SB 375 -- excuse me -- legislation that was passed
at the State level that really requires us all to take into
consideration environmental issues and to implement plans
that will reduce the number of vehicle miles driven by
people and will also reduce the amount of greenhouse gas
that we're adding to the atmosphere and with the resulting
impact on global warming.

We are fortunate. I think this plan does address
that issue, and I think the Santa Clarita Valley, both the
unincorporated and incorporated areas of the valley are
somewhat a step ahead of much of the rest of the
metropolitan planning area that SCAG has to address in
developing the response to SB 375. So I think that this
plan really does take into consideration those significant
overriding environmental issues.
Finally, one other important theme and element that has been incorporated in this plan, and it's one that goes back to the very early days of Newhall Ranch when Victor Gruen developed the original master plan. And that was the recognition of the Town Center area as kind of the valley business center, and this plan does continue to build upon that.

We recognize that all of these -- all of the planning effort that we've undertaken in this process will, in fact, have long term impacts for the community. We recognize that those impacts run the -- from water supply to traffic and so on, and I think that both the City and the County Planning Staff have done a very good job in terms of taking these issues into consideration and developing a plan that reflects a significant care for the quality of life that we are creating for the existing and future residents of the Santa Clarita Valley.

And with that, I'm here to respond to any questions that you may have for the City and would be happy to bring up other Staff if there are questions that I can't answer. But we're here to be a resource and to provide support to the County Planning Staff, who we think have done just an outstanding job in this process.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much. Now I'd like to get testimony from the city officials that are here -- any city
officials. And then from homeowner board chairs, and then
the town council before we go forward with the rest of the
audience.

MS. HAMILTON: I'm sorry. Did you say you have an
order by which you want these people to speak?

MR. BELLAMY: City officials, town council, and
homeowner board chairs.

MS. HAMILTON: Okay. Unless they've signed in as a
city official, I wouldn't know that.

MR. GLASER: Mr. Chair, I believe Mr. Brotzman is the
only representative from the city speaking tonight. Just
Mr. Brotzman from the city.

MR. BELLAMY: Pardon me? There's no others?

MR. GLASER: That's correct. No one else.

MR. BELLAMY: Okay. What about the town council?

MS. HAMILTON: Town council representatives?

MR. BELLAMY: Each speaker will have three minutes.
When the amber light comes on, you'll have 30 seconds to go.
And we're going to try our best to hear all the persons in
the room that want to speak.

The town council -- go ahead.

MR. MODUGNO: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that --
we're meeting in Castaic. The town council -- the Castaic
Town Council has done extensive review of this and
participated with Mr. Glaser. If it's the official position
of the town council of Castaic, I think for the town
councils that neighbor around, we should provide five
minutes for the town councils and then give the general
public three minutes just would be my recommendation.

MR. BELLAMY: So let's hear from the town council.

MR. MODUGNO: I'm sorry. And if there was also anyone
from any of the water agencies or school districts in
official position, governmental agencies, I also again would
recommend providing five minutes for those groups.

MR. BELLAMY: Okay. We'll give the town council five
minutes.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Ready?

MR. BELLAMY: Give your name.

MR. KELLY: My name is Robert Kelly, and I am a
resident and a landowner and a Castaic Area Town Council
representing Region 3, which is the Hasley Canyon area in
question here this evening.

First of all, I want to thank the County and the
Commission for having this meeting tonight. I'm speaking
tonight as a resident, a landowner, and a Castaic Area Town
Council representative for Region 3. I have lived in
Castaic for 23 years. I own 40-plus acres in Charley Canyon
and two two-and-a-half acre parcels in Hasley Canyon. The
Hasley Canyon parcel was a five-acre parcel that I and my
wife split several years ago.
I have reviewed the OVOV plan, and the one thing that -- excuse me -- the one thing that I and other residents completely disagree with is the proposed land use designation of the current A2 zone. My biggest question is: Why the land use changes? I've been told it's to simplify the building and development process. Simplify for whom? The County?

If an owner wants to go through the time and the money and the consuming process, that should be their option. Retirement packages and 401(k)'s have all been hit hard during these economic times. Now, the proposed land use affects our real property. We have all purchased our properties based on the current land use. Real property, even with the current economic issues, has always been a good long-term investment.

When someone purchases real property -- maybe it is their primary residence, a rental property, undeveloped land, or a combination of -- they are hoping that will be a good investment. Nobody invests with the hopes of changing the land use to a higher density from what they purchased it. To think so would be poor investing.

What the draft of the OVOV does, it changes the land use in Charley Canyon and Tapia Canyon from Hillside Management to RL10. This would spell financial disaster for the property owners. The property will be worth pennies on
the dollar. Taking into consideration the current land use, Hillside Management and Ridgelines, it may be feasible that only 13 units would be allowed on my 40 acres. Thirteen is a lot better than four.

Hypothetically, let's assume that each parcel would be worth $100,000. That puts a $1.3 million value on the 40 acres. There is no way that four ten-acre parcels would be worth anywhere near the $1.3 million. Maybe I never sell my property and just leave it to my children or to leave it to theirs -- excuse me -- or they leave it to theirs. The land use, as proposed, would ruin any financial future we might have.

Is it open area OVOV is looking for? A similar thing happened in Boulder, Colorado. The surrounding land around the city was changed, making it worth pennies. Then the City went in and purchased the properties. One would think that the way the City of Santa Clarita has been buying up open space this could be a possibility. Directly to the north is the Angeles National Forest. This is all the open space Castaic would ever need.

The OVOV plan in Hasley Canyon is also poor planning. The owners in Hasley Canyon, like me, have either completed a lot split or have the option to do so. This area is proposed to be changed as well from Hillside Management to an RL5. Owners will end up with five-acre
parcels in the middle of two-acre parcels. In some cases, the area would be two acres next to five, next to two, and back to five. Where's the logic in this?

What gives OV the right to change the land use for personal property? For whose benefit? Obviously, not ours. Does any of this make sense? By changing the land use, you are taking away people's lifestyles, dreams, and retirement plans.

As a council, we have sent letters in opposition to the Charley Canyon-Hasley Canyon proposed land use changes and sent a letter of support for a secondary access road to the northern end of Castaic. This is very much needed. The northern end has limited access from the south. The 5 Freeway and the Old Road are the only means of getting north of the Hasley Canyon off-ramp.

During any 5 Freeway shutdown due to snow, fire, or an accident, the northern end of Castaic is completely inaccessible. It is either a parking lot for truckers and travelers. Emergency vehicle access is also compromised. This could be a life-threatening issue.

We are in support of a secondary access from Tesoro to Parker or Lake Hughes. We know the County does not have the means at this time to develop this road, but now is the time to draw it on the OVOV plan so there are no surprises later. Also, by retaining the current land use in
the Charley Canyon area, future road fees can start to be
collected.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MR. PREACH: My name's Jeff Preach. I live at 28456 Sloan Canyon Road. I'm here as a landowner, business owner, and a --

MR. MODUGNO: Mr. Preach, let me just -- may I just interrupt here. When I spoke to the Chair and recommended that five minutes be provided and that speakers representing town councils or speakers from various districts, it was hope and expectations they would have spoken on behalf of those districts as a whole, not getting into their own personal holdings of property.

Many of us here in the Santa Clarita Valley, including myself, own property in the city, but the allowance and the courtesy of providing for the upfront time and the greater time was to address the more macro issues, in terms of representation, that have been discussed and that you're authorized by your body, in terms of the town council, as a spokesperson -- of a single spokesperson for the town council we allowed the five minutes for.

To the extent to which if there's five members of that body, seven members of that body, it was not the intent that multiple members come forward and have five minutes
each, because that's at the expense of residents who are
going to be allowed three minutes. So I apologize if it
wasn't clearer to begin with, but I think representatives,
again, we allowed time from the City of Santa Clarita
because they're a very active participant. The town council
within Castaic is an active participant, and there may be
other town councils surrounding and having those people
speaking. And so --

MR. PREACH: I can keep it to three minutes.

MR. MODUGNO: Okay.

MR. PREACH: I did have to disclose -- if I don't
disclose I own property, they may shoot me, so -- but the
main -- the main focus is the town council. I'm not here to
talk for the town council tonight. I am the chairman of the
OVOV committee, and I'm a member of the town council. And
from this committee, six months ago, when we first found out
that you had your first meeting, that we had up at the
school district that only about four or five people showed
up at, was the first we heard about it. And this is, of
course, the draft.

Now, our committee, our town council, has spent
probably six different meetings. We split this book up, and
each guy took a certain amount. We're trying to figure out
what this really means. How can the town council tell you
guys what we want until we understand it?
So we've had some meetings. We have three different civil engineers that voted -- that volunteered their time to help us understand what this is. You know, such as clustering. You know, you've got to read way back here about clustering. Now, what does clustering really mean? And so the town council has got to get their information before they can represent this town and talk to you logically.

And after six meetings, we came to our first little agenda, which was we sent you a letter, to Mitch Glaser, about eight days ago. And the point that I wanted to make tonight is that we're still working on it. Tomorrow we have another meeting with the engineers again, trying to get a little further on, having to do with clustering and some other issues that are still coming up.

And my point was, hey, we're working on this thing, and there's a lot to deal with, and we have a lot of responsibility to these -- the members here. And so that's what my point was, is there -- we have this letter now sent, and we have another one following shortly, and we're still working this. I understand that's -- tonight's not the final vote and this is an ongoing deal, so you'll keep the door open for communication with the town council; is that correct?

MR. MODUGNO: Yes. This -- One Valley One Vision has
been presented to us as a Commission -- go back three years, 
Mitch, at least?

MR. GLASER: Yeah, well, frankly, it's been a ten-year 
process, but it's been most active in the last three years.

MR. MODUGNO: So it's been a very long-term process.

This is the first public hearing that the County Commission 
has had on the topic in the community. I suspect there will 
be multiple other hearings, whether they'll be in Santa 
Clarita or whether they'll be in Downtown Los Angeles, and 
we continue to be provided with all of the letters as 
they're coming in, whether they're addressed to any one of 
us, whether addressed to Mr. Glaser, whether addressed to 
whomever. And so, as long as they're hitting the body, it 
becomes all a part of the permanent record.

So we're not going to make the decision this 
evening. I doubt that we'll make the decision at a next 
meeting. It's a long process of making sure that everyone 
who has input has the proper opportunity to vet their input, 
be it in either comments as this evening and all of that -- 
all that oral testimony along with all the written 
testimony.

So if you're not ready to make a decision as a 
town council, which I suspect -- I'm not sure how you could 
when we don't even have sufficient information as the County 
Commission at this point to make a balanced and reasonable
decision and to pass this forward to the Board of Supervisors.

Most of the letters that we have received have been very specific to individuals' concerns about their land, and I think rightfully so if there's a change in zoning on that land, if they expected that they would have a certain building rights within. We need to set up procedures that are not on the more macro basis that we're looking at but that those people are not just falling through the cracks but have an opportunity to, again, express their case, have a reasonable process through the County Staff as when they -- a point in time they want to develop that land.

So, again, as we -- after the City of Santa Clarita incorporated in 1987 and took the County's plans and the City went forth and put a General Plan together, some sort of mapping, zoning ordinances, as individual landowners came in, there was no either taking of anybody's property, hopefully, or any brush of upgrading that property. So it's a long process.

We're here to take input. I think we're trying to focus on the broader issues with One Valley One Vision. Is it a good planning document, jointly, for the whole community? How do we then deal and address individual town councils, be it West Valley or be it Castaic or as we go
over towards the eastern side of the valley, so that all the players have got a piece of that to be able to put that discussion so that once we come out with a decision -- and I think the timing processing, we may be a little bit ahead of the City and, in some respects, maybe the City's a little bit ahead of us.

But there will be a final action taken by the Board of Supervisors based upon all of this input. There will be a final action taken by the City of Santa Clarita's City Council. And then once both of those bodies have acted, we've got now a document from which both planning staffs can continue to function.

But getting at individual, specific properties in terms of, gee, mine's painted this way on that map, I don't know that this is the proper forum to be discussing that, but I think it's the proper forum to at least put yourselves on record, putting us on notice that we have a concern about my piece of property, be it five acres, one lot, 100 acres, or 1000 acres, and how's that going to be treated differently once all this is put in place.

So I don't expect the town council has yet made that determination. We may, as a planning body, say, look, there's so many of these individual cases -- there may be 30, there may be 100, there may be 500 -- that over time those individual cases may need to go, again, under those
town councils' jurisdictions that we're looking to for some
guidance and recommendation, because you clearly are much
closer to the scene, that your own property or anybody else
within Castaic would come forward and say this is what we
want to do with this property. Here's how it used to be
zoned or mapped on the older planning document. Here's how
it is on the new One Valley One Vision.

What are those discrepancies, and what guidance do
we have and the ability of either moving that density up
towards a maximum, taking it minimum -- our sort of overall
planning is we target a midpoint zoning. This 500,000
people that Mr. Glaser had sort of put on board, you know,
that's going to be dependent upon an awful lot of things.
It's going to be dependent upon circulation. It's going to
be dependent upon environmental issues. Most importantly
right now, it's certainly going to be dependent upon water,
water treatment, all the kinds of infrastructure which may
or may not support 500,000 people.

We're looking to add, perhaps, on the design,
another 75- or 80,000 homes as a high-end potential. There
may be already 30,000 of those approved, waiting for some
action. And many of those people may say, look, it just
economically no longer makes sense. We may pull back on
those.

So from a planning standpoint, we, as a master
planning body for the County of Los Angeles, the two of you,
as a microcosm of that as a planning body recommending to us
from Castaic, those views are going to be taken into great
seriousness as individual property owners come to you and
say, look, this doesn't make sense, and then you add your
support to that and say, yeah, we agree with him, it doesn't
make sense. And then that recommendation comes back, is
vetted by our staff, and then looking at how do we
accommodate.

So the real purpose -- and, again, I apologize for
going so long, but I wanted each of the governmental bodies,
elected bodies, those people representing many people, not
just their own interests, to have a little bit more time up
front as a courtesy, which we normally do. And then allow
time for every individual who wants to speak, to speak.

As I said before, this is not going to be the only
hearing nor the only opportunity, and as long as this case
is still open and being processed, written testimony can
continue to come in. And we've been provided with piles and
piles and piles of written testimony. And we don't want to
stop that because, again, everyone has to have their
opportunity to state and step forward. And even those that
don't step forward and state, their rights are still going
to be protected. And so that's a general sort of comment.

MR. PREACH: Okay. I hope I understand. I have 58
MR. MODUGNO: Go ahead.

MR. PREACH: And I want to make sure you understand that the town council, as -- for example, in this Hasley Canyon group, there was a petition. They came to the town council, and they asked our support. And after we heard all the information that we acted on, had the public hearing, to support that. So that's -- that's generated the first letter.

And I want to tell you that we have some more letters. We're still ongoing, working, and I wanted to make sure that was okay.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MS. HAMILTON: We have 50 people wishing to testify. I think I'll call the first three.

MR. BELLAMY: Yes, please.


MR. GRUNAUER: Good evening, gentlemen. My name is Ralph Grunauer.

MR. BELLAMY: We can't hear you.

MR. GRUNAUER: My name is Ralph Grunauer, and I'm -- I am the owner of approximately 38 acres in Section 35.
MS. HAMILTON: Does that come off? Can he -- take it off, Susie.

MR. GRUNAUER: Sorry. My name is Ralph Grunauer. I am the owner of approximately 38 acres in Section 35, in the vicinity of Vasquez Canyon Road and Burton Way. This land consists of two similar adjoining parcels. The first parcel --

MS. GRUNAUER: Is it all right if I read?

MR. BELLAMY: Yes. It's fine.

MS. GRUNAUER: It's not on?

MR. BELLAMY: Give your -- just give your name.

MS. GRUNAUER: Joyce Grunauer. These are parcels 2813017003 and 002. The first parcel is 20 acres. The second one is 17 and a half. We have access to both parcels by paved road from Vasquez Canyon through Burton Way to Sunrise Hill Road, which ends at a cul-de-sac adjoining the property.

The one property, the 20-acre parcel, is one unit per two acres, and the second parcel is one acre per ten -- one unit per ten acres, giving the 17 and a half acre parcel only one unit. The 17 and a half acre parcel, 002, is the northernmost end of the property in a small, self-contained valley with flat land and gentle, sloping ridges with areas of good topography that vary only a few feet. This would require minimal grading to achieve desirable home sites.
The cost would become prohibitive to develop only one unit on the entire 17 and a half acre parcel.

I'd like you to reconsider and allow the same units as parcel 003 so that this parcel can be developed to its full potential. They would be developed together as one parcel, 37 and a half acres. Half of it is zoned differently than the other half, but it's one parcel.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. JENS: Good evening, Commissioners and Regional Planning Staff. Thank you for allowing me to speak this evening. My name is Denise Jens, and I am a resident in the Santa Clarita Valley. But I'm not here to speak on my own behalf. I also -- I'm speaking on behalf of the Property Owners Water System. That is the water company for Forest Park. We're in the northeast section of Canyon Country.

And the Property Owner Water System was developed in -- it was rebuilt in 1995 and gone live in 1998. It supports 50 units, and the region that is -- or the General Plan has -- has decided that it wants to rezone as high residential 18 and 30 in that area. The water company cannot support that many units, and so I wanted to -- to bring this to you to say that we oppose this and hope that you would consider -- reconsider to leave the zoning as it is in that area.

We run right along the greenbelt of just below
Vasquez Canyon, and it is a -- it's a very beautiful area, and we have a strong sense of community there. And it would just -- it would really take away from the quality of life in our area to develop such high density.

Another concern we have would be traffic. We -- we are kind of outside of town, so we have a bus that comes up there, you know, a few times a day. But it really would -- to develop that high of density would increase traffic immensely in our area.

And one final thing is the water runoff. We are -- the runoff from Vasquez Canyon and Sierra Highway Canyon comes right through our neighborhood. And what is proposed in the plan are high density 30 right next to that heavy runoff wash of Mint Canyon. So it just doesn't make sense to do what has been proposed, and we ask that you would consider to keep things as -- as they are. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MR. REINECKER: Good evening. My name is Karl Reinecker. I live at 25643 Tapia Canyon Road, here in Castaic. My formal comments have been submitted to Supervisor Antonovich in two letters, one dated February 17, 2009, and the other one on April 28, 2009. Both of my letters contain my references and attachments. I have a set of that here for the commission if I'm permitted to give it
to you for reference.

But tonight I'd like to talk about three concerns I have, perhaps four, about this plan. And my first concern is that this revision is based upon flawed science. Both of the gentlemen that spoke earlier talked about the -- the laws that have been passed with respect to climate change and things like that. Well, I submit that climate change is happening, but it's not caused by CO2 emissions. And I'm not going to debate that tonight, but you -- I would like to give an example of Senate Bill 375, which is one of those that is referenced.

That was driven by out of control environmentalists through our Congress here in legislation California. Its stated intent is to limit urban sprawl, to minimize dependency on automobiles for transportation, and force people into inner-city housing. I'm amazed that anybody would want us to back into the inner-city. It seems that our planners have forgotten that in the 1930s we moved out of inner-cities to get away from all of the problems that we had. Now they want us to go back. That's a difficult situation. And all of this is done to reduce CO2 emissions.

Now, for the moment, I'd like to go back, and I think that probably everybody in this room is well aware of the fact that 15,000 years ago North America was in an Ice
Age. The ice over Canada was two miles thick. It extended all the way down into what is now the state of Nebraska, and then it started to warm. There was no mankind here. People didn't cause that. That is true climate change that is caused by natural conditions. And with few exceptions, it is continuing to warm since that period 15,000 years ago.

I'm not saying that's good. I'm not saying -- but we don't want to try to correct it for the false reasons. In fact, about 1000 years ago, the average temperature is one and a half degrees centigrade more than it is now and Greenland was green. That's why they called it green. And so it shows you how -- what an impact climate change has, and you can't change it for the wrong reasons.

Also, it then started to cool. And by the mid 1800s, we had an Ice Age, and they had crop failure in Europe. Again, it was only one and a half degrees centigrade below the average. So it's a very serious thing, but we can't change it by limiting carbon dioxide. If you would like to look --

MR. BELLAMY: Can you sum up, sir. I said can you sum up, please.

MR. REINECKER: I'm sorry.

MR. BELLAMY: Can you sum up.

MR. REINECKER: Sum up?

MR. BELLAMY: Yeah.
MR. REINECKER: Okay. I would like to sum up by talking about rezoning very briefly.

MR. BELLAMY: Pardon me.

MR. REINECKER: I've already checked, and if you rezone our lands to lesser value, I've checked with the Pacific Legal Foundation, and we are entitled to just compensation. At my age, I need the money. So if you want to rezone mine, fine. I'll have my hand out and ask to be paid, but I don't think that's the best interests of Los Angeles. So thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MS. HAMILTON: Chris Ball, Kenneth Baumgarten -- Kenneth Baumgartner, and James Crosby. Chris Ball.

MR. BALL: I'd like to stand, if I may, so I could also address my neighbors. My name is Chris Ball. I'm in the Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce. I sit on the Citizens Oversight Committee for both of the Hart District bond measures, including the $300 million Castaic High School bond measure that was just passed.

I own 25 acres on the east side of town. I have had the dickens of a time trying to get entitlements through Regional Planning. I have two points to make.

One, the staff and the administrators in the Department of Regional Planning have unlimited discretionary authority. You call them up, they don't have to answer the
phone. You write them a letter, they don't have to answer it. You ask for a meeting, they don't have to attend. You submit plans for their review, they don't have to look at it.

My property is in the Hillside Management area. I have eight recorded lots, density of three acres per home per lot. The grading is done, and Regional Planning says I need a conditional use permit before they'll let me build a house.

There are exceptions in the Hillside Management ordinance. For example, I've got eight buildable areas that are less than 25 percent slope. The grading is done. The lots are recorded. My grading was done after the lots were recorded. I feel I've got exceptions, as written into the Hillside Management ordinance, that I'm entitled to. They tell me -- arbitrarily, they decide that I'm not entitled to them. How do I appeal that?

What I'm told is -- by the deputy supervisors and by Regional Planning -- is the only way I can come before you to appeal their arbitrary decisions is to, guess what, file for a conditional use permit. Everybody I've talked to says that's a three-year process and they've spent $50,000 in consulting fees.

My grading is done. I've got a road going all the way to the top. I want three-acre density per house. Right
next to me you guys approved ten homes per acre. Ten homes per acre. The water for those houses comes from 400 miles away. On its way it picks up chlorides, and when these people flush their toilets -- the 100 homes that you put right next to me -- it goes across town to the sewer treatment plant, where the taxpayers of this community are being asked to pay $250 million to get the chlorides out before that water goes on down to avocado land.

I've got my own wells, my own private on-site septic systems on three-acre density, but because Regional Planning says that's rural and this is urban, they got -- they're planning on 18 units per acre over here, 30 units per acre over here, commercial property here, Sierra Highway's right there, 100 homes, ten units per acre, right next to me, but I'm RL5, one house for five acres.

My grading's done. My lots are approved. I cannot go before you to get a fair hearing on what Regional Planning is doing to me unless I submit, submit, submit to the arbitrary, discretionary, unlimited requirements -- authority expressed by the -- by the planners in Regional Planning.

MR. BELLAMY: Can you wrap up, please, sir.

MR. BALL: I'm done.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MS. HAMILTON: Jason Broom. Jason Broom. Donald
Mr. Perry: All right. My name's James Perry. I don't own a lot of land like a lot of the people, but I did come to Castaic for a small parcel of horse property. You want to rezone it to residential. I'm not a wealthy person. I don't see why they can come in and rezone my land and to dictate to me in an area of town where we're in Old Castaic of horse property and say we have to be residential.

I don't have a lot to say, but this is something I think should be reconsidered. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Bellamy: Thank you.

Ms. Hawkins: Yes, hello. Thank you, gentlemen, for taking the time to come out here this evening to listen to all of us. My name is Cheryl Hawkins, and I live at 23001 Riverview Road in Santa Clarita, in the San Francisquito Canyon. I own a small five-acre ranch.

And when the residents of San Francisquito Canyon opposed this -- I'm going to be talking about a development that's on the -- on the outskirts of Santa Clarita -- or excuse me, San Francisquito Canyon.

When the residents of San Francisquito Canyon opposed the massive development of Tesoro De Valle, many planned phases in the mid-to-late 1990s, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, after many meetings and
testimonies from residents and the developer alike, they approved the zoning for each of their four phases, allowing for a higher density in each phase -- in Phase A, phasing down through Phase B and C and D, with each phase increasing the lot sizes coming up the canyon. Phase C's were approved from a minimum of one acre to a maximum of 5.2 acres, and that -- that Phase C is right up against the national forest, which is at the upper end of the canyon.

At that time, super Mike Antonovich was instrumental on the decision by the board to phase the lot sizes to increase coming up the canyon with the intent of maintaining the integrity of the canyon, rural lifestyle, and surrounding hills. With the approval of our CSD's for San Francisquito Canyon just in this last month, protecting the canyon and its environment, and with the same intent of maintaining a rural atmosphere for years to come, this same area's zoning on the hillside surrounding San Francisquito Canyon should remain as it was intended by the approval of the Board of Supervisors in 1999.

There was a reason the zoning was applied by the supervisors at that time and that condition still remains today. This is a rural community, which includes our hills that Tesoro has their development proposed for, zoned at A2 and should remain rural, and it should remain at A2. Thank you.
MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

Two more names.

MS. HEFFLEY: Good evening, everyone. Thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I don't have much to say. I'm very small property owner, my husband, Frank, and myself -- my name is Rosie Heffley. And we live at 7520 Escondido Canyon Road in the unincorporated community of Agua Dulce.

And all I wanted to say is that I want to thank the L.A. County Planning Commission and the Santa Clarita commissioners and everyone here, and I do approve of the OVOV. My husband and I both approve of this, and we are very happy that this is happening. Thank you.

And I want to thank also Mr. Adams, because I was able to get in touch with him the first time I tried. The phone system was great. I had no problems. He spent maybe 15, 20 minutes with me and -- on the phone -- and it was very clear what the changes were to our property. Thank you very much and have a nice evening.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. HAMILTON: Milo Brown. Moise Monasebian -- Monasebian. Would each of you please remember to give your name and address.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, my name's Milo Brown. I've lived in this community for 33 years. We have a small parcel up on
Sierra Highway, and the parcel number is 3214020046. And it is rated at C3, and the paper says that they are going to change it to A1-2. And we have an existing nursery operating on it now. If they change that from C to agricultural or whatever the A1-2 is, then that would probably put us out of business, and I don't quite think that that's right that that could happen.

I've been there 33 years. Lot of changes going on here. And would appreciate it take in consideration. As to all the other commercial property owners, some of them are not here. There is a bunch of them up by me that probably wish they were here, so they have M1 and C3 and C4 and stuff. But I don't know why they didn't make it, but it's very critical. Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MR. MONASEBIAN: Good evening. My name is Moise Monasebian. My address is 2804 Main Street in city of Santa Monica, California 90405. I recently received a notice of completion and availability of DEIR for the One Valley One Vision Plan.

I'm the owner of approximately 145 acres of vacant land in Canyon Country in Los Angeles County, located at Sierra Highway and Baker Canyon. I purchased this property based on the fact that the property was zoned for a maximum of 95 homes. There is an existing and active tentative map
number, 47574, on this property, calling for approximately 75 homes.

The new One Valley One Vision Plan is down-zoning my property to only 29 homes. This is a great financial loss to the value of my property. I would appreciate it if Planning Commission can reevaluate One Valley One Vision Plan and return my property to its original density.

After discussing the new plan with the staff at Regional Planning, my engineers, Secant Engineering, has also submitted a secondary plan to the staff and for your consideration regarding possible change of use from residential to commercial IO, which is described as Office Professional by the new General Plan.

The reason for my requests are the following:

My property abuts land that will be designated industrial in the new General Plan. There is a high school planned on 250 acres across the street from my property. This northeast area of Canyon Country is sparsely populated, and the nearest housing tract is about one-half mile away, and still my property is near major highways and freeways. My property is approximately 50 acres of flat land that will require very little grading and is not in any flood zone or environmentally sensitive area, and I'm willing to keep the remainder of my land as open space.

I have two access points to Sierra Highway, and
commercial and industrial development in this area can easily pay for the most infrastructures that are called for in the One Valley One Vision Plan for Sierra Highway, resulting in substantial savings to the Los Angeles County and the taxpayers.

And finally, the fact that there are several thousand homes approved or is in the process of being approved within one to three miles of my property tells me that we do not need more housing, but we need more commercial and industrial development such as well-planned office parks and technology centers to bring in more business and create more jobs and tax revenues for the Los Angeles County.

I hope the Planning Commission can see the same vision I have for this corner of Canyon Country in Santa Clarita Valley area and take this opportunity to create an industrial and commercial hub that will benefit this community for many years to come.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MR. MONASABIAN: Thank you.

MS. HAMILTON: Richard Robb, Lynne Plambeck, Mike Thompson.

MS. PLAMBECK: My name's Lynne Plambeck. I'm here representing Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment. And we, like the Castaic Town Council, haven't
had time to really get into the particulars of the plan, and so we would like to start by asking that you extend the comment period past the November 2nd date. We, too, intend to divide up the different areas of the plan -- with the SCAG projection, which really never came to pass.

And when you base it on this massive projection of population increase that doesn't happen, you build infrastructure that's not needed. It's very expensive to the taxpayers. And I don't know what the law is, whether you are required to base it on the SCAG population figure, but I believe the '93 projection was that we were going to reach 270,000 by 2000. We're not there yet.

So you can see that it's substantially overstated. And based on the current economy, it seems that 500,000 or plus -- I think it's 540 or something like that -- would be substantially overstatement, and there may be significant issues in supplying water for that amount of people and for providing for good air quality for people to even breathe should you put that many people in the valley.

We would like to request more hearings in other sections of the valley. We understood this was going to be the only hearing, and I hope that it isn't because it's difficult for folks on the east side to get over to Castaic at this time in the evening, just as it was probably difficult for all of you to get here.
We were concerned with the fact that you're -- the way it looks like you're doing the floodplains, although it may be an easier way -- I guess we just didn't quite understand it. It looks like there's no -- like you're giving a designation for floodplains, but you're not really going to do any protection for floodplains, and we request that you try to do that.

The earlier area-wide plan really had a good description of groundwater recharge areas in it and looked at how those areas could be protected. Protecting groundwater recharge is going to be just absolutely necessary if we're going to supply -- have a water supply for this valley.

Last, I would just like to say that in the '93 plan, there was sort of a feeding frenzy at the Board of Supervisors where a lot of developers came in at the last minute and said, "We want an increase here, and we want an increase there." And I hope that isn't going to happen again. It's not a technically legal process for an EIR, and it was a very poor process for the way the plan was handled as a whole.

And I would like to reiterate the concerns over having gone through long processes to approve Specific Plans and then having them change in a bulk manner in this process. I don't think that's a way to look at Specific
MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

Can we get -- can we get two more names.


MR. BELLAMY: Yes, sir.

MR. THOMPSEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name's Mike Thompsen, and I reside at 29546 Sand Canyon Road in Canyon Country, on the east end of the valley. And currently our property is A2-1 and you want to change it to RL5, and I would like the consideration of RL2. I have neighbors right next to me, both that already sit on two-acre parcels. We have nine acres.

I'm neighbor of Chris Ball. I think he should be given the chance to have three-acre parcel. An RL2 would do that. The tract that he was speaking of is just across the street from me. I also have Stetson Ranch that's right behind myself. I've got Fire Department 132 that's our neighbor, Canyon Collection. Our proximity to the freeway is 60 seconds. COC -- the new COC is just over the ridge from us.

And I think restricting us to an RL5 is restrictive. I would like the consideration, please, of an RL2. Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

Yes, sir.
MR. GHIAS: Good evening. My name is Sadiq Ghias.

MR. BELLAMY: Closer.

MR. GHIAS: Good evening. My name is Sadiq Ghias. I'm the owner of the Campground of America, and the name is Acton Los Angeles, located at 7601 Soledad Canyon Road in the city of Acton.

The campground has an existing CUP, and my concern is that once this CUP expires I'd like to request that the CUP be renewed when the conditions are met. The second thing that I'd like to state is that any time a raw piece of land is purchased, all you have to look or go by is the zoning on that particular piece of property, and one is paying the price based on that zoning.

If, in the -- after the purchase has been made, several years down, if someone changes the zoning, then effectively, what one did is made that land worthless, because reducing from several units to just few units, the land has lost its economic value.

So I suggest to all the distinguished members to please reconsider this One Valley One Vision because it appears to me that the people who will be sacrificing the most are the existing landowners who happen to be closer to the areas where this vision is going to take place.

I thank you much. Bye-bye.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.
MR. URICH: I'd like to thank the commissioners for coming to Castaic. Thank you very much for coming this evening. Sloan Canyon Road is in OVOV currently --

MS. HAMILTON: Your name, sir?

MR. URICH: -- being downgraded. It's proposed to be downgraded from a secondary highway to a street. And that's going to severely impact the ability to pave that section above Quail Valley Road, and these are the reasons why.

The B&T funds are proposed to go from $3000 per lot to $17,300 per lot. That will be the highest rate in the county. But if you downgrade Sloan Canyon Road, it will not be eligible for an offset of those fees. The current number of lots that are approved either have a map or a tentative map, it's in excess of 150 lots, and that would be an impact of over $3 million that would not be able to be offset to improve and pave Sloan Canyon Road.

Sloan Canyon Road, by the way, it's needed to be paved for fire safety, and also a future elementary school is proposed on this unimproved section. So for the sake of fire safety and being able to pave a road to a proposed future elementary school, we just ask that you do not downgrade Sloan Canyon from a secondary highway. Just keep it the way it is presently.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.
MS. HAMILTON: Vernon Sprankle, Judy Reinsma, and Allan Cameron.

MR. SPRANKLE: Is it on? Hi, my name is Vernon Sprankle, and I am representing the Sprankle Gabroud Jesser Hockenberry property. We have 120 acres up at the end of Sloan Canyon Road. My great grandmother and grandfather homesteaded this property over 85 years ago, and we are -- it has dwindled down to a whole bunch of people now. But with the OVOV plan they have taken -- they have taken our -- our particular property at RL5, which is five -- five acres per -- one house per five acres, and it was one house per two acres. All around us is one house per two. The north side of me is one house per one, RL1, according to the new map, and we just think this is totally unfair.

I personally am on the deed of 80 acres of this land, and this -- it's in escrow as we speak, but I don't think it's going to stay in escrow if it goes one per five. So we would like you to reconsider as far as that area.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. REINSMA: Good evening, gentlemen, and thank you for having us here in Castaic. My name's Judy Reinsma. I live at 29750 San Francisquito Canyon Road. This is where we just were granted a Community Standards District for our rural ranch community, which we are very pleased to have
gotten.

Immediately to the west of the canyon is the Tesoro del Valle development. In 1999 local residents in the Santa Clarita Valley were successful in getting the density of this huge tract reduced so that clustered and small lot dwellings would not march from Copper Hill all the way up to the national forest.

The present approved plan for the unbuilt area of Tesoro del Valle, called Area C, covers 668.7 acres. This can be seen on the One Valley One Vision map as a yellow area extending north between the San Francisquito Canyon and Castaic area Community Standard Districts. This area, which is zoned A2, has been approved for 115 dwelling units, with lot sizes ranging from a minimum of 1 acre to a maximum of 5.2 acres.

If this property is designated H2, as shown in One Valley One Vision, then the homes allowed under the two dwelling units per gross acre parameters will be 1337. This would grant the developer the opportunity to build an additional 1222 dwelling units beyond the number allowed when this development was approved. This is wrong.

I would respectfully request that the H2 overlay for Tesoro del Valle be removed, the current zoning and dwelling units allowed for this property remain as is, and that any changes be done following the standard procedures,
including professional review by Planning Division, the
Planning Commission, and public hearings.

Thank you very much.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Good evening, commissioners. My name is
Allan Cameron. My address is 19425 Soledad Canyon Road,
Santa Clarita, California 91351. And I would like to thank
all of you for taking the time and the trouble to come to
the Santa Clarita Valley and to the Castaic area. I presume
that the ease with which you obtained your shots and got
your passports allowed you to make the journey without too
much difficulty. Again, thank you for having come here this
evening to receive this very important public hearing.

And I would echo some of the earlier comments
about the fact that I hope this would be your opening salvo
in terms of an outreach effort to obtain the opinions and
sentiments of the people that your decisions will affect in
the northern Los Angeles County area.

I have a specific suggestion about the traffic
modeling portion of the General Plan. It is extremely
important that the issue of a proposed second and third
access into northern Los Angeles County be evaluated.
Imagine, if you will, the San Fernando Valley if the only
means to the area south of the San Fernando Valley were the
Cahuenga Pass. Imagine if the 210 did not exist, if all the
surface streets like Glenoaks Boulevard and San Fernando Road did not exist. Imagine if Interstate 5 did not exist and the San Diego Freeway, 405, did not exist and all of the two-lane roads that carry voluminous amounts of traffic, like Coldwater Canyon, Benedict Canyon, Laurel Canyon, Topanga Canyon, all did not exist.

If you were to characterize that nightmarish situation as I just did, you would be approximating the ultimate fate of the Santa Clarita Valley if another means of access to the south is not postulated. So I strongly urge the circulation element look into that and model it.

Now, a lot of my friends concerned about environmental issues say we cannot presume to continue to use personal direct, point to point, rapid transportation, i.e., the car. I would say that is a presumption based on the idea that the car will continue to be an internal combustion engine-powered vehicle.

I think our future planning needs to recognize that the car with the internal combustion engine as we know it today must cease to exist, and we must have electric-powered vehicles or hydrogen fuel celled vehicles, which will render the issue of air pollution and climate change, hopefully, moot, particularly if the electricity that powers those vehicles is generated with clean power, i.e., wind and solar.
So in conclusion of that portion of my testimony, please model the issue of an additional means of major access, at least one if not preferably two, in and out of the Santa Clarita Valley to the south.

Next quick issue. The existing General Plan has a marvelous infrastructure concurrency requirement known for short as the Development Monitoring System, or the DMS. In a new General Plan, you have an option to perhaps abandon that, but I strongly urge you to look at the existing value of the DMS and not abandon it unless and until you can show how another infrastructure concurrency mechanism --

MR. BELLAMY: Can you wrap --
MR. CAMERON: -- would be able to replace it and --
MR. BELLAMY: -- can you wrap up, sir, please.
MR. CAMERON: Yes, thank you. Two more quick points, and I will conclude. Please, if you would, generate an overlay map so that online, as well as in meetings like this, you can take the old zoning and General Plan designation, have an overlay of the new proposed General Plan and zoning designation on top of it, so you can see immediately what the changes that are proposed are from the old to the new.

And then my final comment is this. A stronger safety element is absolutely called for in a comprehensive new General Plan. The Castaic Dam is one of at least three
major dams that is built to a maximum of a seven-point event
on the Richter Scale, and we all know that the next large
event in Southern California will be way above seven points.

MR. BELLAMY: Okay. Thank --

MR. CAMERON: If that happens, we here would be under
several hundred feet of water.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: So I appreciate your listening to us.

Thank you.

MS. HAMILTON: Igor Nikitine, Tim Garrity, and Dianne
Wohlleblen.

MR. NIKITINE: Hello. My name is Nikitine, Igor. I'm
living on 7343 Soledad Canyon. And I will just quickly --
can I address the public for a quick? Only here. Okay.
Then I'll tell my story.

We purchased the land. It's 12 acres. We tried
to do some developments and were always unsuccessful because
it goes in the circles that we cannot do this because the
County has construction of the bridge over the floodplain.
And it's not a small bridge. It's almost like a CalTrans
project, which costs millions of dollars for the small
residents.

And it was going and going until, like, recently I
found there is another, farther up the canyon, properties.
The same river, this same fish protected by law. Everything
is the same, but it's booming. The people are grading. The people are receiving permits, and everything going on. I was wondering, like, why and what's wrong? And it's only beyond borders of your project everything is fine. No bridge, no millions to spend, everything is fine.

We were forced to sell 80 acres to national forest because we couldn't do nothing with it. And many people like here always cannot do nothing. They already put some money. They have businesses. And you guys just forcing them out, and I don't know if some people, like, really trust you that you're doing all this in the public interest. I'm sorry.

That's my total opinion. And believe me, I was lived in Russia. I was born in Communism. I saw the country go into the drain because of the government. Obama doing the same for the whole country, and you guys trying to dish all the people in the local area. I'm sorry, but this is -- that's where it goes. I understand you doing good stuff. That's all my emotions, and thank you so much.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

considering changing, with your OVOV, an area right across Sierra Highway from me, which is -- and down the street -- to a H18, which is 9 to 18 dual occupancy.

We are all individual owners. There are no apartment buildings in our neighborhood except for one that got snuck in that's only two story with eight units. And nobody knows. It's been there for a long time. So we don't know how it got snuck in.

But that area is strictly industrial along Sierra Highway, and all residences -- they're all out here, all my neighbors -- and none of us want it to be changed to have, instead of where I moved to from Silver Lake in L.A., Canyon Country, to Condo Country. You can keep it by the freeways. We don't want to be like Van Nuys. We don't want graffiti and congestion.

We don't want that kind -- we live where there are cows and horses. We're in the County of L.A. for a reason. We don't live in Santa Clarita. We live in the county. We have horses and cows. My neighbors, they walk with their horses. We don't want condo land.

Thank you very much.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. WOHLLEBEN: Oh, and thank you. Thank -- thank you also -- I have one last request. One last request about the meeting. Thank you for coming out to hear us, A. And B, I
know the supervisors meet in L.A. at 9:00 o'clock and that's your final hearing, on a workday. We're working people. We can't come to L.A. on a workday. So if you could please schedule in final opportunities to speak again out here or in Canyon Country, which is an area that you're talking about -- not just Castaic -- we would truly, truly appreciate your effort.

Thank you.


MS. STOLARIK: Hello. Thank you for the opportunity to address the proposed land use designations. My name is Sherry Stolarik. I live at 25241 West Carson Way, Stevenson Ranch. I am a member of the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association, the Santa Clarita Trails Advisory Committee, and Equestrian Trails, Incorporated.

We wish to retain A2-2, or the equivalent of rural land 2, for phases B and C of Tesoro del Valle Tract No. 51644, conditional use permit approved in May 1999. This CUP designated the remaining phases to remain as A2, minimum two acre. This approval by the Board of Supervisors upheld their unanimous vote to preserve, promote, enhance, and expand the equestrian lifestyle. It should not be changed in an effort to defeat the purpose of our long, hard fight
to preserve the area for horses and a rural lifestyle.

This proposed land use change to H2 negates the agricultural uses and denies livestock and horse-keeping.

The Cliffie Stone Trail will extend through these phases along with two other trails designated by the Santa Clarita Trails Advisory Committee as requested by Supervisor Antonovich.

We wish to request that the land remain designated as A2 or its equivalent, not impose restrictions to agricultural uses, conform to the adjacent land uses to the east, west, and north currently zoned A2. This H-2 land uses nonconforming. Changing this will be inconsistent with the Tapia Ranch project and the San Francisquito Canyon by allowing a much higher density.

We also wish to request that the extension of McBean be deleted from the Master Plan of Highways onto San Francisquito Canyon Road. This canyon is rural with designated community standards that retains many varied equestrian uses and is home to our California Rangers program, Mounted Posse Reserve participants, Trail Advocates, and Equestrian Trails.

Thank you very much.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MR. SCHULTZ: Hello. My name is Henry Schultz, and I'm a resident of Santa Clarita. I really am pleased to be able
to speak here. The idea of One Valley One Vision is a great idea, the County and the City and other agencies working together to get a good plan for the area.

What I really want to speak about is a problem that we've had for years, even before we had the City, and that has to do with density. All these projects, developments, changes of zoning, all increase density, and density is the real problem out here in the valley. It causes all the traffic problems that we have, which are only getting worse. Someone mentioned the traffic model. You can see that things are going to go really bad here shortly. Even with the HOV lane, we're going to be in real trouble.

So what we need to do is reduce the density of projects, if at all possible, and reduce the density or keep the density the same in a lot of areas that we have. A prime example of this is Newhall Ranch project. The Newhall Ranch project has -- it takes hillside densities and puts them into high residential, builds into the river, into the floodplain. We've been doing that here even in the City of Santa Clarita. So we're not -- we're not innocent.

But the big problem, though, is to -- whatever you do with the One Valley One Vision, that you keep the densities from being increased. And the real problem here is tax base. The County needs money. The County is running out of gas. As more places get incorporated, there's less
and less space for the County to have direct income. So I
hope that you don't take money as the source of your
motivation for increasing density.

   Thank you.

   MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

   MR. LOMBARDI: Hello. My name is Robert Lombardi. My
address, 29527 Bouquet Canyon Road. I'm here with my
sister. We own a piece of property, 140 acres, on Bouquet
Canyon Road, on both sides, at Vasquez Canyon Road.

   At present the zoning is A1-2000, which is half
acre lots. The County wants to change it to A1-2, which is
one house per two acres. We have some tracts approved
around us, and we're in the middle of them. And all we're
asking for is to have the density that they have. I believe
it's one acre per -- one house per acre.

   I think we need to -- we're an island -- we'd be
an island in the middle of the area, and it just won't work
right for us. My sister wants to say something also.

   MS. HARING: I live at 29677 Bouquet Canyon Road, on
the corner of Vasquez and Bouquet Canyon. My concern is the
roads and the development that's planned in Bouquet Canyon.
Bouquet Canyon Road is being planned as a secondary highway,
which I understand is a four-lane road, extending from Plum
Canyon Road to the national forest boundary.

   Vasquez Canyon, however, is being downgraded to a
limited secondary highway, which is -- remains a two-lane highway. Right now, Vasquez Canyon Road is over-utilized and doesn't provide -- is in terrible condition. There's bumps and cracks and potholes, and even though they're patched frequently, it's just in very bad condition.

We have an additional problem besides the residents that live in Bouquet Canyon, which is now still rural north of Vasquez. And we have lots of residents from Palmdale and the Antelope Valley that use Bouquet Canyon Road to commute to the Santa Clarita Valley and also the San Fernando Valley. They also use Vasquez Canyon.

There are plans in the Antelope Valley, in Leona Valley, and in Palmdale for increased development there. All of that traffic will flow from the Antelope Valley through the Santa Clarita Valley because most people up there are traveling down for jobs here and in the Los Angeles area.

What we would like is to see that Vasquez Canyon Road remains a secondary highway and is eventually planned to be expanded to four lanes. With the additional development that is surrounding our property, if that -- if and when that is ever developed, that will put hundreds of more automobiles on those highways, and it -- we are already in danger now. Whenever there's a fire or a flood -- we've experienced all of it -- earthquake. We've been trapped in
that canyon many times.

So we do need to see that with any plan, whether it's rural or high density, you need to have adequate roads for all people to get in and out of these canyons. It is a unique area with all these canyons, and you can see what has happened with all the fires recently, with people that live in canyons. So I hope you'll take that into consideration, and thank you for coming here and listening to us.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. HAMILTON: William Dudra, Sherry Paradise, and Dean Paradise.

MR. DUDRA: Hi, my name is William Dudra. I live at 44508 Loneoak Avenue, Lancaster, California 93534. I've got two parcels at Bouquet and Vasquez area there that we've been going eight years now to get a grading permit. Finally get it graded and set up, and now you guys talk about changing the zoning.

We had to deal with Hillside Management to go out -- out of the blue, they -- after the grading goes through, then say, oh, now you're in Hillside Management. Now you've got to meet this criteria. Now they want to change it to where you can only put one house on it and -- after it's already been graded out.

I don't see how the County can go and try to change the zoning after you've already started in your
project the way it is now, that you could split it down if you put the roads in. We put the roads in, and because we haven't filed the lot split -- because that's going to take forever to go from five acres to two and a halfs, which are all through the county two and a half acres are a standard. Now they change it. Oh, we don't want to do less than five acres.

I don't see how it benefits us to sit there and let you guys change it. It's just like the open spaces with Santa Clarita and the County. They've got all this land, and they've got their pieces, but they're not putting them up for open spaces, considering the way they built up the city or the way the County's been building up in the heavily, densely populated areas.

And I think it's pretty much an arbitrary thing that you guys are going across because some of these ones you want to go and -- go from two acres on a house to putting 30 houses on two acres, and then the other ones you want to say, okay, you've got five acres, you can only put one, or you've got 20 acres, you can only put one.

And -- but the developers, whatever they want to put, because it's closer in, we'll let you develop everything. They've got roads through Santa Clarita where they've built developments on ridiculously sloped roads.

Going up Shangri-La, it's got to be an 18 percent road they
put in up a hillside that they just built all over.

White's Canyon's got the same thing. All over
Canyon Country's got it where they went straight up on hills
with roads, but now that it's out on the rural area that we
are, that we wanted to be, that's why we bought there, they
want -- you guys want to zone us down, saying okay, you can
only go one house in the area.

I don't -- I don't see how, when you've fought for
all this time to get to this point, now we're going to
change your zoning, we want to make it this. I see no
benefit to it because when you guys start adding, there's
only a certain amount in Hillside Management we can do
anyways. We can't go down, even though the zoning says
20,000 square feet for a half acre on a five-acre parcel,
they won't let you do it in Hillside Management anyways. So
to zone it down lower, I don't see it being beneficial to
us.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. PARADISE: Hi, my name is Sherry Paradise. I live
at 29565 Baringer Road in Castaic. I moved here about ten
years ago and decided this would be a great place to enjoy a
rural environment but also incorporate some of the city
life.

Recently, in July, we received some information
that said, oh, the General Plan Land Committee is going to change the zoning on our property. Now we would be designated as an RL5. Now, when we purchased this lane -- we're not wealthy people. We work very hard. As I keep hearing over and over in this room, people have worked hard. This might be just my little piece of the American Dream that I said I want this land, and I now have the ability to split this property and have a second parcel.

So we wrote a letter, and we talked to many of our neighbors. This wasn't just indulging ourselves. We talked to many of our neighbors, and we asked, "What do you think? What would you like?" And they signed it. They signed a petition. We sent it in. About two weeks later, we received a really nice little letter back saying, "Absolutely not. We didn't hear your request."

I ask you, are you listening to us? Are you hearing this room? Because we asked you: Could you reconsider changing our zoning to RL2? Now, we received a response back that stated no, there was a slope issue; no, there was fire -- fire zone issues.

I want to challenge you here to go back and look because on that -- these parcels that you've said no to, do you know many of these are already graded with a second pad? The fire issue or the slope issue is already taken care of, because we've hired civil engineers to look at this land.
It is not done in a vacuum.

So we received a letter basically saying no on August 12th. I would like you to go back and reconsider your decision on behalf of ourselves and all of the others that have signed this petition. And those of you that didn't have the opportunity to meet with us, we welcome you to sign the petition also.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MR. PARADISE: Thank you. My name is Dean Paradise. I live at 29565 Baringer Road. I'm a civil engineer, and I've been a civil engineer for over 25 years, working in the county. Ten years ago my wife and I bought some land at the end of Romero Canyon, and we built a house and we built a separate pad that we use as a horse arena.

We intend to subdivide in the future and build two parcels of over two acres each. That's over 86,000 square feet per lot. This area has been designated as RL5 by the County planners. We believe this is a mistake, and we've been told that it's not feasible for the RL2 land use.

Although we currently have a 10,000 square foot certified pad on our property, properties to the north, the south, the east, and the west of us are designated as RL2. Only us, in the middle, have as an island of an RL5. So I'd ask you that you please have this revised and join me and
the town council in changing that to the RL2, which is in
conformance with the community standards that the town
council approved three years ago.

I also want to speak to you quickly about the
secondary access into Castaic. Ask any resident here what
it's like to get home into Castaic when the 5 Freeway is
shut down due to a fire or snow or a traffic accident. Good
planning mandates a secondary access into Castaic. And I
believe the logical location for that is through the Tesoro
development.

Thank you very much.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. HAMILTON: Glenda Bona, Gary Shaw, Phillip Scorza.

MS. BONA: Hi, I'm Glenda Bona, 23681 White Oak Court
in Newhall. And I'm here tonight representing the Calgrove
Corridor Coalition.

Let me tell you a little bit about our group to
start out with. We formed originally in opposition to a
ridiculously dense project proposal that was going to be
built on a 100-year floodplain that was just east of the I-5
at Calgrove.

While our group actually represents several
hundred households, CCC itself has a diverse core group, and
we are committed as a core group and as a big group to
solving problems through cooperation, not confrontation.
We're not antigrowth, but we are interested in intelligent planning.

Our group has had tremendous success working with the City of Santa Clarita. We're really happy to report that the proposal to develop the Smiser property was sent back to the developers as unacceptable. We've also worked with the City on zoning changes in regards to One Valley One Vision. The City incorporated lots of our suggestions, and actually some of our words, into the proposed document. We would like to have that same kind of relationship with the County.

There's a number of proposed developments right now that are on the County side of the Interstate 5 Freeway, and some of them are quite large. These developments will have a huge impact on our neighborhood and on our quality of life.

Let me share with you briefly some of our key concerns. We're concerned about traffic circulation. What will increased density do to the circulation, both on the I-5 Freeway and also in the surrounding neighborhoods? What kind of height requirements are you looking at for these projects?

We're concerned that there is adequate parkland. Right now that's not the case. Will you be interfacing with CalTrans during the time that they are doing the I-5
Corridor expansion? Are you considering the ramifications of that freeway expansion to the surrounding neighborhoods as you consider future projects?

With the addition of four new lanes on the I-5 and an increase in traffic due to the new developments, we're also especially worried about air pollution. We're also concerned about adequate water supplies and concerned about build-out in general.

CCC represents neighborhoods near the Calgrove area who care about the quality of life in the Santa Clarita Valley, and we have an offer to extend to you. We would like to work with you in the same reasonable and professional manner that we work with the City of Santa Clarita so that we can find developments that are going to enhance our community.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MR. SHAW: Hi, my name is Gary Shaw, and I live on Fitch Avenue in Forest Park area. And I have to tell you, between my hearing loss and the echo that's developed in this room, it's almost impossible to really hear clearly what is going on. But I hope I can be heard.

I have to admit that I'm in a fog when it comes to what specifically is going to be happening in our particular area on Fitch Avenue in Forest Park. I've heard that
eventually our street is going to be made into some kind of
a four-lane highway. I don't know if that's true or not.
And that would cut right into our already small front yard
property that we have, and we'd like it to remain the rural,
country-type living that -- the very purpose for which we
came to live there and wouldn't like that to be changed.

And concerning the possibility of our house being
taken away or perhaps bought by pennies on the dollar by
eminent domain, I ask you to put yourselves in our place for
a moment. We live in our dream house. We never otherwise
could afford a house except for the fact that my mom died
some years ago, and it presented the opportunity for us to
have enough money to buy a small house -- just about a
1000-square foot house -- there in Forest Park.

If we had to move from our house by it being taken
away or it being bought very inexpensively and so that we
wouldn't have enough money, we couldn't get another place.
We wouldn't have another house to live. It would make it
very difficult for us. I believe many of our neighbors are
in the same position I'm in. Knowing many of them, we have
some elderly neighbors, we have some neighbors who are just
barely making it. And if our houses were bought pennies on
the dollar, we'd be out.

What you call progress, I'd like to ask, at whose
expense? And if ruining lives is part of what you call
progress, I believe that no one with a good conscience should be for it. We'd like to keep our house the way it is. Thank you very much.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MS. HAMILTON: Neil Nadler, Joel Brandon, and Patricia Howell.

MR. NADLER: Good evening. My name is Neil Nadler, and my address is 1250 La Venta Drive, Westlake Village, California 91361. I own approximately 180 acres that lies between the freeway where it splits up the Grapevine, up -- up Highway 5. And I do want to acknowledge the County Staff and the Castaic Town Council and Supervisor Antonovich's office. I'm not here to complain about the future zoning of my property. Frankly, I believe we're all in concert, which is changing the property that is currently zoned A2-2 and A2-10 to light industrial.

One -- one thing that I believe is that the County jobs-housing balance and the specific Santa Clarita area, it does need a greater balance between the two. And my property, along with other properties, will help further that along. So I am in support of it.

The one question that I do have, and that might be a question that could be asked of Mitch -- and I don't think it necessarily needs to be tonight -- is that one of them is zoned M1, light industrial, but on the other one,
approximately 120 acres of the property is -- got a designation of Transportation Corridor and that's the only property. Mitch, can you clarify that or do you want to talk about it later? Okay.

So anyway, I'm in support of it. It's been ongoing for the last 15 years that I've owned the property, and it'll -- I think it'll really help out the area as well and eventually provide local jobs for local people who live here.

And one other thing, I would like to make a statement, is that there are Community Standard Districts out here in Castaic. And a lot of people who live in Hasley Canyon and other canyons are being tremendously affected by the, if you will, down-zoning of their properties from -- from A2 to RL5. And I do object to that. I think that -- that it's kind of spot zoning, if you will. And I think that you guys need to take a more serious look at that one issue.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. HOWELL: Hello. My name is Patricia Howell. I live at 30701 Sloan Canyon Road in Castaic, California. I've lived there 25 years. We own three parcels. We own one up in Hasley, ten acres, and we own two parcels in Sloan, an eight acre and a five acre. And the zoning change
would affect our retirement.

We really want to split the property and sell it and retire. So I would be opposed to the RL5 designation. I would ideally like the A2-2 zoning to stay in affect. But if you do decide to change the zonings up there, I would accept the RL2. That would be acceptable if we could still have heavy agriculture.

And also, I'd like to ask, if you do have plans to downgrade Sloan Canyon north of Hillcrest, I would be in support of that. It is a private road. We privately maintain it. We dedicated it to the County in 1984. They never accepted the dedication or took possession of it, so we've maintained it for the past 25 years. Right now people drive up and down it, 60 miles an hour. We have to repave it. We have to regrade it. And ideally we'd like to gate it and keep it completely private.

And that's it for me. Thank you for your time.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MR. BRANDON: My name is Joel Brandon. I live at 26520 Tapia Canyon Road, in behind the sheriff's honor farm. And I have ten acres of ground, and I don't have any problem at all as far as any zoning is concerned.

I would wish to say one thing, that the -- it's my observation here this evening that there cannot be a regulation of any kind made because of the extreme adversity
of the people who live in the area. It would be almost impossible to make one that was reasonable that would work.

The other thing that I would say is that the federal government has followed regulations, and they're trillions of dollars in debt. The State of California has followed many regulations, are $26 billion in debt. The County of Los Angeles and the City of Los Angeles, in a similar condition.

Therefore, it has become obvious to me that regulations of any kind has virtually destroyed our country. Therefore, I would advocate and heavily stress to make no new regulations of any kind and make the -- a committee, that has a real cognitive ability to reason as a committee, to settle each individual case as it comes about rather than making a blanket deal of the entire area.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. HAMILTON: Kevin Coon, Janette Gabellieri, Karl Mallick.

MS. GABELLIERI: Hello. I am a property owner on Sloan Canyon Road in Castaic, 30730 Sloan Canyon Road. My name is Janette Gabellieri. I live at 28755 Greenwood Place.

The Castaic community spent several years working with the County to create a CSD for our community. I am in favor of downgrading Sloan Canyon Road to a smaller street
to keep it more rural. And all of Hasley Canyon, including Sloan Canyon and Romero Canyon, are designated as rural residential with A2-2 zoning and Hillside Management. The existing CSD and the existing permitted uses for A2 land do not include the commercial uses that are listed in the new RL2 designation.

The One Valley One Vision document states, on Page 3.1 through 17, that the new RL2 designation is supportive of commercial uses such as grocery stores, restaurants, personal services, and retail sales. I am opposed to this land use designation change. RL2 should not allow new commercial retail uses to be added to the current list of uses. I am happy with the existing Hillside Management and N2 designation. Please do not support this change to RL2.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MR. MALLICK: Good evening. My name is Karl Mallick. I'm with CCL Engineering. Tonight I represent the Santa Clarita Facilities Foundation.

The foundation works with the William S. Hart School District and does a lot of their strategic planning for school sites. We have two sites, one on Vasquez Canyon Road, assessed as Parcel No. 3231-001-018, 019, and 029, that's approximately 80 acres. The other site is on Sierra Highway, just east of Vasquez Canyon Road. Those APN
numbers are 2813-18-02, 3, 4, and 9 and 2853-02, 01, and 07. That's about 275 acres.

And as I mentioned, the Facilities Foundation does strategic planning for the William S. Hart School District. These two sites, we've been working on for about three years. They have school components to them and residential components to them. We're -- we just want to express our concern that we don't -- or the land use does not change that will lower the density that we've been working with the last few years in our planning.

I don't believe it currently does with the proposed change. There is existing commercial designation on Sierra Highway, on the north side of Sierra Highway, which is on the south side of our property. The new plan, the OVOV, does not show commercial in that area. We would like to request that that commercial remain on the plan because we have planned for that in our strategic planning.

And we will submit these. That's it. Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MS. HAMILTON: Josephine Welch, Young Song, Virginia Wolf.


All right. I'm here for two properties in Soledad Canyon. One of them does not belong to Acton Town Council, so they don't have --
MR. BELLAMY: Give your name.

MS. BUSEY: -- town council representation.

MR. BELLAMY: Miss -- Miss, give your name.

MS. BUSEY: Okay. My name is Cherylann Busey. I am representing White Rock Lake RV Park, and I am representing Young Song, who recently was denied a CUP for an RV park due to inactivity, although there were some serious problems with the park if the commission really remembers the case.

Anyway, we are concerned about the zone change to A2-2. Both properties hold dual zoning, R1 and A2. Under the R1 we were told by Bruce Durbin that there were many things that these property owners could do without -- without a CUP, up to and including camping. We were told once Mr. Song gave up his CUP he could continue to have camping as long as one RV didn't cross his bridge. And now he went back to Bruce Durbin and found out he has to close his gates to business, even camping, as of December.

So we're concerned that the A2-2 zone change, to A2-2 alone, will devalue the property, will bring them under regulatory code violations, and I'm not sure, but because most of Agua Dulce residents receive the County Journal -- did I speak -- say that right? Anyway, there is a property up there that is now receiving violations under zoning enforcement regulatory code with $1000 a day fine, back to the first violation if they don't come under the regulatory
code to meet that within 30 days.

   It makes these people feel like criminals, and

they are private property owners. So when the regulatory

codes get enforced and they come to these people's property

with guns, which was done to Young Song, his wife had a

nervous breakdown. She has not been able to come out of

that house since that event.

   So these people are private property owners. They

have large properties, Young Song 50 acres, Joanne 12 acres.

Yes, it's agricultural. Joanne came in 50 years ago. There

were no trees. They planted the trees. I believe the

Regional Planning Department sees all the greenery there and
doesn't realize that the property owners, when they came in

50 years ago and there was nothing there, built these parks

under zoning exceptions originally. And I spoke with -- I

know her name --

   MS. HAMILTON: Miss Hamilton.

   MS. BUSEY: -- Miss Hamilton, at length concerning the

history of the parks. Anyway, again, I'm speaking shortly

for both owners. We feel the A2-2 zoning will bring us

under regulatory code enforcements. Can anyone tell me --

and I appreciate Mitch Glaser taking quite a lot of time on

the phone with me to really explain this plan to me. I

realize you have a lot of work to do, and I've heard all the

comments.
MR. BELLAMY: Can you wrap it up, please.

MS. BUSEY: Yes. The wrap-up is: Can someone explain to me that after the CUPs that are existing come up for renewal, will the A2-2 zoning negatively affect their ability to get a new CUP on the property? I'm concerned that Josephine Welch owns 12 acres and under the RL20 zoning, one residence per 20 acres. What's going to happen to property owners with less than 20 acres that have houses?

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. BUSEY: Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. WOLF: Hello. My name is Virginia Wolf. I am property owner of ten acres at 30730 Sloan Canyon Road in Castaic. I am against the changes that are proposed for my neighborhood. The existing land use, the Castaic CSD have designated my neighborhood and all of the Hasley Canyon as rural without commercial uses such as listed in the new RL2 designation.

I am opposed to having RL2 being supportive of commercial uses. Commercial uses, grocery stores, restaurants, personal services, and retail stores do not belong in a rural residential neighborhood. Please do not support this. I bought these -- this property to live in a rural neighborhood, away from traffic and strip malls.

I am also in favor of downgrading Sloan Canyon
Road to a smaller street. Thank you for hearing me.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

MS. HAMILTON: Steven Patterson, Diana Larios, Joe Cota. Joanne Swanson, Susan Rauch, James Rogers, and there's one last person, Commissioner. Frederico Enriquez.

MS. LARIOS: Hi. Thank you for hearing us today. My name is Diana Larios. I live at 30758 Sloan Canyon Road in Castaic, and I've been a resident for over 15 years. I've been active on the original Master Plan committee and also in helping to form the Castaic area Community Standards District and have worked with the County a lot with all of that.

Castaic -- the Castaic community and the CSD has very strongly stated that they wanted to keep Hasley Canyon, Romero Canyon, and Sloan Canyon rural and equestrian. And I believe that the RL2 land designation which is being assigned to some of the properties out there is not consistent with our CSD.

I have a list of all the existing heavy agricultural zone uses, and there are a lot of uses that are already listed. But what I'm concerned with is that this RL2 is actually adding the commercial, grocery, restaurants, retail. That is not rural.

Your agenda item states that the reason for this zoning change and the land use change is for density
control. Well, adding commercial uses in a rural
neighborhood has nothing to do with density control. You
are changing the character of our community, and our CSD is
opposed to that, and our community is opposed to that.

So please realize that it's not all about density,
that in this case it's about changing the character of our
community, and I'm very, very seriously opposed to that.
I would also like to say that I am in favor of
downgrading Sloan Canyon Road to be a smaller street, again,
in favor of our CSD that says that we would like to keep
that neighborhood more rural and equestrian-like. We would
not like it to have larger, paved roads.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MS. RAUCH: My name's Susan Rauch, and my address is
30470 Sloan Canyon Road, and I've lived there for 12 years.
And I have the same concerns that Diana has about the retail
uses. I don't understand how that's cropping up in this new
redesignation and how it's contrary to what our CSD says.
It almost seems like it's thrown in there willy-nilly. I
mean, it just seems out of place.

I mean, are you seriously saying that grocery
stores can go in our rural neighborhoods? I mean, that's
what it looks -- I mean, that's what it says. So I really
do hope you'll take the time to look at that and toss it out
or have it coincide more specifically with our CSD.

And on the matter of Sloan Canyon Road,

there's -- Sloan Canyon Road is a dirt road now, and the
idea of it being anything other in the future, as a small
country road, is out of character too and it seems to me
wouldn't benefit anyone except maybe perhaps some developers
who might get a foothold into the area. And that's it.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.

Yes, sir.

MR. COON: Hi, my name is Kevin Coon. I've lived in
Santa Clarita since 1972. I own two pieces of property.
One is a 15-acre parcel at 18120 Texas Canyon Road, and
another piece, a quarter acre, in Old Forest Park at 16969
Forest.

I purchased both pieces of property with the --
with the zoning and use, specifically picked out those
pieces of property for that. With your proposed changes, it
negates everything that I purchased my properties for. The
Texas Canyon property, I've only owned for five or six
years. But the reason I bought that was for the zoning and
for the use. I strongly oppose any changes to the existing
zoning.

Thank you.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you very much.
MS. HAMILTON: I believe that completes the speakers, commissioners.

MR. BELLAMY: Okay. Continuation of reports.

MS. LEMKE: Nothing from County Counsel.

MR. BELLAMY: Commission?

MR. MODUGNO: Mr. Chairman, let me ask Mr. Glaser a couple questions.

The recommendation you have this evening as to continue this to give you an opportunity of coming back with findings and Final EIR, at least one speaker had indicated that the close-off date for comments is November the 2nd. Is that accurate or not?

MR. GLASER: Yes. Yes, that's correct. It is a 60-day comment period. It commenced on September 4, 2009. It closes on November 2, 2009.

MR. MODUGNO: The extent to which we keep this -- keep hearings open, while that official date closes off, there's still opportunity for people to submit materials. There's opportunity for people to come and speak at any continued public hearings. As this is going on through processing, there's opportunities for people to continue to speak and comment up until the point in time through the Board of Supervisors hearing; is that correct?

MR. GLASER: Yes. Let me clarify what the 60-day review period is. It is specific to the Draft Environmental
Impact Report. The 60 days is for comments specific to the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Otherwise, comments on the plan in general and the land use changes, on the zoning changes, you are correct. The comments on that are open until the day that the Board of Supervisors adopts it.

MR. MODUGNO: So the recommendation this evening is to continue this hearing. We would anticipate that there would be more hearings than one?

MR. GLASER: Yes. What the recommendation is, that the close of the EIR comment period, again, would be in November. We would have Impact Sciences, who has prepared the EIR, respond to all comments and prepare a final EIR. What staff is envisioning is that we would return to you with that final EIR with all of the responses to comments in addition with any and all changes to the draft plan that you would like us to make pursuant to the testimony today.

And at that point, we would come to you with a resolution to approve the plan and recommend that it be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors then would have at least one hearing before adopting or not adopting the document.

MR. MODUGNO: All right. The concern that I --

MS. LEMKE: Commissioner, can I --

MR. MODUGNO: -- I'm sorry.

MS. LEMKE: -- can I add a clarification on -- on the
environmental report is you're correct. While there's an
official comment period, you know, we can't dictate what
people testify to at hearings, and if they want to continue
to comment on the environmental impacts, that's open through
the public hearing process.

MR. MODUGNO: Okay. So the mere fact --

MS. LEMKE: It's just that we don't have to provide
official comments in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

MR. MODUGNO: Okay. So the mere fact of setting off
that comment period as a date that is set for the consultant
then to wrap up some of their work, but it still opens up
discussion, the ability of anyone to add any comments until,
as they sort of say, the fat lady sings.

MS. LEMKE: That's correct.

MR. MODUGNO: Okay. One of the concerns that I have,
and I think echoing most of the comments that we had this
evening, while very few were looking at the overall sort of
macro issue of One Valley One Vision, which has been the
intent, that the County has been working on for at least
three years, the City has been working on in parallel with
that, I think the reaction that has occurred is people are
saying: How is this impacting me personally? How is this
affecting my piece of property?

Many of those piece of properties have had in the
past open cases which have been submitted, may have even
gone through some approval process, and action was never
taken, and so those have become closed cases. In some
cases, there is current zoning on those properties which has
changed over the years and there's now some proposals, but
that still doesn't impact what application someone may come
in and take.

I think I'd like to have greater clarity, both
from us as a commission and for the property owners, in
terms of what that processing will be for them individually
as they want to come forward.

For example, we have long said that -- that the
achievable point is we're going to look sort of around a
midpoint range for development. There -- that means if
somebody's got zoning that could have 1 to 20 houses on a
parcel of land, the desired impact may be somewhere around
10. Without doing overlays of hillside, dealing with oak
trees, circulation, set all of those which will impact where
that ultimate recommendation and number's going to be.

We have worked -- and I know the City of Santa
Clarita has worked as well -- that the more rural an area
is, the less circulation that may be applicable, the less
access to infrastructure. The further away from community
services, the further away from parks, the further away from
library, et cetera, would tend to get far more towards a
rural end, which would indicate the lower density on that.
As one gets closer to infrastructure, or if a large developer is prepared to move forward and help build this community out of the infrastructure deficit by bringing adequate roads, by perhaps funding libraries nearby, funding beyond just some land dedication for schools, but really going above and beyond the requirements, that may warrant and allow them to get to a higher density.

So the mere fact of putting and saying, gee, your density was two house per acre that we're changing to five houses, or five houses changing to two, never guaranteed that anyone could walk in and be given that. It was merely a starting point and a sort of a planning purpose point.

But again, we're looking at all those aspects.

In my mind, if somebody had a higher density before and bought property on that, held that for years on that basis, and then stepped forward and we have said now we're sort of moving that number down, well, I, as being somewhat, hopefully, reasonable would look at that aspect of it and might be leaning more towards going back to what they might have had versus what we're trying to achieve.

Again, in terms of -- in terms of looking at that aspect of it -- but I'd have to also be concerned what's around it, what infrastructure is nearby. Clearly, we will never get to that higher point of numbers if the State does not address the water problems, which is -- which is really
a legislative issue at the moment. We're out there trying
to protect a small endangered fish, and so a federal judge
says you can't get the water. And the State Legislature,
rather than dealing with what is a massively important issue
of the State, decides to sort of pass it off and adjourn.

We have, for years, attempted to get CalTrans in
front of us to speak and say we have a serious problem of
transportation in and out of this valley, we have a serious
problem of transportation through this valley. What goes
along the I-5 Corridor, and while there's construction work
now, much of that construction work is looking to -- to get
us out of the problems we have and -- or anticipating the
added units that are so far approved for -- for Newhall
Ranch.

And so my concern, echoing, I think, back what
we've heard this evening, is individuals want some assurance
that we're neither taking from them or, those that want
lower densities, that we're not suddenly creating some
madhouse building opportunity in their neighborhood. So
that we're neither adding wealth nor subtracting wealth, nor
taking or adding to rights. And I think that's how, as we
go through this, individual cases, individual applications
that come through, what type of treatment should individuals
expect to hear?

We've had some people testify this evening, and I
think our fellow -- my fellow commissioners will reflect
upon, very recent cases where we have taken action. And we
have taken action, and we're hearing again somebody coming
back and saying, gee, I still didn't like what your decision
was. Their opportunity was to move forward to the Board of
Supervisors on appeal. Their opportunity beyond that is, I
suppose, to file a lawsuit. We have not -- we've done
reasonable planning, looking at what we think is in the best
interests of the county at large and taking into -- to sort
of all of our guidelines and pieces.

So again, I think as we come back, I'd like to
have some understanding of the type of treatment that will
be done in terms of what are the expectations of individuals
that sort of lays out the ground rules. It was a good
suggestion somebody had in terms of having overlay, what was
the old zoning, what's the new zoning on top. And then how
we move forward from that.

So I really appreciate the testimony we've had
this evening. I think it's been constructive. Two of our
commissioners were not here this evening. For them to be
able to take action at our next meeting, they're going to
have to get themselves up to speed, which means review
everything that has been said.

I think that acoustics in this room were horrible.
While -- while the speakers got sent out towards your
direction in terms of the public, what echoed back to the
three of us, I would say -- we're all getting a little bit
older, but we're not deaf. I think I picked up probably no
more than 25 percent of what was said.

We nodded. We looked as if we heard it. I don't
know what the other two commissioners heard. Many of you,
in terms of once you got to the microphone, went very
quickly. The tone of your voice may have destroyed the
words that were being said. I did not hear everything. I
think I got the gist of the discussion.

Much of the -- many of the comments were
repetitive. It was a lot of the stuff from Sloan Canyon. I
think we got the essence from that community. But this was
not a good room, although it is a County-owned facility, so
it didn't cost the County anything to have it. Perhaps if
we have another meeting in the community, there might be a
better room.

We clearly can hear better at our hearing room in
Los Angeles, although that does have a requirement that
everyone who's out there has got to come down to downtown.
Everyone who's up here, other than myself -- who lives in
Santa Clarita -- has got to come here.

I've got five minutes to get home so that's
convenient for me. It's not for the commissioner to my
left, who lives almost on the Orange County line. So he
comes a great distance. The commissioner to my right comes
more from Downtown Los Angeles. All the staff has made a
terrific effort of coming out and really trying to get the
input from this community. So when we normally have our
hearings in Los Angeles on Wednesday mornings, we do thank
everyone from -- who makes a long drive to come and see us.

And I'm not sure even the tapes from this evening
are going to be clear in picking up what everyone said. So
if you did not have a written comment, if you have something
very strong that you want to make sure that we have and you
only verbally spoke this evening, I would encourage you to
go home, either type up what you had and mail it in to
Mr. Glaser, send him an e-mail.

If it gets sent to Mike Antonovich, it gets sent
to us. If it gets sent to Paul Novak, it gets to us. If it
gets sent to Rosalind Wayman, it gets sent to us. So if
it's a field deputy for the supervisor, if it's a member of
staff, I think it's easier if it comes in to Mr. Glaser
because he's coordinating all that. But if it comes in,
that will then be part of the permanent record. None of
it's going to get lost.

But again, I apologize that we couldn't pick up
everything. It's -- I think it's more a matter of the room.
There's too many hard surfaces here. We couldn't suddenly
run and put carpet and put -- maybe if we wear a bunch of
blankets the next time to sort of bounce the sound. But --
and I don't know how much of my mumbling you've picked up
either.

I don't know if there's any other comments,
commissioners.

MR. BELLAMY: Do we have a motion?

MR. REW: Mr. Chairman, due to the lateness of the hour
and the journey that I have to make, I'm here on a visa so I
have to get home. But I agree with Commissioner Modugno.

I've always preached to people about you go to
Las Vegas and you put some money out there for the blackjack
dealer, and you look at it as, hey, you know, sure, it's a
gamble, but it's an investment. Or you go to Santa Anita,
and you pick out a horse and you say, yeah, it's a gamble,
but it's an investment because I can get some return on my
money. Or you purchase a stock and you say I hope that
stock goes up because this is really an investment, but if
it goes down, you know, it was a gamble.

But no one feels the same way about real estate.
You know, they -- they always expect that real estate,
they're going to make a bundle. And sometimes things
change, and they have to look at it as also a gamble.

So I look forward to our next hearings. I'm going
to ask for a copy of the transcript because you don't speak
too fast, I just listen too slowly. So I'm going to ask for
a copy of the transcript and maybe even a copy of the tapes if they're clearer due to the recording. But thank you for all coming.

MR. BELLAMY: Thank you.

MR. MODUGNO: Mr. Glaser, when would you recommend -- or Miss Hamilton, is there a date certain for continuance of this case?

MR. GLASER: Commissioners, what we would anticipate in terms of if the comment period were to cease in November as is scheduled for the Draft EIR, we were anticipating that the Final EIR would be available after the first of the year. So again, though, depending on the amount of comments that are received, especially in the next month, we weren't really certain, which is why we were requesting to take it off calendar. However, if the Commission would like to set a date, we would probably suggest the planning day in January at the earliest.

MR. MODUGNO: All right. So your stronger suggestion is we just take it off -- we don't set a date at this point and allow comment period to remain.

MR. GLASER: Yes. And we can ensure that everyone who has signed up on our contact list and everyone who has spoken here tonight can receive notification of the next hearing date once it's scheduled.

MR. MODUGNO: Your recommended motion also has to
return with a resolution to the Board of Supervisors. I
don't think that that's wise at this point. I'd like to
really have another hearing first, or is that the point that
we have to have that?

MR. BELLAMY: She's not on.

MR. MODUGNO: All right.

MR. BELLAMY: Your mic wasn't on.

MS. LEMKE: Oh, I'm sorry. The advantage of continuing
the hearing to a date certain is that we do that here
tonight and announce the date, then we don't have to
renotice that hearing. This will be sufficient of it. I
mean, obviously, if the Planning Department decides it wants
to, you know, give advertising notice, it can do that. But
if we can set it to a date certain, you don't have to
renotice the hearing. If you take it off calendar, when we
have it come back, we'll have to renotice the hearing.

MR. MODUGNO: All right. The recommended motion we had
in our packet did not have a date. So it's -- is that then
we could determine a date this evening, not have to
renotice, and then return, but we could -- I just feel a
little uncomfortable that we only -- we'd lay out with one
meeting versus having a meeting and then another meeting.

So the recommended motion has returning with a
resolution to the Board of Supervisors. Do we feel we would
have sufficient information at that point, or is that just
that then becomes part and parcel with the whole packet that rolls along with the continued hearings?

MS. LEMKE: I can't answer that question, Commissioner.

I think that's up to you to determine whether or not you think the responses that you may get based on the comments tonight --

MR. MODUGNO: Okay.

MS. LEMKE: -- or whether or not you'd have enough information to make a recommendation at the next hearing.

MR. MODUGNO: Okay. Because I go back to the first -- the first speakers -- or actually, sorry, the City of Santa Clarita was the first speaker -- but the two representatives from the Castaic Town Council. We did not hear from other town councils who are affected from this -- or by this. We didn't hear from West Valley. We didn't hear from the people at the other side, over in Agua Dulce sort of area.

I think it's important that we have an entire community involved in this process, not just selected ones. So I would suggest we have at least, in my mind, at minimum two more hearings, in which I'd like the next one sort of address the discussion this evening. We'll take a look at that Final EIR.

MR. GLASER: Commissioner, if Staff could make a suggestion, there was at least one individual who had requested an extension of the 60-day comment period. One
possibility that staff would like you to consider would be
to extend that comment period for an additional 30 days. So
that would be a 90-day comment period. And to hold your
second hearing with -- before that 90-day period closes so
that there's still an opportunity to testify on the Final
EIR and -- it would be a Draft EIR, excuse me -- and it
would be a little bit earlier than what we were discussing.

We could contact the other town councils, and I
think what I'm hearing is that in terms of the requests that
were made today, I think the commissioners would like a
report from staff on each request that was made, trying to
describe maybe the rationale behind each recommendation of
staff, so that we could come back to you with that before
the end of the year, when the comment period is still open
and, you know, continue this discussion and decide how to
move forward at that time.

MR. MODUGNO: That would then, if we left the -- if we
allowed the comment period then to go 90 days versus 60, if
it's currently scheduled to expire November 2nd, then that
would suggest extending it to December the 2nd, having a
hearing prior to that or after?

MR. GLASER: Either immediately prior or immediately
afterwards, so either mid November before the Thanksgiving
holiday or shortly thereafter before the Christmas holiday.

MR. MODUGNO: Okay. Then I would like us to look at a
date certain to do that. And then for the planning date in January, which might be the next date, I'm going to be out of the country. So I'd prefer then to look and carry that out at least until some February time period in terms of another hearing. And is that feasible within the schedule in terms of your time?

MR. GLASER: Yes. I believe if we were to come back to you at that time, we could discuss the issues, see what issues remain, and then schedule another hearing. And at that time, hopefully, the commission would be comfortable with staff returning with a resolution to the Board of Supervisors.

MR. MODUGNO: Okay. I seem Miss Lemke and Miss Hamilton sort of looking at dates to come up with a date certain.

MS. HAMILTON: We might have a planning day available on November 23rd, which is a Monday.

MS. LEMKE: Although it looks like there's -- there's a lot of current planning projects on.

MS. HAMILTON: There's only two cases on the 23rd, so that might work out.

MS. LEMKE: And that's the Monday before -- that's your Monday hearing before Thanksgiving.

MR. MODUGNO: Okay. And that would be to do a lot of these housekeeping elements of this. Not necessarily to --
to really get a full blown -- if people want to come and 
testify, they may, but let's try and get some of these 
issues and get that back out to the community.

So I'll make a motion then, Mr. Chairman, that we 
continue the public hearing on Project R200701226 to 
November 23rd.

MS. HAMILTON: Twenty-third.

MR. MODUGNO: And staff to return -- I guess they have 
to return to us. And then also to continue the comment 
period on the Draft EIR for an additional 30 days to 
December the 2nd, 2009.

MS. LEMKE: And that meeting will be held at your 
regular commission hearing room?

MR. MODUGNO: I'm sorry.

MS. LEMKE: And the meeting will be at your regular --

MR. MODUGNO: Yes. The meeting will be held in our 
commission hearing room downtown.

MR. REW: Second.

MR. BELLAMY: Any further discussion?

All in favor?

MR. MODUGNO: Aye.

MR. REW: Aye.

MR. BELLAMY: Aye.

Okay. We'll move on to County Counsel.

MS. LEMKE: Nothing further.
MR. BELLAMY: Director?

MS. HAMILTON: Nothing to report.

MR. BELLAMY: Okay. Public comment pursuant to Government Code? Seeing none, we're adjourned until Wednesday, October the 14th, Downtown L.A.

(Whereupon, at 9:24 p.m., the meeting adjourned.)
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