

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

SUBMITTED TO RPC ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2009			
	Name / Date of Comment	Summary of Comments	Staff Response
1	Terry Hathaway 8-20-2009	Opposes RL20 designation of Hathaway Temescal Ranch (Parcel Numbers 3247-022-001, 3247-022-002, 3247-022-003, 3247-022-004, 3247-022 007, 3247-022-006 3247-022-005 3247-023-005, 3247-023-004, 3247-023-003, 3247-023-002, 3247-023-001, 3247-023-007, and 3247-023-006)	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • Almost all of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The property does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The property is not served by sewer or public water; and • The property is distant from fire stations, schools, and other services.
2	Luke Salzarulo 8-29-2009	Believes that the Draft Plan will not preserve the rural nature of the Val Verde community.	Policy LU-1.2.9 of the Draft Plan states that the rural character of Val Verde will be protected. Staff welcomes follow-up comments regarding specific concerns.
3	Matt Beneviste	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers	Staff recommends changing this designation to RL2,

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	9-9-2009	3244-030-029, 3244-030-027, 2810-001-035, and 2810-001-040. Suggests RL2, which is consistent with approved Tract No. 51644 (Tesoro del Valle).	which would be consistent with approved Tract No. 51644 (Tesoro del Valle). The Land Use Map has been updated to reflect the RL2 designation. It should be noted that the revised Tract No. 51644 does not propose any re-design of the previously approved lots in this area.
4	County Sanitation Districts 9-9-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
5	Eva Kornev 9-14-2009	Opposes P designation of Parcel Number 2853-008-008 because this parcel does not contain a public facility and is privately owned. Suggests H5 designation, which is consistent with adjoining parcels.	Staff has verified that this parcel does not contain a public facility and recommends changing this designation to H5. The Land Use Map has been updated to reflect the H5 designation.
6	Shane Ramey 9-14-2009	<p>a) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3211-003-014.</p> <p>b) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-039-026.</p> <p>c) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-040-064.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL2 designation is appropriate, as the property is in a rural area and has relatively few constraints. The parcel is also located in the Agua Dulce Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size. The proposed zoning, A-2-2, is consistent with the CSD. The current zoning, A-2-1, is not.</p> <p>b) The current designation for this parcel is Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the parcel contain slopes over 25%

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>and over 50%;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcel is adjacent to a proposed SEA; • The parcel is in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcel is in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the parcel is in a Liquefaction Zone; <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the parcel is in a Flood Zone. <p>The parcel is also located in the Agua Dulce Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size. The proposed zoning, A-1-2 is consistent with the CSD. The current zoning, A-2-1, is not.</p> <p>c) The current land use designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the parcel is located in a proposed SEA; • The parcel is in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • The parcels does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The parcel is not served by sewer or public water; <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcel is distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>The parcel is also located in the Agua Dulce Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size. The proposed zoning, A-1-2 is consistent with the CSD. The current zoning, A-2-1, is not.</p>
--	--	--	--

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

SUBMITTED TO RPC ON OCTOBER 1, 2009			
7	Charles Moore 10-1-2009	Opposes RL5 and RL10 designations of Tract No. 53822 (Tapia Canyon Ranch). Suggests H2 designation, which is consistent with adjoining area (Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C).	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL5 and RL10 designations are appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A large portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water. <p>If Tract No. 53822 has been deemed complete, the application may proceed under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan.</p>
8	Dan Holmquist 10-1-2009	Represents Property Owners Water System (POWS) in Forrest Park. Indicates that H18 and H30 designations in portions of Forrest Park would result in increased density that cannot be served by the POWS.	Staff has re-evaluated the H18 and H30 designations in this area, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing these designations to H5. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the H5 designation.
9	Marguerite Happy 9-29-2009	Opposes re-zoning of Parcel Number 2813-006-021 from A-1-1 to A-1-2.	The proposed designation for this parcel is RL2. The A-1-2 zone is consistent with the proposed designation, but the A-1-1 zone is not.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

10	Allen Hubsch (Windsor Pacific) 9-30-2009	Requests that the designation of Parcel Numbers 2853-006-001, 2853-006-002, and 2853-006-003 be restored to the designation given in the Preliminary Draft Plan, released in 2008.	Staff recommends that these parcels be restored to the designation given in the Preliminary Draft Plan. The Land Use Policy map has been updated to reflect the previous designation.
11	Allen Hubsch (WP Cyn. Country Associates) 9-30-2009	Requests that the designation of Parcel Numbers 2854-004-017 and 2854-004-018 be restored to the designation given in the Preliminary Draft Plan, released in 2008.	Staff recommends that these parcels be restored to the designation given in the Preliminary Draft Plan. The Land Use Policy map has been updated to reflect the previous designation.
12	Allen Hubsch (Hogan & Hartson) 9-30-2009	Supports child care policies in the Draft Plan.	Comment acknowledged.
13	Matt Beneviste 9-30-2009	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3271-005-025 and portions of Parcel Numbers 3247-032-040 and 3247-032-010. Cites incompatibility with proposed Tract No. 060665 and adjoining designations. Suggests H2 designation.	<p>The current designations of these parcels are Hillside Management (HM), Floodplain/Floodway (W), and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this area from rural to urban land uses, given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria.</p> <p>If Tract No. 060665 has been deemed complete, the application may proceed under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan.</p>
14	Diann Peterson 9-30-2009	Opposes Draft Plan because she wants to remain in Castaic, not the City of Santa Clarita.	The Draft Plan does not propose annexation of Castaic to the City of Santa Clarita.
15	Donna Tetzlaff 9-30-2009	Opposes Draft Plan because she wants to remain in Castaic, not the City of Santa Clarita.	See #14 above.
16	Denise Jens 9-30-2009	Opposes H18 and H30 designations in portions of Forrest Park.	Staff has re-evaluated the H18 and H30 designations in this area, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing these designations to H5. The Land Use Policy map has been updated to reflect the H5 designation.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

17	Chris Ball 9-28-2009	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 3231-010-016, 3231-010-017, 3231-010-018, 3231-010-019, 3231-010-020, 3231-010-021, 3231-010-022, and 3231-010-023. Suggests urban designation.	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcels is located in a Landslide Zone; and • A portion of one of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone. <p>Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this area from rural to urban land uses.</p>
18	Tesoro del Valle HOA 9-28-2009	Opposes addition of a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community.	<p>This request was referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). On September 23, 2010, the IEC held a public meeting to discuss this matter and determined that it would not be feasible to add a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community. Therefore, the IEC did not recommend the addition of this Highway designation. However, language has been added to the Circulation Element of the Draft Plan that acknowledges the need for additional access for Castaic and calls for future land divisions between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community to explore the feasibility of accommodating a collector street to link these areas. Collector streets are not shown on the Highway Plan.</p>
19	Elizabeth Lantzy 9-24-2009	Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons.	<p>The primary current designation for this area is Hillside Management (HM), although some areas are</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>designated Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this area include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the area contains slopes over 25%, with some slopes over 50%; • The area contains significant ridgelines, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The area is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of the area are located in a Landslide Zone; • Portions of the area are located in a Liquefaction Zone; • Portions of the area are located in a Flood Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, this area is not served by sewer or public water. <p>Areas designated RL2 to the south and east are relatively less constrained. Areas designed RL1 and RL2 to the west reflect the density of previously approved subdivisions.</p>
20	Bill Blomgren 9-23-2009	<p>a) Opposes CG designation of Parcel Number 2813-024-006 and 2813-024-014. Suggests IL designation.</p> <p>b) Opposes RL5 designation of a portion of Parcel Number 2813-024-007. Suggests IL designation.</p>	<p>a) Staff recommends that the designation be changed to IL. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the IL designation.</p> <p>b) The current designations for this parcel are Hillside Management (HM) and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the parcel contains slopes over 25%

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>with some slopes over 50%;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcel is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of the parcel are located in a Landslide Zone; • Portions of the parcel are located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcel is not served by sewer or public water. <p>Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this entire parcel from rural to industrial land uses. However, staff recommends changing the designation of a small portion of the parcel from RL5 to IL. This small portion is relatively level (slopes less than 25%) and adjoins Sierra Highway. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the IL designation on this small portion.</p>
21	Castaic Area Town Council 9-22-2009	<p>a) Opposes any changes to the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD).</p> <p>b) Supports addition of a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community</p> <p>c) Opposes RL10 designation in Charley and Tapia Canyons. Suggests RL2 designation.</p> <p>d) Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons. Suggests RL2 designation.</p>	<p>a) Staff does not propose any changes to the Castaic Area CSD at this time.</p> <p>b) See #18 above.</p> <p>c) Although the Town Council's letter does not mention specific parcels, property owners have previously identified Parcel Numbers 2865-004-007, 2865-004-018, 2865-004-019, and 3244-023-011. The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>Fire Zone;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of one of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The parcels do not contain, and are distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The parcels are not served by sewer or public water; and • The parcels are distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>These constraints generally apply to adjacent properties in Charley and Tapia Canyons, which are also designated RL10.</p> <p>d) The primary current designation for this area is Hillside Management (HM), although some areas are designated Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this area include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the area contains slopes over 25%, with some slopes over 50%; • The area contains significant ridgelines, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The area is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of the area are located in a Landslide Zone; • Portions of the area are located in a Liquefaction Zone; • Portions of the area are located in a Flood Zone;
--	--	--	--

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To staff's knowledge, this area is not served by sewer or public water. <p>Areas designated RL2 to the south and east are relatively less constrained. Areas designed RL1 and RL2 to the west reflect the density of previously approved subdivisions.</p>
22	Sherrie Stolarik 9-22-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	<p>When the Tesoro del Valle project (Tract No. 51644) was approved, specific dwelling unit allocations were given to Phase A, Phase B, and Phase C. Phase A has been constructed, but Phases B and C have not. Phase A was constructed with fewer dwelling units than allocated. It has been determined that, under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan, these unconstructed dwelling units may be transferred to Phases B and C without a Plan Amendment. The proposed H2 designation acknowledges this determination.</p> <p>A revised Tract No. 51644 must be approved before the density transfer can occur. An application for revised Tract No. 51644 has been submitted to the Department of Regional Planning and has been deemed complete.</p>
23	Shahram Monasebian & Bill Blomgren 9-21-2009	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 2813-024-007, 2853-003-013, and 2853-006-006 to -016. Cites incompatibility with approved Tract No. 47574. Suggests RL1, IL, and IO designations.	<p>If the Draft Plan is adopted, approved Tract No. 47574 may proceed under the conditions and time limitations of the previous approval.</p> <p>The current designations for these parcels are Hillside Management (HM) and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of these parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of these parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A large portion of these parcels are located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcel is not served by sewer or public water. <p>Staff does not feel that it would appropriate to convert this area from rural to industrial land uses.</p>
24	Kenneth Brenner 9-21-2009	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-038-033.	<p>The current land use designation for this parcel is Non-Urban 1 (N1), but the current zoning designation is R-3, which is inconsistent. This parcel is part of "Sleepy Valley," a community that has been developed with single-family homes at low urban densities, although it is surrounded by rural lands. Therefore staff has proposed an H5 land use designation, with R-1 zoning, which is consistent. Staff feels that these changes are appropriate.</p>
25	James & Doris Hill 9-20-2009	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-042-023.	<p>Staff has re-evaluated the proposed land use and zoning designations. Staff recommends a CG land use designation and C-3 zoning. The Land Use Policy Map and the proposed zoning map have been updated to reflect the CG land use designation and the C-3 zoning.</p>
26	Helen Gubrud 9-19-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-026-055 and 3247-026-056. Suggests RL2 designation. Cites adjoining RL1 and RL2 designations.</p> <p>b) Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM), Non-Urban 1 (N1) and Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety,</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		(north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	<p>and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • All of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A majority of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer. <p>b) This request was referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). On September 23, 2010, the IEC held a public meeting to discuss this matter but did not make a recommendation and continued this matter to a future date. On December 6, 2010, the IEC will hold another public meeting to discuss this matter and will make a recommendation. Staff will provide this recommendation to the RPC on December 8, 2010.</p>
27	Norman Sprankle 9-19-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3247-026-055. Suggests RL2 designation. Cites adjoining RL1 and RL2 designations.</p> <p>b) Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	See #26 above.
28	Vernon Sprankle 9-18-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-026-055 and 3247-026-056. Suggests RL2 designation. Cites adjoining RL1 and RL2 designations.</p> <p>b) Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	See #26 above.
29	Erik Pfahler	Requests that portions of approved Tract No.	Although the Draft Countywide General Plan has an

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	9-16-2009	46018 be re-designated to be consistent with proposed revisions to the Tract. Specifically, requests that 13.7 acres be re-designated from H5 to H9, 14 acres be re-designated from H18 to OS-C, and 1 acre be re-designated from H18 to H9.	H9 designation, the Draft Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan does not. Therefore, staff recommends that 13.7 acres be re-designated from H5 to H18, 14 acres be re-designated from H18 to OS-C, and 1 acre be re-designated from H18 to H5. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect these re-designations.
30	Carolyn Seitz 9-17-2009	Requests that the boundary between the CG designation and RL1 designation on Parcel Number 3231-006-006 be shifted to the south, as it splits the parcel in the middle. Also requests that, if designations are shifted, that zoning designations also be shifted to be consistent.	Staff recommends approval of this request. The Land Use Policy Map and proposed zoning map have been updated to reflect this boundary shift.
31	Native American Heritage Commission 9-10-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
32	Linda Tarnoff 9-29-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.
33	Ruthann Levison 9-28-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON OCTOBER 5, 2009			
34	Don Henry 10-2-2009	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3212-019-029. Cites incompatibility with existing zoning and surrounding uses. Suggests IL.	Staff recommends approval of this request. A portion of the parcel is currently zoned M-1. Adjacent parcels are also designated IL and zoned M-1. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the IL designation.
35	Diana Larios 10-2-2009	Opposes allowance of commercial uses in RL2 designation.	The Draft Plan does not allow unlimited commercial uses in the RL designation. The commercial uses must serve the local rural area and are only allowed

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>in “activity areas” that meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 mile from any commercial land use designation; and • No greater than 5 acres in size. <p>Although a Plan Amendment would not be required for commercial uses in “activity areas,” a zone change would be required. A zone change would require public hearings before the RPC and Board of Supervisors, which would allow adjacent residents and property owners to review the proposed commercial use(s) and to provide comments.</p> <p>The intent of these provisions is to allow local-serving businesses in rural areas so that residents are not compelled to travel large distances to meet their daily needs. This could potentially reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled.</p>
36	Jason Vroom 10-2-2009	Opposes CM designation of Parcel Number 2826-003-015 Suggests that a portion be re-designated to IO, with the remainder remaining as CM. Provided map of suggested split designation.	Staff feels that it would inappropriate to split the designation of this property. Given the Draft Plan’s suitability criteria, either the CM or IO designations could be appropriate. Subsequently, staff has recommended an IO designation for the entire property. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the IO designation.
37	Joanna Ivey 10-2-2009	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Numbers 3210-017-041 to -047. Cites incompatibility with existing zoning.	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM), Floodway/Floodplain (W) and Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan’s suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property is located in an adopted SEA;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • The property abuts the Angeles National Forest; • A large portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a FEMA Flood Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer or public water.
38	Mary Ivey 10-2-2009	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Numbers 3210-017-041 to -047. Cites incompatibility with existing zoning.	See #37 above.
39	Linda & Roger Haring 10-1-2009	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Numbers 2813-012-005 and Number 2813-012-006.	Staff has re-evaluated the RL2 designation, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing this designation to RL1. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the RL1 designation.
40	Ralph Grunauer 10-1-2009	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Number 2813-017-002. Suggests RL2 designation, which is consistent with adjoining Parcel Number 2813-017-003.	The primary current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM), although a portion is designated Non-Urban 2 (N2). Staff has re-evaluated the designation of this parcel, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and agrees that both parcels have similar constraints. Therefore, staff recommends changing the designation to RL2. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the RL2 designation.
41	Eugene Lombardi 10-4-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3247-053-004. Suggests RL1 designation.</p> <p>b) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-032-025 and 3247-032-026.</p>	<p>a) An RL1 designation for this parcel would be inconsistent with the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size for new subdivisions in this area.</p> <p>b) An urban designation for this parcel would be</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		<p>Suggests an urban designation.</p> <p>c) Opposes minimum lot size requirements in the RL1 and RL2 designations.</p> <p>d) Opposes elimination of current Plan's "quarter mile rule" in Draft Plan. The "quarter mile rule" allows for additional density for rural projects within a quarter mile of an urban land use designation.</p>	<p>inconsistent with the Castaic Area CSD, which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size for new subdivisions in this area.</p> <p>c) The Draft Plan has been revised to eliminate the minimum lot size requirements in the RL1 and RL2 designations. The Draft Plan has been revised to allow clustering (density-controlled development) in all land use designations, provided that CSD requirements regarding minimum lot sizes are met, where applicable.</p> <p>d) Staff feels that the "quarter mile rule" is not compatible with the Draft Plan's proposed land use legend.</p>
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON NOVEMBER 5, 2009			
42	Craig Cantrell 10-12-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL1 designation of Parcel Number 3231-014-024. Cites incompatibility with current land use designation. Suggests an urban designation.</p> <p>b) Concerned about H18 designation of Parcel Numbers 3231-016-015 and 3231-016-018.</p> <p>c) Opposes removal of Highway designation between Forrest Park and Plum Canyon Road.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM) and Urban 2 (U2). Staff feels that the RL1 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • All of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer. <p>b) See #16 above.</p> <p>c) The Draft Plan will remove this designation. This change has been recommended by the</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

43	Terance Chapman Undated	<p>a) Opposes re-designation of Parcel Number 3210-013-041.</p> <p>b) Opposes re-designation of Parcel Number 3210-007-018.</p> <p>c) Opposes re-designation of Parcel Number 3212-019-077.</p> <p>d) Opposes re-designation of Parcel Number 3210-007-017.</p> <p>e) Opposes re-designation of Parcel Number 3210-007-024.</p>	<p>Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC).</p> <p>a) The current designation for this parcel is Floodway/Floodplain (W) and Transportation Corridor (TC). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25%; • All of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • All of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water. <p>b) The current designation for this parcel is Floodway/Floodplain (W). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25%; • All of the property is located in an adopted SEA; • All of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A large portion of the property is in a FEMA flood zone; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water. <p>c) The current designation for this parcel is Non-</p>
----	----------------------------	---	--

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL2 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water. <p>d) The current designation for this parcel is Floodway/Floodplain (W). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the property contains slopes over 25%; • All of the property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Most of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • Most of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • The property abuts the Angeles National Forest; and • The property is not served by sewer or public water. <p>e) The current designation for this parcel is Open Space-National Forest (O-NF). Staff feels that the OS-NF designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these</p>
--	--	--	---

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entire property is located within the Angeles National Forest; • Almost all of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • All of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and <p>The property is not served by sewer or public water.</p>
44	Ralph Grunauer 10-5-2009	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Number 2813-017-002. Suggests RL2 designation, which is consistent with adjoining Parcel Number 2813-017-003.	See #40 above.
45	Virginia Wolf 10-5-2009	<p>a) Opposes allowance of commercial uses in RL2 designation.</p> <p>b) Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	<p>a) See #35 above.</p> <p>b) See #26b above.</p>
46	Karl Reinecker 2-17-2009 and 4-28-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 2865-006-004, 2865-006-016, and 2865-006-017.</p> <p>b) Believes that land use and zoning changes are unconstitutional.</p> <p>c) Concerned about notification to property owners.</p> <p>d) Believes that the theory of man-made climate change is based on flawed science. Disagrees with AB32 and SB375, State laws intended to address man-made climate</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of one of the parcels is located in a

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		change.	<p>Liquefaction Zone; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To staff's knowledge, the parcels are not served by sewer or public water. <p>b) County Counsel has reviewed the proposed land use and zoning changes. To date, they have not identified any constitutional issues.</p> <p>c) In September 2009, mailed notice was sent to all property owners. Each notice was customized with the land use and zoning changes (if any) proposed for each parcel.</p> <p>d) The County is required to comply with all State laws, including AB32 and SB375.</p>
47	Cheryl & Jack Hawkins 10-5-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.
48	Sherrie Stolarik 10-5-2009	<p>a) Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.</p> <p>b) Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.</p>	<p>a) See #22 above.</p> <p>b) This request was referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). On September 23, 2010, the IEC held a public meeting and recommended that the Highway designation be retained.</p>
49	Sherrie Stolarik 9-22-2009	<p>a) Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.</p> <p>b) Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.</p>	See #48 above.
50	Judy Reinsma 10-5-2009	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.
51	Castaic Lake Water Agency 10-28-2009	Comments on Draft EIR. Requests that the Water Section of the Draft EIR be updated with information from the State Department of Water Resource's 2010 State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report.	Comments acknowledged. The Water Section of the Draft EIR has been updated with information from the State Department of Water Resource's 2010 State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report and has been re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p>
52	Shadiq Ghias 10-30-2009	<p>Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Numbers 3209-010-026, 3209-010-030, and 3209-010-031. Concerned that Conditional Use Permit for campground cannot be renewed if Draft Plan is adopted.</p>	<p>The primary current designation for these parcels is Floodway/Floodplain (W), although portions are designated Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and 50%; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a proposed SEA; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A large portion of the parcels are located in a Flood Zone; • The parcels are not served by sewer or public water; and • The parcels are distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>The proposed zoning for these parcels is A-2-2. Campgrounds are permitted by right in the A-2 Zone, and RV trailer parks are permitted in the A-2 Zone with a Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, the existing Conditional Use Permit could be renewed,</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			pursuant to Zoning Ordinance requirements and the public hearing process.
53	Roy Ramey 10-30-2009	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3211-003-014.	See #6 above.
54	John Cahill 11-4-2009	<p>a) Opposes IL designation and M-1 zoning of Parcel Number 2853-002-010. Cites incompatibility with existing structures. Indicates that 10 structures are on the property, and that they are used exclusively for religious purposes.</p> <p>b) Concerned that commercial uses are not allowed in IL designation and M-1 zone.</p> <p>c) Concerned that CN designation of Parcel Number 3214-025-028 will impact existing church use.</p> <p>d) Concerned that the Draft Plan contains flood plain maps that differ from Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood plain maps.</p> <p>e) Concerned that Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designations limit a parcel to 1 dwelling unit, and that a Conditional Use Permit is required for that dwelling unit.</p>	<p>a) If the existing structures were legally constructed, they may remain subject to the Non-Conforming Structure and Use provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. However, Assessor's records indicate only one structure (single-family home) on the premises. A single-family home is exempt from the termination provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>b) The description of the IL designation in the Draft Plan states that "Allowable uses in this designation include . . . supportive commercial uses." The Zoning Ordinance allows commercial uses in the M-1 zone.</p> <p>c) Churches are allowed in the proposed CN designation. The zoning will remain C-3, which allows churches as a by-right use.</p> <p>d) The Draft Plan's flood plain map (Exhibit S-4) is derived from FEMA data, so staff is not aware of any inconsistencies. Staff welcomes follow-up comments regarding specific concerns.</p> <p>e) The SEA designation does not limit a parcel to 1 dwelling unit, as the maximum density is determined by the land use designation (e.g. RL1, RL2, RL5, etc.). Section 22.56.215.C of the Zoning Ordinance exempts one dwelling unit on one parcel of land from the SEA Conditional Use Permit requirement, and staff does not propose any amendment to Section 22.56.215.C at this time.</p>
55	Henry Ulrick 10-29-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

56	Allen Russell 9-25-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
57	Boone Narr 10-26-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
58	Karen Allard 10-29-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
59	Dorothy Jesser 9-27-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
60	Vernon Sprankle 10-5-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
61	Jon Hockenberry 10-5-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
62	Eugene Lombardi 10-8-2009	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
63	Castaic Area Town Council 10-22-2009	Requests clarification on the relationship between the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD) and the Draft Plan.	Staff provided a response on 10-29-2009. This response was also submitted to the RPC on 11-5-2009.
64	Roy Ramey 10-29-2009 (3 letters)	a) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3211-003-014. b) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-039-026. c) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Number 3214-040-064.	See #6 above.
65	State Clearinghouse 11-3-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
66	State Department of Fish and Game 11-5-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON NOVEMBER 19, 2009			
67	Matt Beneviste 11-5-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 2865-012-001. Suggests H2 designation.</p> <p>b) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 2865-019-010. Suggests H2 designation.</p> <p>c) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 2865-019-009. Suggests H2 designation.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM) and Urban 3 (U3). Staff feels that the RL2 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Most of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer. <p>b) The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM) and Urban 2 (U2). Staff feels that the RL2 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The property is located in a Very High Severity

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>Fire Zone;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer. <p>c) The current designation for this parcel is Hillside Management (HM) and Urban 2 (U2). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • Almost all of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer.
68	Castaic Area Town Council 11-11-2009	<p>a) Concerned about impact of Draft Plan on approved projects.</p> <p>b) Concerned about impact of Draft Plan on pending projects.</p> <p>c) Opposes restrictions on clustering (density-controlled development) in all RL designations.</p>	<p>Staff provided a response on 1-13-2010.</p> <p>a) Projects that have been previously approved by the RPC or Board of Supervisors are not affected by the Draft Plan. If the Draft Plan is adopted, these projects may proceed under the conditions and time limitations of the previous approval. (see Page 9 of</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		<p>d) Opposes any changes to the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD). e) Requests that the Castaic Area CSD be considered as a local plan.</p>	<p>the Introduction of the Draft Plan) b) Pending project applications are not affected by the Draft Plan if they are filed with the Department of Regional Planning prior to adoption of the Draft Plan. These applications may proceed under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan. (see Page 9 of the Introduction of the Draft Plan) c) The Draft Plan has been revised to allow clustering in all land use designations, provided that CSD requirements regarding minimum lot sizes are met, where applicable. d) See #21a above. e) The CSD is a component of the Zoning Ordinance, not the General Plan, so it cannot be considered as a local plan. The local plan is the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.</p>
69	<p>Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy 11-16-2009</p>	<p>a) Believes that the new Significant Ecological Area (SEA) boundaries are not determined and cannot be used until adopted as part of the Countywide General Plan. b) Comments on Draft EIR. c) Suggests that all RL2 and RL5 designations be re-designated to RL10. d) Suggests that the North Lake Specific Plan be eliminated.</p>	<p>a) The new SEA boundaries are provided in Exhibit CO-5. The new SEA boundaries will be adopted when the Draft Plan is adopted. The Draft Plan is a component of the Countywide General Plan. b) Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR. c) All rural areas were evaluated pursuant to the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Parcels that have been designated RL2 and RL5 were found to be more suitable (with relatively fewer constraints) than parcels that have been designated RL10 and RL20. d) The Draft Plan does not propose any changes to adopted Specific Plans.</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

70	<p>Maureen Davidheiser 11-16-2009</p>	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>c) Opposes conservation easement requirements.</p>	<p>a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Most of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The property does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The property is not served by sewer or designation prior to the next public water; and • The property is distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>b) Staff has re-evaluated the proposed SEA and has determined that it is appropriate given the County's SEA designation criteria. However, the name of the proposed SEA and the description of the proposed SEA have been revised.</p> <p>c) The Draft Plan does not include policies that require conservation easements. Currently adopted Zoning Ordinance regulations for hillside management areas and Significant Ecological Areas (Section 22.56.215) have open space standards, but</p>
----	---	--	--

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			do not require conservation easements. Staff does not propose any amendments to these Zoning Ordinance regulations at this time.
71	Agua Dulce Town Council 11-17-2009	Opposes re-zoning of several parcels in Agua Dulce from R-R to A-1 or A-2.	Staff feels that the R-R zone is incompatible with Rural Land designations. It allows several potentially impactful resort and recreational uses by-right, but requires a Conditional Use Permit for a single family home. The A-1 and A-2 zones are more appropriate, as they allow a single family home by-right and require a Conditional Use Permit for potentially impactful uses.
72	Nicole Pyburn Valenzuela 11-17-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>c) Believes that land use and zoning changes, as well as proposed SEA designations, are unconstitutional.</p> <p>d) Opposes conservation easement requirements.</p> <p>e) Believes that the City of Santa Clarita has had undue influence in the development of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>f) Believes that the proposed land use designations are intended to facilitate open space acquisition.</p>	<p>a) See #70a above.</p> <p>b) See #70b above.</p> <p>c) County Counsel has reviewed the proposed land use and zoning changes and the proposed SEA designations. To date, they have not identified any constitutional issues.</p> <p>d) See #70c above.</p> <p>e) Although the Draft Plan is the result of a collaborative effort between the County and the City of Santa Clarita, it represents the independent analysis and judgment of County staff.</p> <p>f) The intent of the Draft Plan is not to facilitate open space acquisition. As stated in the Introduction, the intent is to guide the regulation of development, in compliance with State Law requirements.</p>
73	Carl Tarquinio 11-18-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL1 designation of Parcel Number 3231-007-042.</p> <p>b) Requests "buffer zone" between his</p>	a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL1 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		property, Parcel Number 3231-007-042, and adjacent CG designation.	<p>suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer. <p>b) Staff recommends that the proposed CG designation of adjacent Parcel Number 3231-007-041 be adjusted to match the current C-3 zoning boundary, which should provide the "buffer" that is being requested. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect this adjustment.</p>
74	Tarran Chew 11-18-2009	Opposes re-zoning of Parcel Number 3212-011-074 from R-R to A-1.	See #71 above.
75	Shannon & Judy Pickett 11-18-2009	Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Number 3214-022-026.	Staff has re-evaluated the proposed SEA and has determined that it is appropriate given the County's SEA designation criteria.
76	Bill Davidheiser 11-19-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p>	<p>a) See #70a above.</p> <p>b) See #70b above.</p>
77	Linda Pyburn 11-19-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL20 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA)</p>	<p>a) See #70a above.</p> <p>b) See #70b above.</p> <p>c) See #72c above.</p> <p>d) See #70c above.</p> <p>e) These parcels are included in the currently</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		<p>designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020.</p> <p>c) Believes that land use and zoning changes, as well as proposed SEA designations, are unconstitutional.</p> <p>d) Opposes conservation easement requirements.</p> <p>e) Requests that Parcel Numbers 3247-028-007 to -010, 3247-035-003, 3247-035-004, 3247-036-010, 3247-036-011, and 3247-036-020 be removed from the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>adopted Area Plan, so they will continue to be included in the Draft Plan.</p>
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON DECEMBER 3, 2009			
78	Nicole Pyburn Valenzuela 11-23-2009 (2 e-mails)	This is a written version of the testimony Ms. Valenzuela provided to the RPC on 11-23-2009. It reiterates the comments she provided on 11-17-2009 (see #72 above).	See #72 above.
79	Friends of the Santa Clara River 11-24-2009	<p>a) Comments on Draft EIR.</p> <p>b) Suggests that the Development Monitoring System (DMS) be retained.</p>	<p>a) Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>b) The DMS is a component of the Countywide General Plan. No amendments to the DMS are proposed at this time and it will remain in effect until such time that the Countywide General Plan is amended.</p>
80	Santa Clarita Valley Facilities Foundation 11-20-2009	<p>a) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcels 3231-001-011, 3231-001-015, 3231-001-018, 3231-001-019, 3231-004-014, and 3231-004-015. Cites inconsistency with proposed subdivision (32 residential lots with average 1 acre lot size,</p>	<p>a) The overall density of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the RL2 designation. However, the proposed commercial lot is not consistent with the RL2 designation. Therefore, staff recommends changing the designation on that portion of the</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		<p>1 school lot, and 1 proposed commercial lot).</p> <p>b) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Numbers 2813-018-002, 2813-018-003, 2813-018-004, and 2813-018-009, 2853-002-001, and 2853-002-007. Cites inconsistency with proposed subdivision (102 residential lots with average 0.5 acre lot size), existing commercial zoning, and approved Tract No. 47573.</p> <p>c) Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3247-043-011. Cites inconsistency with pending Tract No. 52475.</p>	<p>property to CG. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the CG designation.</p> <p>b) The overall density of approved Tract No. 47573 is consistent with the RL2 designation. However, the existing commercial zoning was removed and those portions of the property were designated as IL. Staff has re-evaluated the IL designation and recommends changing this designation to CG, which is consistent with the existing commercial zoning. The Land Use Policy Map has been updated to reflect the CG designation.</p> <p>c) A designation for this parcel with a density greater than RL2 would be inconsistent with the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD), which requires a 2 acre minimum lot size for new subdivisions in this area. If Tract No. 52475 has been deemed complete, the application may proceed under the provisions of the currently adopted Plan.</p>
81	William S. Hart Union High School District 11-20-2009	Supports requests of Santa Clarita Valley Facilities Foundation (see #80 above).	See #80 above.
82	Linda & Larry Stelling 12-1-2009	Supports re-zoning of several parcels in Agua Dulce from R-R to A-1 or A-2. This is a response to the Agua Dulce Town Council's opposition (see #71 above).	Comment acknowledged.
83	State Department of Transportation 12-1-2009	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
84	National	Comments on Draft EIR. Requests that	Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	Resources Defense Council 11-30-2009	Sections of the Draft EIR be revised and re-circulated.	been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
85	State Department of Justice (Attorney General) 12-1-2009	a) Believes that the Draft Plan will not meet the mandates of AB32. b) Comments on Draft EIR. Requests that Sections of the Draft EIR be revised and re-circulated.	a) Comment acknowledged. Staff from the County and City of Santa Clarita jointly reviewed the policies in the Draft Plan, using the model policies developed by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) as a guide, and made appropriate revisions to ensure consistency with the mandates of AB32. b) Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON FEBRUARY 11, 2010			
86	Shannon Pickett 11-18-2009	Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Number 3214-039-032.	Staff has re-evaluated the proposed SEA and has determined that it is appropriate given the County's SEA designation criteria.
87	William & Edda Elmore 11-19-2009	Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of Parcel Number 3214-040-046.	Staff has re-evaluated the proposed SEA and has determined that it is appropriate given the County's SEA designation criteria.
88	Southern California Edison 12-18-2009	Suggests that staff review a comment letter regarding the Draft Countywide General Plan (dated 11-20-2008), as those comments apply to some of the policies in the Draft Plan.	Comments acknowledged. Staff has added the following language to the Land Use Element in the Draft Plan: The Area Plan recognizes that there are existing utilities and associated infrastructure, operating with previous approvals, located in all land use designations. The County's ability to regulate or

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			condition these uses is limited and, in some cases, preempted by other lead government agencies. It is expected that these uses will continue, that necessary operations and maintenance will continue to be performed, that on-site testing will continue to be necessary, and that expansion will occur as demands increase.
89	Craig Cantrell 12-28-2009	Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3231-014-024. Suggests H5 designation.	<p>The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • A portion of the property contains a significant ridgeline, as defined by the Castaic Area CSD; • Almost all of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • The property does not contain, and is distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The property is not served by sewer or public water; and • The property is distant from fire stations, schools, and other services.
90	David Brandon	Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of	The current designation for this parcel is Non-Urban

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	1-22-2010	Parcel Number 3214-020-046.	1 (N1) and the proposed designation is RL2. Both designations allow the same density (1 unit per 2 acres). The primary current zoning designation is A-1-20000, although a very small portion is zoned C-3. The proposed zoning designation is A-1-2, which is consistent with both the current and proposed land use designations. The existing C-3 zoning is inconsistent with both the current and proposed land use designations.
91	Castaic Area Town Council 1-25-2010	Opposes restrictions on clustering (density-controlled development) in all RL designations.	See #68c above.
92	State Department of Justice (Attorney General) 1-26-2010	Acknowledges phone conversation with staff in which staff indicated that the Draft EIR will be revised and will be re-circulated for further review and comment.	Comment acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
93	Robert Tallent 1-29-2010	a) Opposes re-designation and re-zoning of Parcel Numbers 3247-028-013 and 3247-028-016. b) Believes that land use and zoning changes are unconstitutional.	a) The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of these parcels contains slopes over 25%, and a large portion contains slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a proposed SEA; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcels is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the parcels is located in a Liquefaction Zone;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcels do not contain, and are distant from, existing and proposed routes on the Highway Plan; • The parcels are not served by sewer or public water; and • The parcels are distant from fire stations, schools, and other services. <p>b) County Counsel has reviewed the proposed land use and zoning changes and the proposed SEA designations. To date, they have not identified any constitutional issues.</p>
94	Nicole Pyburn Valenzuela 2-1-2010	<p>Generally reiterates the comments she provided on 11-17-2009 (see #72 above). However, new comments include:</p> <p>a) Comments on Draft EIR.</p> <p>b) Opposes restrictions on clustering (density-controlled development) in all RL designations.</p> <p>c) Concerned about Policies CO-3.6.3, CO-3.1.7, and CO-3.1.5, as they restrict uses in Significant Ecological Areas.</p>	<p>See #72 above for response to reiterated comments.</p> <p>a) Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>b) See #68c above.</p> <p>c) Policy CO-3.6.3 is not intended to restrict someone from using an off-road vehicle on their own property. Policy CO-3.1.7 applies to all areas, not just SEA areas, and is consistent with adopted Zoning Ordinance requirements for drought-tolerant landscaping. Policy CO-3.1.5 applies to all areas, not just SEA areas, and is consistent with adopted Zoning Ordinance requirements for drought-tolerant landscaping.</p>
95	Maureen Davidheiser 1-30-2010	Reiterates comments she provided on 11-16-2009 (see #70 above).	See #70 above.
96	Francine Hathaway Rippy	a) Opposes RL20 designation of Hathaway Temescal Ranch (Parcel Numbers 3247-022-	<p>a) See #1 above.</p> <p>b) See #70b above.</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	1-30-2010	<p>001, 3247-022-002, 3247-022-003, 3247-022-004, 3247-022 007, 3247-022-006 3247-022-005 3247-023-005, 3247-023-004, 3247-023-003, 3247-023-002, 3247-023-001, 3247-023-007, and 3247-023-006).</p> <p>b) Opposes Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation of majority of Hathaway Temescal Ranch (Parcel Numbers 3247-022-001, 3247-022-002, 3247-022-003, 3247-022-004, 3247-022 007, 3247-022-006 3247-022-005 3247-023-005, 3247-023-004, 3247-023-003, 3247-023-002, 3247-023-001, 3247-023-007, and 3247-023-006).</p> <p>c) Agrees with comments made by Nicole Pyburn (see #72 and #94 above).</p>	c) See #72 and #94 above.
97	Sierra Club 2-1-2010	<p>a) Opposes elimination of the Development Monitoring System (DMS).</p> <p>b) Comments on Draft EIR.</p>	<p>a) The DMS is a component of the Countywide General Plan. No amendments to the DMS are proposed at this time and it will remain in effect until such time that the Countywide General Plan is amended.</p> <p>b) Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p>
98	Golden Oak Ranch 2-1-2010	<p>a) Comments on Draft EIR.</p> <p>b) Opposes 60 foot height limit in IO designation, references Page 3.1-22 of the Draft EIR.</p> <p>c) Notes inconsistency between Significant Ecological Areas (SEA) map in the Draft Plan and the corresponding map in the Draft EIR.</p>	<p>a) Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>b) The 60 foot height limit was included in the</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		<p>d) Requests that the proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA) designation on the property exclude areas allowed for set construction under the property's current Conditional Use Permit.</p> <p>e) Concerned about Figure 3.16-2 (Trails Map) in the Draft EIR, as there are not dedicated public trails located on the property.</p>	<p>Preliminary Draft Plan, but was removed from the Draft Plan. The Revised Draft EIR has been revised for consistency.</p> <p>c) The SEA map in the Draft Plan is correct. The Revised Draft EIR has been revised for consistency.</p> <p>d) Staff has re-evaluated the proposed SEA and has determined that it is appropriate given the County's SEA designation criteria.</p> <p>e) Figure 3.16-2, as well as Exhibit CO-9 of the Draft Plan, is intended to show the Master Plan of Trails, not trails that are currently dedicated and available for public use.</p>
99	County of Ventura 12-2-2009 (received 2-1-2010)	Comments on Draft EIR.	Comments acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
SUBMITTED TO RPC ON DECEMBER 2, 2010			
100	R. Fred McHaddad 2-11-2010	Opposes RL10 designation of Parcel Numbers 2827-029-008, 2827-029-011, 2827-030-012, 2827-030-013, 2827-031-002, and 2827-031-007. Cites incompatibility with existing industrial zoning. Suggests RL2.	<p>Staff has re-evaluated the portions of the property with existing industrial zoning and recommends that those portions be designated as IL to reflect the existing industrial uses. The existing industrial zoning designation will be retained. The Land Use Policy Map and the zoning map have been updated to reflect the IL designation and the existing zoning.</p> <p>The current designation for the remainder of the property is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for the property include the following:</p>

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large portion of the property contains slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • Almost all of the property is located in a proposed SEA; • The property is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A large portion of the property is located in a Landslide Zone; • A portion of the property is located in a Liquefaction Zone; and <p>To staff's knowledge, the property is not served by sewer or public water.</p>
101	Chad Stadnicki 2-17-2010	Opposes RL1 and RL10 designation of Parcel Numbers 2812-005-004, 2812-005-018, 2812-005-019, 2812-005-032, 2812-005-035, 2812-006-001, 2812-006-002, 2812-006-004, 2812-006-005, 2813-014-001, and 2813-014-004. Cites inconsistency with proposed subdivision. Suggests H2.	The overall density of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the RL1 and RL10 designations. Staff feels that the RL1 and RL10 designations are appropriate, given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria and the rural character of the Bouquet Canyon area.
102	Lynne Plambeck 2-19-2010	Represents Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE). a) Suggests that the County and City of Santa Clarita release a single EIR for the County's Area Plan Update and the City's General Plan Update. b) Suggests that the County and City of Santa Clarita conduct joint hearings. c) Opposes elimination of the Development Monitoring System (DMS). d) Concerned about water supply issues. e) Concerned about greenhouse gas emissions. Concurs with written comments by the State Department of Justice (Attorney	a) The County has prepared a Revised Draft EIR for its Area Plan Update and the City has prepared a Draft EIR for its General Plan Update. The County's Revised Draft EIR was developed in conjunction with the City's Draft EIR. The County's Revised Draft EIR evaluated potential impacts within the unincorporated communities of the Santa Clarita Valley, while the City's Draft EIR evaluates environmental impacts within the City's incorporated boundaries and adopted sphere of influence. Although the County's Revised Draft EIR and the City's Draft EIR evaluate potential environmental impacts in different portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, necessitating two separate documents, the

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		<p>General) and the National Resources Defense Council.</p> <p>f) Concerned about traffic impacts.</p> <p>g) Believes that population projections maintained by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are overstated.</p> <p>h) Supports Alternative 2 in the Draft EIR.</p>	<p>two documents reach the same conclusions with regard to potentially significant environmental impacts.</p> <p>b) Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>c) The DMS is a component of the Countywide General Plan. No amendments to the DMS are proposed at this time and it will remain in effect until such time that the Countywide General Plan is amended.</p> <p>d) The Water Section of the Draft EIR has been completely revised. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>e) The Global Climate Change Section of the Draft EIR has been completely revised. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>f) The Transportation and Circulation Section of the Draft EIR has been revised. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.</p> <p>g) Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>h) Comment acknowledged. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new</p>
--	--	--	--

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
103	Castaic Area Town Council 2-22-2010	<p>a) Supports addition of a Highway designation between Castaic and the Tesoro del Valle community.</p> <p>b) Requests that the Castaic Area CSD remain in effect.</p> <p>c) Supports “grandfathering” of all previously approved projects.</p> <p>d) Opposes RL10 designation in Charley and Tapia Canyons. Suggests RL2.</p> <p>e) Opposes RL5 designation in Hasley and Sloan Canyons. Suggests RL2.</p> <p>f) Requests that the clustering (density-controlled development) provisions in the Draft Plan be consistent with those in the Castaic Area CSD.</p>	<p>a) See #18 above.</p> <p>b) See #21a above.</p> <p>c) See #68a above.</p> <p>d) See #21c above.</p> <p>e) See #21d above.</p> <p>f) See #68c above.</p>
104	Roger Van Wert 2-23-2010	<p>Represents Norman and Patricia Howell.</p> <p>a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Number 3247-042-012. Suggests RL2.</p> <p>b) Does not believe that a public purpose is served by reductions in allowable density.</p> <p>c) Believes that the Draft Plan’s suitability criteria are poor indicators of appropriate density.</p> <p>d) Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.</p>	<p>a) This parcel is currently designated Hillside Management (HM) and Non-Urban 1 (N1). Staff feels that the RL5 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan’s suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for this parcel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the parcel contains slopes over 25%, and slopes over 50%; • The parcel is located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • A portion of the parcel is located in a Landslide Zone; • A large portion of the parcel is located in a Liquefaction Zone; • A portion of the parcel is located in a Flood Zone;

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			<p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To staff's knowledge, the parcel is not served by sewer or public water. <p>b) Staff feels that reductions in allowable densities are necessary to serve the overriding public purposes described in AB 32, SB 375, the Area Plan's Vision and Guiding Principles, and the policies of the Area Plan's Land Use Element.</p> <p>c) Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>d) See #26b above.</p>
105	Kenneth Baumgartner 2-23-2010	<p>a) Supports the allowance of clustering (density-controlled development) in rural areas.</p> <p>b) Opposes RL10 designation of portions of Parcel Numbers 3244-031-013, 2813-010-002, and 2813-010-003. Suggests RL1.</p>	<p>a) The Draft Plan has been revised to allow clustering in all land use designations, provided that CSD requirements regarding minimum lot sizes are met, where applicable.</p> <p>b) Staff feels that the RL10 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcels are adjacent to, or directly abut, the Angeles National Forest; • Portions of the parcels contain slopes over 25%; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Portions of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • Portions of the parcels are located in a Liquefaction Zone; and • The parcels do not contain or adjoin an existing or proposed route on the Highway Plan.
106	Tanya & Jeff Smith 2-24-2010	Opposes rezoning of Parcel Number 3231-021-032 from A-1 to R-1. Cites existing agricultural use on property (growth and harvesting of trees).	Staff has re-evaluated the proposed zoning and recommends the R-A zone instead of the R-1 zone. The R-A zone allows for the growth and harvesting of trees. The proposed zoning map has been

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

			updated to reflect the R-A zone.
107	Castaic Lake Water Agency 2-24-2010	Comments on Draft EIR. Requests that the Water Section of the Draft EIR be updated with information from the State Department of Water Resource's 2010 State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report.	Comments acknowledged. The Water Section of the Draft EIR has been updated with information from the State Department of Water Resource's 2010 State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report and has been re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR. Since the Draft EIR has been revised and re-circulated as a Revised Draft EIR, staff will require reviewers to submit new comments on the Revised Draft EIR. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR will be addressed in the Final EIR.
108	Chad Stadnicki 3-22-2010	Opposes RL1 and RL10 designation of Parcel Numbers 2812-005-004, 2812-005-018, 2812-005-019, 2812-005-032, 2812-005-035, 2812-006-001, 2812-006-002, 2812-006-004, 2812-006-005, 2813-014-001, and 2813-014-004. Cites inconsistency with proposed subdivision. Suggests H2.	See #101 above.
109	Philip Simmons 4-5-2010	a) Opposes CG designation of Parcel Number 2813-024-006 and 2813-024-014. Suggests IL designation. b) Opposes RL5 designation of a portion of Parcel Number 2813-024-007. Suggests IL designation.	See #20 above.
110	Jeff Preach 4-8-2010	Opposes H5 designation of portions of Parcel Numbers 2865-019-064 and 2865-019-065. Cites inconsistency with proposed multi-family residential use that has received approval from the Castaic Area Town Council. Suggests H18.	Staff has re-evaluated the proposed H5 designation, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing portions of these parcels to the H18 designation. The proposed multi-family residential use has received approval from the Castaic Area Town Council and will address the need for additional multi-family housing in the Castaic community.
111	Thomas Clark	Opposes IO designation of Parcel Numbers	Staff feels that the IO designation is appropriate,

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	8-6-2010	3210-014-022, 3210-014-024, 3210-014-026, 3210-014-033, and 3210-017-063. Suggests a residential designation.	given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria and the need for additional employment centers in the Santa Clarita Valley, especially in the eastern portion.
112	Sherrie Stolarik 9-15-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
113	Cheryl Hawkins 9-15-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
114	Diana Larios 9-16-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
115	Virginia Wolf 9-16-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
116	Becky Bennett 9-17-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
117	Barbara & Robert Waycott 9-19-2010	Supports change of Vasquez Canyon Road from a Major Highway designation to a Limited Secondary Highway designation.	This request was referred to the County's Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC). On September 23, 2010, the IEC held a public meeting and recommended that the change from a Major Highway designation to a Limited Secondary Highway be retained.
118	Thomas & Claudia Tucker 9-20-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
119	Miguel Larios 9-21-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
120	John Wolf 9-21-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

121	Aleks Baharlo 9-22-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
122	Karl Mallick 9-23-2010	a) Opposes change of Vasquez Canyon Road from Major Highway designation to Limited Secondary Highway designation. b) Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	a) See #117 above. b) See #26b above.
123	Matt Beneviste 10-13-2010	Opposes RL2 designation of Parcel Number 3271-005-025. Suggests H2.	See #13 above.
124	Agua Dulce Women's Club 10-27-2010	Opposes RL2 designation and A-1-2 zoning of Parcel Number 3212-015-080. Cites incompatibility with existing clubhouse use. Suggests CG designation and C-3 zoning.	Staff has re-evaluated the proposed RL2 designation, using the Draft Plan's suitability criteria, and recommends changing the designation of this parcel, and the parcel adjoining to the north, to CG. The proposed zoning would also be changed to C-3. The parcels adjoin an existing route on the Highway Plan and adjoin a CG designation and C-3 zone to the north. The clubhouse use has existing for many years without complaint, so it should not be made non-conforming. The Land Use Policy Map and the proposed zoning map will be updated to reflect this change.
125	Agua Dulce Town Council 11-10-2010	Supports request by Agua Dulce Women's Club (see #124 above).	See #124 above.
126	Sherrie Stolarik 11-10-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
127	Lisa Schwalm 11-15-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
128	Newhall School	Provided copy of comment letter on City of	Comment acknowledged and will be addressed in

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

	District 11-15-2010	Santa Clarita's Draft EIR for its General Plan Update and requests that the comment also be applies to the County's Revised Draft EIR for its Area Plan Update. Comment letter suggests that additional mitigation measures be placed in the EIR to address impacts to school districts.	the Final EIR.
129	Mark Gates 11-16-2010	Opposes RL20 designation on portions of Parcels 2581-001-015 and 2581-001-021. Suggests IL.	The current designation for these parcels is Hillside Management (HM). Staff feels that the RL20 designation is appropriate given the Draft Plan's suitability criteria. Relevant environmental, safety, and infrastructure constraints for these parcels include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the parcels contain slopes over 25% and slopes over 50%; • The parcels are located in a proposed SEA; • The parcels are located in a Very High Severity Fire Zone; • Most of the parcels are located in a Landslide Zone; • The parcels do not adjoin an existing or proposed route on the Highway Plan; and • To staff's knowledge, the parcels are not served by sewer or public water.
130	Bob & April Jauregui 11-17-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
131	Walt & Michelle Beard 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
132	Bill & Paula Reber 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

133	Bob & Alexandra Ernst 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
134	Dean & Sherry Paradise 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
135	Frank Anet 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
136	Glen & Sandia Ennis 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
137	Jean Cloyd 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
138	Jim & Charlene Nigra 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
139	Larry & Marshana Fuentes 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
140	Lindy & Janice Lucas 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
141	Richard & Peggy Landy 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
142	John Molinar 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
143	Marv & Manette Metcalf 11-18-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

144	Walter & Kimberly Prezioso 11-19-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
145	Sean & Katherine Ekins 11-19-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
146	Robert & Debbie Frances 11-19-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
147	Luanne Simon 11-19-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
148	Greg & Kayla Smith 11-19-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
149	Glenn & Marina Martin 11-20-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
150	Terese Reber 11-20-2010	Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
151	Amy Minter 11-23-2010	Represents Citizens for Castaic. Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
152	Eddie Reinsma 11-27-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
153	Thomas Berman 11-28-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
154	Eric Ekeberg 11-29-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon	See #48b above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		Road.	
155	Melissa Kimberly-Blair 11-29-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
156	Bud & Elizabeth Lantzy 11-30-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
157	Susan Rauch 11-30-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
158	Vernon Sprankle 11-30-2010	a) Opposes RL5 designation of Parcel Numbers 3247-026-055 and 3247-026-056. Cites Suggests RL1 or RL2. b) Opposes removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	a) See #26a above. b) See #26b above.
159	Kimberly Dwight 11-30-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
160	equestrianevents@aol.com (no name provided) 11-30-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
161	Daniel & Kathleen Henry 11-30-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
162	John Wolf 12-1-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
163	Judy Reinsma 12-1-2010	Represents the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association. Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

164	Denyse Davis 12-1-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
165	Arthur Carvalho, Jr. 12-1-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
166	Stephen Citron 12-1-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
167	Jane Fleck 12-1-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
168	Brenda Ofiesh 12-1-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
169	Judy Reinsma 12-1-2010	Represents the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association. Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.
170	Julie Thomas 12-1-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
171	Mike Fairbanks 12-1-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
172	Linda Tarnoff 12-1-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon Road.	See #48b above.
173	Bruce Thomas 12-2-2010	Supports removal of Sloan Canyon Road (north of Hillcrest Parkway) from Highway Plan.	See #26b above.
174	Amy Lillenberg 12-2-2010	Opposes Highway designation that would link McBean Parkway to San Francisquito Canyon	See #48b above.

STAFF RESPONSE TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

		Road.	
175	Sherrie Stolarik 12-2-2010	Opposes H2 designation of Tesoro del Valle Phases B and C.	See #22 above.