

**From:** Susan Tae  
**To:** Emma Howard; Brianna Menke; Thuy Hua  
**Subject:** FW: Updated Draft Ordinances  
**Date:** Monday, February 24, 2014 7:53:31 AM

---

Hi ladies,

You received these as well but on quick skim, these are the edits I was going to suggest to Matt. If you have any other edits or changes on language and/or content, please let me know and I can coordinate the response back

(Also, I started my comments on the message that ended up being recalled - please take a look at the e-mail sent 4:52pm for the later version)

Thanks!  
Susie

Susan Tae, AICP  
Community Studies North  
Department of Regional Planning  
(213) 974-6476

---

**From:** Dubiel, Matthew [mailto:MDUBIEL@dpw.lacounty.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 21, 2014 4:41 PM  
**To:** Connie Chung; Susan Tae; Alyson Stewart; Bruce Durbin; Morgan, Jason; Hernandez, Bella; Sharkey, David; Rothman, Dayna; Bordas, Hector; Lafferty, Dan; Lee, Rudy; Cline, Craig; Thuy Hua; Brianna Menke; Emma Howard; Rehman, Waqas; Jones, Jill M.; Even, Greg; Cruz, Jemellee; Wood, Pat; Nyivih, Anthony; Sarda, Juan; Burger, Steve; Moynihan, Niall; Alfonso, Lani; Castaneda, Ronald; Sheridan, Steve; Vander Vis, Art; Darensbourg, Charles  
**Cc:** Smith, Brian; Pachano, Fabrizio  
**Subject:** FW: Updated Draft Ordinances

Thank you for attending Tuesday's (2/18/14) meeting that was held between Public Works and Regional Planning. As you know the meeting was to discuss DPW's concerns on the General Plan as well as other ordinances that are currently being processed. The documents listed below were discussed using DPW's comment memos as a guide. The following is a summary of discussion items and follow-up actions (as Steve Burger, Juan Sarda, and I recall it) agreed upon by both Departments. Should there be something written below that has been misinterpreted or is missing please let everyone know by 2/26/14 so the information below can be deemed final.

Not everyone signed the sign-in sheet however I believe I have included everyone in attendance (those listed in the "To" section of this email were in attendance). If you notice that I missed someone please let me know.

I apologize for the length of the email, but given that our meeting was over 5.5 hours long there are a lot of meeting minutes.

Thank you.

\*edited\*

## **Significant Ecological Areas (SEA) Ordinance (DPW Draft Comment Memo dated February 18, 2014):**

**Link to latest Draft released to the Public by DRP:**

[http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/sea/SEA\\_Ordinance\\_Draft\\_4\\_Final\\_Public\\_Release\\_Version.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/sea/SEA_Ordinance_Draft_4_Final_Public_Release_Version.pdf)

**Link to SEA Program Guide:**

[http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/sea/SEA\\_Program\\_Guide\\_Prelim\\_Draft\\_Dec2013\\_\(3\).pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/sea/SEA_Program_Guide_Prelim_Draft_Dec2013_(3).pdf)

**Link to DPW Draft Comment Letter dated 02/18/14:** [P:\ldpub\General\DRP - DPW Coordination Meeting\Significant Ecological Area SEA Ordinance\2014-02-18\\_SEA\\_Ordinance\\_Draft\\_4\\_DPW\\_Comments.pdf](P:\ldpub\General\DRP - DPW Coordination Meeting\Significant Ecological Area SEA Ordinance\2014-02-18_SEA_Ordinance_Draft_4_DPW_Comments.pdf)

Please note these comments are for the December 5, 2013 Draft Ordinance (Draft 4) which DPW received for review on January 15, 2014.

### **General Comment #1:**

A general discussion took place regarding DPW's concerns regarding potential issues with exemption

eligibility for existing County maintenance activities and what may be considered as maintenance activities per the proposed SEA Ordinance. The proposed Ordinance does not specifically define what maintenance activities are, but rather defines which activities will trigger a review under the proposed SEA Ordinance.

DRP (Emma Howard) anticipates ~~having draft materials available to the public around late March, and presenting the SEA Ordinance to the RPC around late March or early April on April 23, 2014.~~

DRP indicated that the SEA Ordinance establishes how potential projects being proposed within an SEA will be reviewed by DRP and that it is not the intention that DRP would review every small project that the County has in the pipeline.

DRP indicated that projects that already require CEQA documents and oversight by other regulatory agencies (eg. RWQCB, DFW), such as many of the FMD activities, would not necessarily be scrutinized by DRP again but DRP requests that they be made aware of the project.

The intention of the SEA Ordinance is to establish two distinct processes regarding project reviews: County projects and non-county projects. Draft 4 of the Ordinance outlines a review process for County projects to be streamlined per section 22.52.2955. Non-County projects are to follow a general review process per SEA Ordinance.

Future Drafts of the SEA Ordinance will outline a clearer picture of the County process to take into account DPW's concerns regarding maintenance facilities. The Draft will be re-worded by DRP (in consultation with DPW) to eliminate any confusion about the County needing to gain a CUP (Type A or B) and identify a more defined, specific County process.

DPW and DRP agreed that the SEA Ordinance would have a broad approach in establishing requirements for County projects and any exemptions. Specific guidelines applicable to DPW activities would be addressed through the SEA Program Guide. This will provide the ultimate flexibility to have a dynamic Ordinance in which modifications, revisions, and incorporations could be made (to the Program Guide) without changing the original Ordinance.

DRP and DPW agreed that establishing a systematic approach on processing and reviewing County projects for SEA Ordinance compliance is the best way of streamlining any review/consultation process. In the beginning, DPW may need to dialog with DRP on many of its maintenance activities to make sure they are in compliance with the SEA Ordinance however; if the same types of activities are being deemed as a "non-issue" these can be documented in the Program Guide as activities that may not need to be vetted each time.

DPW (Patricia Wood – WRD) expressed concern regarding previously purchased property (by the Board) for Sediment Placement Sites (SPS) and how the SEA Ordinance and reviews by SEATAC would affect this. DRP indicated that SEATAC's recommendations go to DRP for consideration. DRP also indicated that it would be better to be made aware of SPS sites (APN's) now so that they can see if there is potential for conflict but it may just be a matter of indicating (to the Board) that due to the importance of flood protection on the previously purchased property these sites need to be used.

#### **Action Items:**

**DRP:** Revise ordinance to incorporate vetted comments that will support the generalized ordinance approach discussed and redistribute through the e-consultation process for DPW to re-review.

Revise ordinance to clarify which Sections will govern the initial project appraisal under Section 22.52.2955-B. Currently, it presumes that every project will be a CUP.

**DPW – All Divisions:** Review the Program Guide draft located here [http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/up/sea/SEA\\_Program\\_Guide\\_Prelim\\_Draft\\_Dec2013\\_\(3\).pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/up/sea/SEA_Program_Guide_Prelim_Draft_Dec2013_(3).pdf) and provide recommendations **(to LDD by 2/26/14)** to incorporate information that addresses specific concerns or establishes specific guidelines pertinent to each reviewing Division. A separate email will be sent to DPW Divisions formally soliciting Divisional Comments however the above link leads to the document so your review can commence. As discussed at the meeting, comments on the Program Guide should take into consideration providing a listing of DPW activities that would be considered "Emergency Activities", and also recommend procedures that can be established for when projects need to go through the SEA process and be submitted to DRP for review. In addition, the program guide would be a good place to expand on the design/maintenance responsibilities of the wildlife crossings.

**DPW – (Patricia Wood – WRD):** Provide DRP/LDD by **2/26/14** with a listing of the APN's associated

with SPS sites that there are concerns about.

Waste Management Comment #1:

DRP (Emma Howard and Susie Tae) confirmed that once a landfill CUP expires the renewal would not be required to comply with SEA Ordinance if the renewal is for the same use and within the same footprint of the original CUP. The expansion of any landfill facility or change in use, would need to go through the County process outlined in the SEA Ordinance.

Waste Management Comment #2:

DRP (Emma Howard) confirmed that Third party projects that the County has a vested interest in, such as composting facilities, will need to go through the review process for non-county projects.

Waste Management Comment #3:

DRP (Emma Howard) indicated that she was not aware of any agreements that landfills would be excluded from the SEA boundaries. If there was any documentation to this effect, DRP has requested that it be sent along to them.

See Waste Management Comment #1 above for more information on how CUP's for Landfills would be processed.

DRP (Emma Howard) informed DPW to provide her with a listing of the APN's for County Landfill facilities that have been flagged as being a potential issue.

**Action Items:**

**DPW (Chris Sheppard – EPD):** Provide an APN listing to DRP/LDD by **2/26/14** of any Landfills in question.

Development Services Comment #1:

DPW expressed concerns about the maintenance and design of required wildlife crossings.

DRP (Emma Howard) indicated that the Program Guide may be a good place to elaborate on wildlife crossing design and maintenance.

DRP will consult with those (biologists?) that typically look at and require wildlife crossings and what their recommendations are.

**Action Items:**

**DRP:** Will work on revised language in the Program Guide addressing maintenance/design concerns.

**DPW – All Divisions:** Review the Program Guide draft located here [http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/sea/SEA\\_Program\\_Guide\\_Prelim\\_Draft\\_Dec2013\\_\(3\).pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/sea/SEA_Program_Guide_Prelim_Draft_Dec2013_(3).pdf) and provide recommendations (to LDD by **2/26/14**) to incorporate information that addresses specific concerns or establishes specific guidelines pertinent to each reviewing Division. A separate email will be sent to DPW Divisions formally soliciting Divisional Comments however the above link leads to the document so your review can commence. As discussed at the meeting, comments on the Program Guide should take into consideration providing a listing of DPW activities that would be considered "Emergency Activities", and also recommend procedures that can be established for when projects need to go through the SEA process and be submitted to DRP for review. In addition, the program guide would be a good place to expand on the design/maintenance responsibilities of the wildlife crossings.

Development Services Comment #2:

DRP indicated that both the SEA Ordinance and the Hillside Ordinance would be adopted together and that Section 22.56.215 as it existed prior to the adoption of the Ordinance would still remain "~~on the books~~" ~~at as reference within~~ DRP and therefore the wording in the new Ordinance makes sense.

DPW Commenter (Matthew Dubiel – LDD) satisfied.

Development Services Comment #3:

**Action Items:**

DRP: will address this comment in Version 5 of the Ordinance.

Development Services Comment #4:

DRP indicated they will address this comment in Version 5 of the Ordinance taking into consideration the discussions that were held at the meeting regarding the County not being subject to a CUP process.

**Action Items:**

DRP: will address this comment in Version 5 of the Ordinance.

Transportation Comment #1:

DPW and DRP agreed that the SEA Ordinance would have a broad approach in establishing requirements for County projects and any exemptions. Specific guidelines applicable to DPW activities would be addressed through the SEA Program Guide. This will provide the ultimate flexibility to have a dynamic Ordinance in which modifications, revisions and incorporations could be made (to the Program Guide) without changing the original Ordinance.

Although it was noted that the Ordinance should have a broad approach, the group agreed that the following activities should be listed as being exempted in Section 22.52.2910:

Removal or thinning of vegetation/trees for fire/**Public/roadway/bridge** safety or in response to an emergency;

Operations and maintenance of flood, **water supply**, water conservation, and roadway infrastructure that includes the removal or thinning of vegetation/trees; or

Hazard management activities in response to emergency or other public safety concerns *including maintenance, preservation, or restoration of existing roadways, bridges, or flood protection facilities involving adjacent slopes, shoulders, drains, and appurtenant structures (e.g., guardrail, rail and timber walls, head walls, etc.) located near or within dedicated public right of way or associated easements.*

Operation and maintenance of a public water system, including replacement of facilities.

In addition, Section 22.52.2915, Permitted Uses, Subsection D, page 14 of 46 should be modified as follows:

D. Development to be undertaken by the County the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, or other Special District excluding maintenance activities, in accordance with the procedures provided in Section 22.52.2955.

**Action Items:**

DRP: will address these comments in Version 5 of the Ordinance.

Transportation Comment #2:

DRP (Emma Howard) reported that she doesn't have a response yet and will follow-up when she does.

**Action Items:**

DRP: Will follow-up with response to DPW's concern.

Transportation Comment #3:

**DPW – Ron Castaneda:** I don't recall that there was a conclusion reached on this item. Were you satisfied with the discussions that took place regarding this?

## Hillside Management Ordinance (DPW Comment Memo dated February 18, 2014):

Link to latest Draft released to the Public by DRP:

[http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/HMA\\_Ordinance\\_Draft\\_Oct2013.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/HMA_Ordinance_Draft_Oct2013.pdf) -

Link to DPW Draft Comment Letter dated 02/10/14: [P:\ldpub\General\DRP - DPW Coordination Meeting\Hillside Management Ordinance\2014-02-18\\_Draft Hillside Management Area Ordinance - DPW COMMENTS.pdf](P:\ldpub\General\DRP - DPW Coordination Meeting\Hillside Management Ordinance\2014-02-18_Draft Hillside Management Area Ordinance - DPW COMMENTS.pdf) Please note these comments are for the October 17, 2013 Draft Ordinance

### General Comment #1 (Discussion regarding how this affects Public Facilities):

DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated that DPW activities/projects would only need to be in substantial compliance with the Hillside Design Guidelines which indicates that two Best Practices in each Section (for projects less than 10 acres) and three Best Practices in each Section (for projects more than 10 acres). She also indicated that DRP has already begun to revise the October 2013 Draft to indicate that if any of the sections of the Guidelines do not apply to a particular project or activity, this can be regarded as compliance with that particular Section (A Sediment Placement Site will not need to comply with the BMP's listed under "Building Design" Section of the Guidelines.).

DRP (Susie Tae) indicated that the Guidelines are also being revised to state that hillside project should meet the BMP's instead of the current draft which indicates that hillside projects must meet the BMP's listed in the Guidelines.

DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated that DRP would be open to the idea of DPW suggesting BMP's that could be met for Public Works projects so that they could be added into the Guidelines.

### **Action Items:**

**DPW: All Divisions** that would like to add in BMP's to the Hillside Guidelines Manual that would benefit your Divisions projects please send them to Matthew Dubiel of Land Development Division by **2/26/14**.

### Water Resources Comment #1

This was a comment from DPW-FMD. Art Vander Vis of DPW-FMD indicated that Army Corps regulations require certain facilities, mainly levees and debris dams, to be vegetation free and therefore there is concern regarding meeting the BMP requirements in the Landscaping Section of the Guidelines. DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated that the Landscaping Section in the guidelines contains other requirements that could possibly be met such as avoiding oak tree encroachments. DPW Commenter (FMD) was satisfied.

### Water Resources Comment #2

In addition to the modifications listed in the comment memo it was suggested by Dan Lafferty of DPW-WWD that "Special Districts" be added to modification in the Comment memo. Therefore the revised paragraph should read:

"d. Development to be undertaken by the County, *the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, or other Special District* provided that such development complies with the following procedure: The lead County department *or District* shall prepare a written report that documents substantial compliance with the Hillside Design Guidelines. This report shall be included as part of the development's publicly available documents and included as part of any subsequent project reports to the Board of Supervisors and its attendant commissions. A report shall not be required for maintenance activities or any activities listed in Subsection i, below."

### Water Resources Comment #3

DRP (Brianna Menke and Susie Tae) indicated that work within already-started sediment placement sites such as May and Lincoln that already have fill plans approved through a CUP process would NOT be required to comply with this new ordinance.

DPW Commenter (Art Vander Vis – FMD and Patricia Wood – WRD) were satisfied.

### Water Resources Comment #4

DPW (Patricia Wood-WRD) expressed concern that recently Board acquired land for the purpose of establishing SPS sites would need to comply with the Hillside Guidelines.

DPW (Steve Burger-LDD) indicated that Skyline would need to comply but in looking at the lists in the

guidelines it should be doable. In addition Art Vander Vis of FMD indicated that since some of the categories of the Guidelines don't apply to a SPS site (such as Building Design) it is not expected that SPS sites would need to comply with this given the information DRP presented.

#### Water Resources Comment #5

Art Vander Vis of DPW-FMD provided a description (to DRP) of the process behind the timing of the filling of a SPS.

DRP (Susie Tae) indicated that the ultimate fill plans would be the plan that would need to comply with the Guidelines (not the interim fill plans). This is similar to the process at landfills.

DPW Commenter (Art Vander Vis – FMD and Patricia Wood – WRD) were satisfied.

#### Transportation Comment #1

DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated this comment will be addressed as noted in next Draft. DPW Commenter (Brian Smith – GMED) was not present but the group was satisfied.

#### Transportation Comment #2

DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated this comment will be addressed as noted in next Draft. DPW Commenter (Brian Smith – GMED) was not present but the group was satisfied.

#### Transportation Comment #3

DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated this comment will be addressed through the use of a figure/graphics being added to the document materials. DPW Commenter (Brian Smith – GMED) was not present but the group was satisfied.

#### Transportation Comment #4

After discussion between Steve Burger of DPW-LDD and Susie Tae of DRP this comment would no longer apply.

#### Transportation Comment #5

DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated that we would have the opportunity to review the open spaces proposed on a project since DPW would be reviewing the site plan/map for the project. DPW Commenter (Brian Smith – GMED) was not present but the group was satisfied.

#### Transportation Comment #6

DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated this comment will be addressed as noted in next Draft. DPW Commenter (Brian Smith – GMED) was not present but the group was satisfied.

#### Transportation Comment #7

Steve Burger of DPW-LDD indicated that this item was taken care of through our discussion regarding Transportation Comment #5 above. All present were satisfied.

#### Transportation Comment #8

Discussions took place as to if the definition of "maintenance" would need to be further defined in the Hillside Management Area Ordinance. It was mutually decided that it should and Comment 8 should still apply with the additions as noted below:

Removal or thinning of vegetation/*trees* for fire/**Public/roadway/bridge** safety (including under bridge hydraulic vegetation reduction) or in response to an emergency;

*Operations and maintenance of flood, **water supply**, water conservation, and roadway infrastructure that includes the removal or thinning of vegetation/trees; or*

Hazard management activities in response to emergency or other public safety concerns *including maintenance, preservation, or restoration of existing roadways, bridges, or flood protection facilities involving adjacent slopes, shoulders, drains, and appurtenant structures (e.g., guardrail, rail and timber walls, head walls, etc.) located near or within dedicated public right of way or associated easements."*

#### Development Services Comment #1

DRP indicated that both the SEA Ordinance and the Hillside Ordinance would be adopted together and that Section 22.56.215 as it existed prior to the adoption of the Ordinance would still remain “~~on the books~~” ~~at as reference within~~ ~~DRP~~ and therefore the wording in the new Ordinance makes sense. DPW Commenter (Matthew Dubiel – LDD) satisfied.

#### **Overall Action Item:**

**DRP:** Revise HMA Ordinance/Guidelines given DPW comments and resubmit through the e-consultation process for further DPW review.

## **Hillside Design Guidelines (DPW Comment Memo dated February 10, 2014):**

**Link to latest Draft released to the Public by DRP:**

[http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/HMA\\_DesignGuidelines\\_Draft\\_2013Oct.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/HMA_DesignGuidelines_Draft_2013Oct.pdf)

**Link to DPW Draft Comment Letter dated 02/10/14:** <P:\ldpub\General\DRP - DPW Coordination>

[Meeting\Hillside Design Guidelines\2014-02-10\\_Hillside Design Guidelines\\_2013 Draft version, DPW DRAFT Comments.pdf](#) Please note these comments are for the 2013 Draft Hillside Guidelines

#### General Comment #1 (Discussion regarding how this affects Public Facilities):

DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated that DPW activities/projects would only need to be in substantial compliance with the Hillside Design Guidelines which indicates that two Best Practices in each Section (for projects less than 10 acres) and three Best Practices in each Section (for projects more than 10 acres). She also indicated that DRP has already begun to revise the October 2013 Draft to indicate that if any of the sections of the Guidelines do not apply to a particular project or activity, this can be regarded as compliance with that particular Section (A Sediment Placement Site will not need to comply with the BMP's listed under “Building Design” Section of the Guidelines.).

DRP (Susie Tae) indicated that the Guidelines are also being revised to state that hillside project should meet the BMP's instead of the current draft which indicates that hillside projects must meet the BMP's listed in the Guidelines.

DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated that DRP would be open to the idea of DPW suggesting BMP's that could be met for Public Works projects so that they could be added into the Guidelines.

#### **Action Items:**

**DPW: All Divisions** that would like to add in BMP's to the Hillside Guidelines Manual that would benefit your Divisions projects please send them to Matthew Dubiel of Land Development Division by **2/26/14**.

#### Water Resources Comment #1

This was a comment from DPW-FMD. Art Vander Vis of DPW-FMD indicated that Army Corps regulations require certain facilities, mainly levees and debris dams, to be vegetation free and therefore there is concern regarding meeting the BMP requirements in the Landscaping Section of the Guidelines. DRP (Brianna Menke) indicated that the Landscaping Section in the guidelines contains other requirements that could possibly be met such as avoiding oak tree encroachments. DPW Commenter (FMD) was satisfied.

#### Water Resources Comment #2 through #6, Transportation Comments #1 through #8, Development Services Comments 1 through 8:

DRP indicated that they will take these comments and mesh them in with other comments received.

#### Development Services Comment #9:

Steve Burger of DPW-LDD indicated that this comment shouldn't apply anymore because a caveat does exist in the Guidelines that indicates “if approved by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works”.

**Overall Action Item:**

**DRP:** Revise HMA Ordinance/Guidelines given DPW comments and resubmit through the e-consultation process for further DPW review.

**Renewable Energy Ordinance (DPW Comment Memo dated November 18, 2013):**

**Link to the latest Draft released the Public by DRP:**

[http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/REOV7\\_public100313.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/REOV7_public100313.pdf)

**Link to DPW Comment Letter dated 11/18/13:** - [P:\ldpub\General\ORDINANCE UPDATES\ORD\\_Renewable\\_Energy\\_Ordinance\2013-11-18\\_Renewable\\_Energy\\_Ordinance - July 2013 DPW Comments.pdf](P:\ldpub\General\ORDINANCE UPDATES\ORD_Renewable_Energy_Ordinance\2013-11-18_Renewable_Energy_Ordinance_-_July_2013_DPW_Comments.pdf)

Please note these comments are for the July 2013 Draft Ordinance. The October 2013 Draft that was released to the Public does NOT incorporate DPW comments however we have been informed that DRP plans to incorporate our comments into a February/March 2014 Draft release.

Transportation Comment #1:

DRP indicated that they believe the Ordinance already addresses this comment. Although the DPW Commenter (Jason Morgan – AVI) was not present at the meeting during this particular discussion item, LDD staff (Matthew Dubiel) informed DRP that this item would need to be added in to further define what is already in the Ordinance. The Ordinance should indicate what the requirements for the FAA rules are ---simply just sending it to the FAA for comment is not enough.

Waste Management Comment #1

DRP indicated there was no intention of adding the individual types of renewable energy types but rather just add in “any future technologies”. It was agreed by the group that the known technologies would be listed along with “or any other future renewable technologies”. DPW Commenter (Chris Sheppard – EPD) satisfied.

Development Services Comment #1 through #5

DRP indicated they will implement comments as written. DPW Commenter (Matthew Dubiel – LDD) satisfied.

Development Services Comment #6

After group discussion this comment should be modified to:

"H. Transmission lines: Transmission lines shall be placed underground to the satisfaction of Public Works and Regional Planning except where above-ground ~~right-of-way~~ crossings are required: *A franchise agreement will be required for distribution/transmission facilities within the public right of way.*"

Development Services Comment #7 through #9:

**Action Item:**

**DRP:** After group discussion DRP will work on definition of Grading and propose something that addresses concern. Steve Burger (DPW-LDD) indicated that the definition should mention that any mechanical disturbance that removes the root system (with the exception of access roads, debris basins, and inverter pads) would be considered grading (within the context of this Ordinance) but this should be run by DRP's biologist.

Development Services Comment #10

DRP indicated they will implement comments as written. DPW Commenter (Matthew Dubiel – LDD) satisfied.

**Overall Action Item:**

**DRP:** Revise Renewable Energy Ordinance given DPW comments and resubmit through the e-consultation process for further DPW review.

Matthew Dubiel, P.E.  
County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Land Development Division, Subdivision Mapping Section,  
CIP/CEQA/B&T Planning Unit

☎ (626) 458-1921 📠 (626) 458-1919

[Please click here to take our customer service survey](#)

