

1.0 INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

This introduction is intended to provide the reader with general information regarding: (1) the purpose of an environmental impact report (EIR); (2) standards for EIR adequacy; (3) an introduction to the format and content of this EIR; and (4) the EIR processing requirements for the proposed project. Environmental documents can be confusing; so, this section is provided to educate the reader regarding the intent, format, and content of this EIR so that it can be more useful.

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PLANNING PROCESS

One Valley One Vision (OVOV) is a joint effort between the City of Santa Clarita (City), the County of Los Angeles (County), and Santa Clarita Valley (Valley) residents and businesses to create a single vision and guidelines for the future growth of the Valley and the preservation of natural resources. Realizing that development within both jurisdictions can have regional implications, the City and County have jointly endeavored to prepare planning policies and guidelines to guide future development within the Santa Clarita Valley. The result of this work effort will require the adoption of two separate documents. The City will adopt a new General Plan and EIR to update the City's 1991 General Plan, while the County will adopt a new Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan to replace the 1990 Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan and prepare its separate EIR. This EIR has been prepared to evaluate the potential impacts of the goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.

In 2000, the City and County kicked off Phase I of the OVOV process by conducting a series of citizen and stakeholder workshops to solicit feedback from the community regarding their vision for the future of the Santa Clarita Valley. Phase II (2001) of the OVOV process included development of a community-guided Vision Statement and Guiding Principles. The Vision Statement and 35 Guiding Principles developed during Phase II, served as tools to guide the development of the General Plan goals and policies and the General Plan Land Use Map.

Phase III (2002–2004) of the OVOV process included the compilation of technical background reports (TBRs) that served as a starting point to evaluate future buildout of the OVOV Planning Area by providing a snapshot of current population, jobs, housing, infrastructure, community services, health and safety, and environmental conditions within the OVOV Planning Area. Phase IV (2005–2008) of the OVOV process culminated in the preparation of the preferred land use plan for the planning area in

coordination with areawide circulation planning. Phases V and VI will complete the preparation of the various state-mandated elements and this program EIR.

The OVOV planning process reflects the City's and County's mutual decision to coordinate land uses and the pace of development with provision of adequate infrastructure, conservation of natural resources, and common objectives for the Valley. Major goals of the OVOV joint planning effort were to achieve greater cooperation between the City and the County; coordinated planning for roadways, infrastructure, and resource management; and enhanced quality of life for all who live and work in the Santa Clarita Valley.

Public Participation/Community Outreach

General Plan

The OVOV project included comprehensive public outreach during all stages of the planning process. Community participation was solicited through surveys, meetings and workshops, mailings, maintenance of an informational website, stakeholder interviews, children's and youth activities, visioning workshops, outreach to Spanish-speaking residents through meetings and personal contact, placement of door-hangers, bus-shelter advertising, newspaper advertisements, the Valley Congress, correspondence, and public hearings (**Table 1.0-1**). An initial year-long public participation process resulted in formulation of community recommendations for the future of the Valley. A list of agencies and parties contacted during this planning process is provided in **Table 1.0-1** of this EIR. Updates on OVOV process are available on the City's Web site <http://www.santa-clarita.com/ovov/> which includes information on the project background, draft elements, upcoming meetings, monthly newsletters, maps, and documents.

**Table 1.0-1
Community Outreach and Public Meetings**

| Meetings | Date held |
|---|-------------------|
| Community | |
| Placerita Canyon Property Owner's Association | June 29, 2009 |
| Calgrove Corridor Coalition | April 27, 2009 |
| Calgrove Corridor Coalition | February, 9, 2009 |
| Workshop – Castaic Elementary School | November 17, 2008 |
| Workshop – Pinetree Elementary School | November 13, 2008 |
| Workshop – Rancho Pico Junior High | November 10, 2008 |
| Workshop – Santa Clarita Sports Complex | November 6, 2008 |
| Public Scoping Meeting OVOV EIR | August 4, 2008 |
| Housing Element Community Workshop | July 22, 2008 |
| Town Hall Update and Overview | May 17, 2007 |
| Town Hall Update and Overview | May 14, 2007 |
| Town Hall Update and Overview | May 10, 2007 |
| Town Hall Update and Overview | May 7, 2007 |
| Valley Congress | October 25, 2001 |
| General Plan Visioning Workshop | May 23, 2001 |
| General Plan Community Workshop | May 14, 2001 |
| General Plan Community Workshop | May 10, 2001 |
| General Plan Community Workshop | May 9, 2001 |
| General Plan Community Workshop | April 30, 2001 |
| Issues & Vision Workshops | April 11, 2001 |
| Issues & Vision Workshops | April 3, 2001 |
| Issues & Vision Workshops | March 3, 2001 |
| Kick-off Flapjack Breakfast | January 27, 2001 |
| City Council | |
| Overview Presentation | January 14, 2009 |
| Award Contract to Austin Foust for Traffic Study | March 11, 2008 |
| Presentation and update | October 14, 2003 |
| Appropriate funds from County | March 11, 2003 |
| Contract Awarded for Phase III | May 14, 2002 |
| City Council approved the Vision & Guiding Principles | December 11, 2001 |
| Contract Awarded for Phase II | March 13, 2001 |
| Contract Awarded for Phase I OVOV | July 11, 2000 |

| Meetings | Date held |
|---|--------------------|
| Presentation to the Regional Planning Commission | February 25, 2009 |
| City Planning Commission | |
| Presentation and update | October 7, 2003 |
| Presentation of Vision and Guiding Principles | November 20, 2001 |
| Presentation and update | April 17, 2001 |
| City Planning Commission Study Sessions | |
| Economic Development | March 16, 2010 |
| Noise Element | February 17, 2009 |
| Housing Element | November 18, 2008 |
| Circulation Element | October 21, 2008 |
| Land Use Element | July 15, 2008 |
| Conservation and Open Space Element | June 17, 2008 |
| Safety Element | April 15, 2008 |
| Update and Overview, Planning Commission | July 17, 2007 |
| Update and Overview, Joint City Council/Planning Commission | June 7, 2005 |
| Update and Overview, City Council | March 13, 2001 |
| Parks, Recreation and Community Services Commission Meetings | |
| Presentation | October 2, 2003 |
| Presentation | May 3, 2001 |
| Presentation Vision and Guiding Principles | November 1, 2001 |
| Stakeholder Interviews/Presentations to and/or meetings with local organizations, agencies | |
| Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) | September 11, 2008 |
| County Sanitation Districts | July 23, 2008 |
| CLWA | July 10, 2008 |
| Building Industrial Association | July 9, 2008 |
| Building Industrial Association | June 11, 2008 |
| Newhall Redevelopment Committee | June 2, 2008 |
| CLWA | May 9, 2008 |
| Newhall Redevelopment Committee | May 5, 2008 |
| Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society | March 24, 2008 |
| Water Purveyors | May 16, 2007 |
| Elementary School Superintendent's Meeting | May 2007 |
| Realtors' Association | October 28, 2003 |
| Valley Industrial Association | October 24, 2003 |
| Newhall Redevelopment Committee | October 6, 2003 |
| Acton Town Council | October 6, 2003 |
| Canyon Country Advisory Committee | September 25, 2003 |

| Meetings | Date held |
|--|--------------------|
| CLWA | September 24, 2003 |
| SCV Chamber of Commerce | September 16, 2003 |
| Elementary School Superintendent's Meeting | September 12, 2003 |
| Saugus Action Committee | September 11, 2003 |
| Building Industrial Association | September 10, 2003 |
| Castaic Town Council | August 25, 2003 |
| Castaic Area Town Council | April 23, 2002 |
| Santa Clarita Valley Trails Advisory Committee | February 28, 2002 |
| Building Industrial Association | October 10, 2001 |
| SCV Chamber of Commerce Legislative Committee | October 9, 2001 |
| Realtors' Breakfast | October 9, 2001 |
| Water Board Meeting | September 26, 2001 |
| SCOPE | September 20, 2001 |
| Canyon Country Better Than Ever | September 20, 2001 |
| Castaic Town Council | September 19, 2001 |
| SCV Chamber of Commerce | September 18, 2001 |
| Acton Town Council | September 17, 2001 |
| Saugus Spirit Committee | September 13, 2001 |
| Newhall Redevelopment Committee | September 10, 2001 |
| Agua Dulce Town Council | September 5, 2001 |
| Stevenson Ranch Town Council | September 5, 2001 |
| Newhall Redevelopment Committee | August 6, 2001 |
| Rotary | May 23, 2001 |
| Principals' Luncheon | May 17, 2001 |
| Various Community Representatives | August 10, 2000 |
| County trails and parks representatives | August 10, 2000 |
| Media representatives | August 10, 2000 |
| Various elected and appointed | August 9, 2000 |
| Various reps from development community | August 9, 2000 |
| Various members of community service organizations | August 9, 2000 |
| Various members of utility companies | August 9, 2000 |
| Various Community Representatives | August 9, 2000 |

EIR

To determine which environmental topics should be addressed in this EIR, the City of Santa Clarita prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) from July 25, 2008, through December 31, 2008, in order to receive input from interested public agencies and private parties. On August 4, 2008, a scoping meeting was held at City Hall. The NOP and scoping meeting are discussed further under the heading **Format and Content** of this section.

PURPOSE OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Subsequent to the passage of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 1970, a process was established that would (1) inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potentially significant environmental effects of proposed activities; (2) identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced; (3) prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible; and (4) disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.¹ This information is the basis of any EIR.

EIR ADEQUACY

The principal use of an EIR is to provide input and information for comprehensive planning analysis. The staff reports prepared by City staff synthesize pertinent environmental and planning information for presentation to the City of Santa Clarita Planning Commission and City Council. Given the important role of the EIR in this planning and decision-making process, it is imperative that the information presented in the EIR be factual, adequate, and complete. The standards for adequacy of an EIR, defined in Section 15151 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, are as follows:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

¹ State of California, *State CEQA Guidelines*, as amended July 11, 2006, Section 15002(a) of the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3.

This EIR has been prepared by the City of Santa Clarita in accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines* and City guidelines for the implementation of CEQA.

Type of EIR and Level of Analysis Detail

CEQA provides a lead agency with the flexibility to prepare different types of EIRs, and to employ different procedural means to focus environmental analysis on the issues appropriate for decision at each level of environmental review (Public Resources Code Section 21093(a)). CEQA provides that the “degree of specificity required in an EIR will correspond to the degree of specificity involved in the underlying activity which is described in the EIR” (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15146).

This EIR can be classified as a “program EIR.” A program EIR is an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either geographically; as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions; in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways. The program EIR enables an agency to examine the overall effects of the proposed course of action and to take steps to avoid unnecessary adverse environmental effects. According to Section 15168 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the program EIR will be most helpful in dealing with subsequent activities if it deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible. With a good and detailed analysis of the program, many subsequent activities could be found to be within the scope of the project described in the program EIR, and no further environmental documents would be required.

This program EIR evaluates the broad-scale impacts of the City’s proposed General Plan. A General Plan EIR, addressing the potential impacts of the City’s goals, objectives, and policies can be thought of as a “first tier” document. It evaluates the large-scale impacts on the environment that can be expected to result from the adoption of the General Plan, but does not necessarily address the site-specific impacts that each of the individual development projects that will follow and implement the General Plan may have. CEQA requires each of those subsequent development projects to be evaluated for their particular site-specific impacts. These site-specific analyses are typically encompassed in second-tier documents, such as project EIRs, focused EIRs, and mitigated negative declarations on individual development projects subject to the General Plan, which typically evaluate the impacts of a single activity undertaken to implement the overall plan. The program EIR can be incorporated by reference into subsequent documents to focus on new or site-specific impacts.

This EIR anticipates a series of actions needed to achieve the implementation of the proposed General Plan. Further actions or procedures required to allow implementation of the proposed General Plan

include the processing of specific plans, tentative tract maps, site design plans, building permits, and grading permits.

EIR FORMAT AND CONTENT

Report Format

This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the environmental review requirements established under CEQA (1970, as amended), the *State CEQA Guidelines* for implementation of CEQA as prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research and adopted by the Secretary for Resources, and City of Santa Clarita guidelines for implementation of CEQA. The City of Santa Clarita *Local CEQA Guidelines* (Resolution 05-38), adopted on April 26, 2005, also serve as the basis for identifying thresholds to determine the significance of the environmental effects of a project and have been included for analysis in the appropriate resource sections.

The City's CEQA guidelines for thresholds of significance are as follows:

Traffic increases at any location where the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio increases more than two percentage points (0.02) and where the final ratio is less than 89 percent (0.89); Level of Service E).

Traffic increases at any location where the V/C ratio increases more than one percentage point (0.01) and where the final ratio is 90 percent (0.90); Level of Service F or greater.

Removal of any heritage oak trees, as defined in Unified Development Code Section 17:17.090, removal of more than five (5) oak trees for a project on a site that has an existing single-family residence, or the removal of more than three (3) oak trees, proposed as part of any other project.

Disturbance of, or encroachment into, any river, river tributary, riparian habitat, stream or similar waterway identified on a United States Geologic Survey map as a "blue-line" watercourse, or any waterway otherwise identified as a significant resource by the City of Santa Clarita.

Disturbance of any habitat known or suspected to contain a plant or animal species, listed as endangered on such Federal and/or State lists.

Movement or grading of earth exceeding 100,000 cubic yards.

Disturbance to any Significant Ecological Area (SEA) as identified by the City of Santa Clarita.

*Changes to the topography of a Primary or Secondary Ridgeline.**

Exceedance of the most recent air quality thresholds as determined by the South Coast Air Quality Management District, as published in its "[Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook](#)."

**Subsequent to the adoption of Resolution 05-38, the City has modified its hillside guidelines to consider any changes to primary ridgelines as significant.*

Among the principal objectives of CEQA is that the environmental review process be a public one, and that the EIR be an informational document for governmental decision makers and the public about potential significant environmental effects of proposed activities.

Although the legally required contents of a program EIR are the same as those for a project EIR, in practice there are considerable differences in level of detail. Program EIRs are typically more conceptual and abstract. They contain a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures. The program EIR for a city the size of Santa Clarita is not intended to be site-specific but is a more broad analysis. For example, the traffic analysis determines whether the roadway widths proposed in the General Plan Circulation Element will accommodate the planned land uses. The program EIR does not, however, determine the fair share roadway improvements for individual development projects. These fair-share improvements, which development will be responsible to build or pay for, will be determined during subsequent environmental review on a case-by-case basis.

The environmental impact analysis presented in this EIR is divided into 19 major sections within **Section 3.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**, which describe the existing conditions present in the area surrounding the project site, predict the potential individual and cumulative impacts attributable to the proposed project, present mitigation measures that are intended to minimize or avoid significant impacts caused by the proposed project, and identify the significant impacts which would occur after implementation of mitigation measures.

Report Content

Notice of Preparation

To determine which environmental topics should be addressed in this EIR, the City of Santa Clarita prepared and circulated an NOP from July 25, 2008, through December 31, 2008. An NOP is a notice that the lead agency (the City) plans to prepare an EIR for a project. The NOP is circulated in order to receive input from interested public agencies (e.g., responsible and trustee agencies) and private parties on the EIR. Per *State CEQA Guidelines*, an NOP is to be circulated for 30 days, allowing agencies and the public to provide the lead agency with specific detail about the scope and content of the environmental information. Per the public's request, the City extended the circulation of the NOP to December 31, 2008, allowing for approximately five months of public input on the EIR content. A list of the letters and comments submitted during the NOP comment period are provided in **Table 1.0-2**, located at the end of this chapter. Included in **Table 1.0-2** is the location of where the comments are addressed in the EIR. A copy of the letters and comments received during the NOP comment period are provided in **Appendix 1.0**.

Scoping Meeting

In compliance with *State CEQA Guidelines*, the City held a scoping meeting on August 4, 2008, at City Hall to solicit comments and to inform the public of the proposed General Plan EIR. The notes taken at the scoping meeting are provided in **Table 1.0-3**, located at the end of this chapter. Included in **Table 1.0-3** is the location of where the comments are addressed in the EIR.

Topics Addressed in the EIR

The following topics are addressed in this document:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Global Climate Change
- Biological Resources
- Community Services
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Human-Made Hazards
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Parks and Recreation
- Water Services
- Transportation and Circulation
- Utilities and Infrastructure

In addition to these technical sections, other important information is incorporated as part of this EIR. As required by CEQA, this EIR also includes a (1) description of the existing environmental and regulatory setting; (2) description of the goals, objectives, and policies developed to incorporate the Vision Statement and 35 Guiding Principles for the proposed buildout of the City (included in the **Project Description** section); (3) a description and analysis of alternatives that can reduce the proposed project's impact potential (included in the **Alternatives** section); and, (4) sections that summarize cumulative, long-term, and irreversible effects associated with the proposed project.

Documents referred to, referenced or cited, are incorporated by reference and are available for review at the City of Santa Clarita, Community Development Department, 23920 Valencia Boulevard, Suite 140, Santa Clarita, California 91355.

INTENDED USES

The City is the lead agency for the purposes of CEQA because it has the principal responsibility for deciding whether or not to approve the General Plan and how it will be implemented. The City will use the EIR to consider the environmental effects, mitigation measures, and alternatives, when reviewing the

proposed General Plan approval. The EIR will serve as the CEQA compliance document for adoption of the General Plan. The program EIR will help determine the need for subsequent documentation.

EIR PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS

The City of Santa Clarita Community Development Department directed and supervised the preparation of the draft EIR. During preparation of the draft EIR, many informal documentation reviews were held with City staff. The draft EIR will also be circulated for a 90-day public review period (an additional 15 days of review to the CEQA 45-day review mandate). During the 60-day review period, written comments concerning the adequacy of the document may be submitted by all interested public agencies and private parties to the City of Santa Clarita, 23920 Valencia Boulevard, Suite 302, Santa Clarita, California 91355; Attention: Jason Smisko, Senior Planner (One Valley One Vision).

During and after the 90-day public review and comment period, public hearings will be held before the City of Santa Clarita Planning Commission regarding the proposed General Plan document and program EIR. Following the public hearing(s), written responses to all written comments will be compiled into a final EIR. As required by CEQA, responses to comments submitted by public agencies will be distributed to those agencies for review 10 days prior to consideration of the final EIR. At the conclusion of the EIR public hearing process, the Planning Commission will vote on whether to recommend certification of the adequacy of the EIR to the City of Santa Clarita City Council and to recommend approval of the proposed OVOV General Plan. The recommendation will then be presented to the City Council who will decide what action to take with respect to the EIR, the OVOV General Plan and other requested changes or actions.

SUMMARY OF NOP COMMENTS

This section provides a summary of the NOP comments received by the City and County during the NOP period, which began on July 25, 2008, and ended on December 31, 2008. These comments are provided in **Table 1.0-2, Summary of NOP Comments and Location of Where the Comment is Addressed in the Draft EIR.** **Table 1.0-2** also includes comments received by the City and County during the month of January 2009. This tabled summary of comments and responses is not required by the *State CEQA Guidelines* nor is it the City's or County's usual practice to include such a table in the preparation of their EIRs.

The NOP comments are presented in the order of federal agencies, state agencies, local agencies, local groups, and individuals. The responses in **Table 1.0-2** are not intended to provide complete responses to the corresponding comment. The responses to comments are intended to be brief and to direct the reader to the appropriate section of the EIR or General Plan Element where comments are addressed in greater detail.

**Table 1.0-2
Summary of NOP Comments and Location of Where the
Comment is Addressed in the Draft EIR**

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|--|-------------|---|---|
| Federal Agencies | | | |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency dated August 18, 2008 | | | |
| | 1 | All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., Flood Zones A, AO, AH, AE, and A1 through A30 as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation level in accordance with the effective Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). | This concern is addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality , of the draft EIR. |
| | 2 | If the area of construction is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the FIRM, any <i>development</i> must not increase base flood elevation levels. A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis must be performed <i>prior</i> to the start of development, and must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels. No rise is permitted within regulatory floodways. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality , of the draft EIR. |
| | 3 | All buildings constructed within a coastal high hazard area, (any of the "V" Flood Zones as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated on pilings and columns, so that the lowest horizontal structural member, (excluding the pilings and columns), is elevated to or above the base flood elevation level. In addition, the posts and pilings foundation and the structure attached thereto, is anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and water loads acting simultaneously on all building components. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality , of the draft EIR. |
| | 4 | Upon completion of any development that changes existing Special Flood Hazard Areas, the NFIP directs all participating communities to submit the appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic data to FEMA for a FIRM revision. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality , of the draft EIR. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary |
|--|-------------|--|
| State Agencies | | |
| Native American Heritage Commission dated July 31, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center (CHRIS) to adequately assess project-related impacts on historical resources. Please see Section 3.8, Cultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | 2 | Contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NACH) for a Sacred Lands File. Please see Section 3.8, Cultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | 3 | Also, we recommend that you contact the Native American contacts on the attached list to get their input on the effect of potential project (e.g., APE) impact. Please see Section 3.8, Cultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | 4 | Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence. This concern is addressed in Section 3.8, Cultural Resources , of the draft EIR |
| | 5 | Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archaeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American Monitor, with knowledge of cultural resources, are recommended to monitor all ground-breaking construction activities. This concern is addressed in Section 3.8, Cultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | 6 | Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifact, in consultation with culturally affiliated tribes. This concern is addressed in Section 3.8, Cultural Resources , of the draft EIR |
| | 7 | Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains or unmarked cemeteries in their mitigation plans. This concern is addressed in Section 3.8, Cultural Resources , of the draft EIR |
| | 8 | Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15370 when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning or execution. This concern is addressed in Section 3.8, Cultural Resources , of the draft EIR |

| Comment | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| Governor's Office of Emergency Services dated August 1, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | In preparing the General Plan and accompanying draft EIR, the city should examine the sections of state planning law that involve potential hazards the city may face. For your information, I have underlined specific sections of state planning law where identification and analysis of hazards are discussed (see Attachment A). |
| | 2 | A table in the draft EIR (or General Plan) which identifies these specific issues, and where they are addressed in the General Plan would be helpful in demonstrating the city has complied with these requirements. (state planning law). |
| | 3 | If the draft EIR determines that state planning law requirements have not been met, it should recommend that these issues be addressed in the General Plan as a mitigation measure. |
| Office of Agricultural Commissioner dated August 8, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | The scope and content of the One Valley One Vision EIRs should include identifying the classes of farmland soils, their locations, and the number of acres of each class that are intended to be converted to non-agricultural uses. |
| | 2 | The EIR may propose mitigation measures that can be uniformly applied. The Ventura County Agricultural Commissioner's Office is currently evaluating proposals for standard mitigation measures from existing uniformly applied policies that limit the loss of agricultural soils in Ventura County. Los Angeles County and City jurisdictions may have uniformly applied policies that could serve as standard mitigation measures. |
| | 3 | If the Los Angeles County and City jurisdictions deem that the amount of farmland to be converted to urban uses under One Valley One Vision is significant with unavoidable environmental effects, the EIRs should include consideration and adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA for each EIR. |
| | | This comment is addressed in the Safety Element and Section 3.15, Public Services (Police Services) , of the draft EIR. |
| | | Given the limited scope of issues and discussion in the EIR, Table 1.0-2 will serve to identify where an issue is addressed in the EIR and in which General Plan element related discussion is presented. |
| | | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | | This concern is addressed in Section 3.5, Agricultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | | The conversion of agricultural land to urban uses is a significant and unavoidable impact. If the City Council were to approve the OVOV General Plan, a Statement of Overriding Considerations must be adopted addressing this issue. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 4 | Agricultural Water. This evaluation pertains to the effects on the local area's quantity from the conversion of agricultural water to non-agricultural uses as well as on water quality in discharges and run-off. The Ventura County Initial Study Guidelines do not quantify a general significance threshold for water quantity; the evaluation is case-by-case. The significance threshold for agricultural water quality aims to identify and reduce Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) to no greater than 1200 milligrams per liter in the impact area. The Ventura County Water Resources Division also evaluates the effects of projects on this resource. The scope of the OVOV EIRs should include these subjects. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.5, Agricultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | 5 | Agricultural Air Quality and Microclimates. This evaluation pertains to increased dust or harmful emissions from new non-agricultural projects or a decrease in solar access on adjacent farmland from new tall structures. The Ventura County Initial Study Guidelines thresholds of significance for increased dust and decreased solar access are 10 percent, respectively. The Ventura County Air Pollution Control District also evaluates the effect of new projects on this resource. The scope and content of the OVOV EIR should include these subjects. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.5, Agricultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | 6 | Agricultural Pests and Diseases. The analysis considers the types of new uses that will be permitted adjacent to existing agricultural land and focuses on reducing vectors and dust from any new uses. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.5, Agricultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | 7 | Land Use Incompatibility. This evaluation pertains to the introduction of incompatible land uses adjacent to agricultural uses. The Ventura County Initial Study Guidelines consider most human intensive uses within 300 feet of irrigated agriculture to pose a significant effect on agricultural resources. Mitigation measures may include site redesign with extended setbacks and/or other measures such as fencing and vegetative screening. The Ventura County Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) policy includes an optional 150-foot extended setback with a vegetative barrier as an alternative to the policy standard 300-foot setback. The scope and content of the OVOV EIRs should include this topic. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.5, Agricultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |

| Comment | | |
|--|-----|---|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics dated August 13, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | In accordance with state law, California Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 21676 et seq., prior to the amendment of a general plan or specific plan, or the adoption or approval of a zoning ordinance or building regulation within the planning boundary established by the airport land use commission (ALUC), the local agency shall first refer the proposed action to the Los Angeles County ALUC. |
| | 2 | The proposal should also be coordinated with Agua Dulce Airpark staff to ensure its compatibility with future as well as existing airport operations. |
| | 3 | Direct conflicts between mapped land use designations in a general plan and the ALUC criteria must be eliminated. A general plan needs to include (at the very least) policies committing the county to adopt compatibility criteria essential to ensuring that such conflicts will be avoided. |
| | 4 | CEQA, Public Resources Code 21096, requires the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook) be utilized as a resource in the preparation of environmental documents for projects within airport land use compatibility plan boundaries or if such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 nautical miles of an airport. |
| | 5 | Federal and state regulations regarding aircraft noise do not establish mandatory criteria for evaluating the compatibility of proposed land use development around airports (with the exception of the 65 dB CNEL "worst case" threshold established in the State Noise Standards for the designated "noise problem" airports). For most airports in California, 65 dB CNEL is considered too high a noise level to be appropriate as a standard for land use compatibility planning. This particularly the case for evaluating new development in the vicinity of the airport. The 60 dB CNEL, or even 55 dB CNEL, may be more suitable for new development around most airports. |

Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.

Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.

Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.

Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.

This comment is addressed in the Noise Element of the General Plan.

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|--|
| | 6 | Sound insulation, buyer notification, and navigation easements are typical noise mitigation measures. These measures, however, do not change exterior aircraft noise levels. Noise mitigation measures are not a substitute for good land use compatibility planning for new development. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 7 | General Plans must include policies restricting the heights of structures to protect airport airspace. | This comment does not address the draft EIR. This issue is addressed in the Safety Element of the General Plan |
| | 8 | Education Code Section 17215 requires a school site investigation by the Division prior to acquisition of land for a proposed school site located within 2 miles of an airport runway. | Comment has been taken into consideration. |
| | 9 | Any person who intends to offer subdivided lands, common interest developments, and residential properties for sale or lease within an airport for sale or lease within an airport influence area is required to disclose that fact to the person buying the property. | Comment has been taken into consideration. |
| | 10 | Land use practices that attract or sustain hazardous wildlife populations on or near airports can significantly increase the potential for wildlife-aircraft collisions. The FAA recommends that landfills, wastewater treatment facilities, surface mining, wetlands and other uses that have the potential to attract wildlife, be restricted in the vicinity of an airport. | Comment has been taken into consideration and addressed in Section 3.1, Land Use , of this draft EIR. |
| | 11 | The protection of airports from incompatible land use encroachment is vital to California's economic future. Agua Dulce Airpark is an economic asset that should be protected through effective airport land use compatibility planning and awareness. | There are no airport influence areas in the OVOV Planning Area. |

| Comment | | |
|--|-----|---|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| Public Utilities Commission Rail Crossings Engineering Section, dated August 21, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | As the state agency responsible for rail safety within California, we recommend that the County/City add language to the General Plan update so that any future planned development adjacent to or near Metrolink's Antelope Valley Line tracks is planned with safety of the rail corridor in mind. New developments may increase traffic volumes not only on streets and at intersections, but also at at-grade highway-rail crossings. This includes considering pedestrian circulation patterns/destinations with respect to railroad right-of-way. |
| | 2 | Mitigation measures to consider include, but are not limited to, the planning for grade separations for major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade highway-rail crossings due to increase in traffic volumes and continuous vandal resistant fencing or other appropriate barriers to limit the access of trespassers onto the railroad right-of-way. |

Department of Transportation dated August 28, 2008

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | 1 | Given that the Los Angeles County's Congestion Management Program debit and credit system has been suspended, we recommend the County consider an alternate local funding plan towards regional transportation improvements. We request the County consider implementing a funding program to contribute to improvements on the State highway system, including impacted I-5, SR-14, SR-126, and on/off ramps. County of Los Angeles and City of Santa Clarita may take this opportunity to include policies that allow it to procure funds towards regional transportation improvements such as additional mixed flow lanes, High Occupancy Lanes (HOV), and truck lanes on I-5; as well as modifications to I-5/SR-14 interchange. |
| | 2 | Other traffic mitigation alternatives may include vehicular demand reducing strategies, such as incentives for commuters to use transit i.e., park-and-ride lots, discounts on monthly bus and rail passes, vanpools, etc. |

This issue is addressed in the Circulation Element of the General Plan and not that of the draft EIR.

This issue would be addressed on a project-level basis.

This comment does not address the draft EIR. This issue is addressed in the Circulation Element of the General Plan

Traffic mitigation is addressed in **Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation**, in the draft EIR.

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|--|
| | 3 | Caltrans requests inclusion in the environmental review process of land use projects within County and City General Plan areas and in all projects that have the potential to significantly impact traffic conditions on State highways. To avoid delays and any misunderstandings in the traffic impact analysis, we request to be involved in its development. | As required in the <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> , any agency involved in the potential impacts to a resource will be contacted during the NOP process. |
| | 4 | We remind you that traffic impact studies that are in compliance with Los Angeles county's Congestion Management Program (Metro's CMP), are not necessary satisfactory to Caltrans, the agency with jurisdiction over State highway facilities. The thresholds for significance on State highway facilities may be different than those applied in the CMP. | This comment will be addressed in Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation , in the draft EIR. |
| | 5 | Land Use Element and Other Elements. The Circulation Element of the General Plan needs to be consistent with the Land Use and Housing Elements of the General Plan. | This comment does not address the draft EIR. This issue is addressed in the Land Use and Circulation elements of the General Plan |
| | 6 | We recommend that special attention be given to the jobs-and-housing balance concept. Communities with predominantly residential allocations should be encouraged to set aside areas for office, commercial/retail, and open space uses. | This issue is addressed in the Housing Element of the General Plan and not that of the draft EIR. |
| | 7 | We encouraged the application of the state Regional Blueprint Program's and SCAG's Compass Blueprint Program's land use and transportation planning principles in their General Plan update. | This concern is addressed in the Circulation Element of the General Plan and not that of the draft EIR. |
| | 8 | Housing Element. We ask that efforts be made to provide affordable housing for all income levels to ensure that substantial numbers of employees can afford to purchase homes and live in proposed residential projects. | This comment does not address the draft EIR. This issue is addressed in the Housing Element of the General Plan. |

Department of Conservation dated August 28, 2008

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | The draft EIR should describe the project setting in terms of the actual and potential agricultural productivity of the land. The Division's Important Farmland Map for the County should be utilized to identify land within the project site and surrounding land that may be impacted. | This comment is addressed in the Section 2.0, Project Description , of the draft EIR and in Section 3.5, Agricultural Resources . |
| 2 | Describe current and past agricultural use of the project area. Include data on the types of crops grown, crop yields, and farm gate sales values. | Section 3.5, Agricultural Resources , of the draft EIR addresses this comment. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 3 | Describe the full agricultural resource value of the soils of the site. We recommend the use of economic multipliers to assess the total contribution of the site's potential or actual agricultural production to the local, regional, and state economies. | An economic analysis of the full agricultural resource value of soils within the OVOV Planning Area is not necessary for the program-EIR level of analysis. An economic analysis of this kind is beyond the scope of this EIR. Economic and social effects are not considered environmental effects under CEQA (<i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> Sec. 15131) |
| | 4 | Indirect impacts on current and future agricultural operations e.g., land-use conflicts, increases in land values and taxes, vandalism, population, traffic, water availability, etc. | Section 3.5, Agricultural Resources , of the draft EIR addresses this comment. |
| | 5 | Growth-inducing impacts, including whether leapfrog development is involved. | Section 9.0, Growth-Inducing Impacts , of the draft EIR addresses this comment. |
| | 6 | Incremental project impacts leading to cumulatively considerable impacts on agricultural land. | The cumulative impacts of agricultural resources are addressed in Section 3.5, Agricultural Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | 7 | Impacts on agricultural resources may also be quantified and qualified by use of established thresholds of significance. | The City of Santa Clarita utilizes Appendix G of the <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> to establish thresholds of significance for analysis. |
| | 8 | The Department encourages the use of agricultural conservation easements on land of at least equal quality and size as partial compensation for the direct loss of agricultural land. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 9 | Mitigation using agricultural conservation easements can be implemented by at least two alternative approaches: the outright purchase of easements or the donation of mitigation fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements. | This information will be taken into consideration by policy makers. |

| Comment | | |
|--|-----|---|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| Department of Fish and Game (DFG) dated August 28, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | The California Wildlife Action Plan, a recent Department guidance document, identified the following stressors affecting wildlife and habitats within the project area: 1) growth and development; 2) water management conflicts and degradation of aquatic ecosystems; 3) invasive species; 4) altered fire regimes; and 5) recreational pressures. |
| | 2 | The Department's general concerns regarding potential impacts to biological resources from project implementation are direct and indirect impacts to the Santa Clara River watershed and the associated vegetation communities and wildlife. |
| | 3 | Special attention should be given to the South Coast Missing Linkages Project, specifically the San Gabriel Mountains to Castaic Range is critical for preserving ecosystem processes in the South Coast Ecoregion. |
| | 4 | The Department recommends that the areas within the linkage be considered as high priority open space within this planning document for the City and County. |
| | 5 | As one of the last free flowing natural riparian systems left in southern California, the Santa Clara River supports a diversity of aquatic, semi-aquatic, and terrestrial organisms. |
| | 6 | However, some parcels within the flood plain of the Santa Clara River have been impacted by development and would therefore benefit from conservation and restoration. |
| | 7 | Include the following in the draft EIR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A complete, recent assessment of flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats. b. A thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts. This discussion should focus on maximizing avoidance, and minimizing impacts. |
| | | This concern does not address the draft EIR. Instead it can be found in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan. |
| | | Please see Section 3.7, Biological Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| | | This concern does not address the draft EIR. Instead it can be found in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan. |
| | | This concern does not address the draft EIR. Discussion regarding open space linkages can be found in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan. |
| | | The Santa Clara River is addressed in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan. |
| | | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | | This comment is addressed in Section 3.7, Biological Resources , of the draft EIR. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 8 | A range of alternatives should be analyzed to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated. A range of alternatives which avoid or otherwise minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources including wetlands/riparian habitats, alluvial scrub, coastal sage scrub, should be included. | Please see Section 6.0, Alternatives , of the draft EIR. |
| | 9 | A California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Permit must be obtained if the project has the potential to result in "take" of species of plants or animals listed under CESA, either during construction or over the life of the project. | Comment is acknowledged. |
| | 10 | The Department opposes the elimination of watercourses (including concrete channels) and/or canalization of natural and manmade drainages or conversion to subsurface drains. All wetlands and watercourses, whether intermittent, ephemeral, or perennial, must be retained and provided with substantial setbacks, which preserve the riparian and aquatic habitat values and maintain their value to on-site and off-site wildlife populations. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |

Department of Transportation dated September 15, 2008

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | The comments from this letter are noted in the Department of Transportation letter to the City of Santa Clarita dated August 28, 2008. There are no additional or changed comments with this letter that have been addressed to the County of Los Angeles. | See August 28, 2008, letter and comments. |
|---|--|---|

Local Agencies

Metropolitan Transportation Authority dated July 28, 2008

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), with highway, freeway, and transit components, is required under the State of California Congestion Management Program (CMP) statute. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation , of the draft EIR. |
|---|--|---|

Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts dated July 30, 2008

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Portions of the project area are outside the jurisdictional boundaries of the Districts and will require annexation into the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District before sewerage service can be provided to any proposed development. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , in the draft EIR. |
| 2 | The Districts own, operate, and maintain only the large trunk sewers that form the backbone of the regional wastewater conveyance system. | This information would be used in the Project Description of the draft EIR. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 3 | The District operates two water reclamation plants (WRPs), the Saugus WRP and Valencia WRP, which provide wastewater treatment in the Santa Clarita Valley. These facilities are interconnected to form a regional treatment system known as the Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System (SCVJSS). The SCVJSS has a design capacity of 28.1 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 21 mgd. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , in the draft EIR. |
| | 4 | The Districts are authorized by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee for the privilege of connecting (directly or indirectly) to the Districts' Sewerage System or increasing the strength or quantity of wastewater attributable to a particular parcel or operation already connected. | This comment does not address the draft EIR or the General Plan. |
| | 5 | As such, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of wastewater service, but is to advise you that the Districts intend to provide this service up to the levels that are legally permitted and to inform you of the currently existing capacity and any proposed expansion of the Districts' facilities. | This comment does not address the draft EIR or the General Plan. |

County of Los Angeles Public Health, Solid Waste Management Program dated August 13, 2008

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Solid Waste. The plan must consider that landfills and other solid waste facilities in the Los Angeles County have a limit on the tonnage received per day and hours of operation, and no new landfills are expected to be created in the Los Angeles County area. At the present time there are no transfer stations or materials recovery facilities (MRF) in the Santa Clarita area to help process the solid waste stream. How will this issue be mitigated? | This concern is addressed in the draft EIR Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , subsection Solid Waste. |
| 2 | How much solid waste per household or establishment will be generated as a result of the planned development, and how much solid waste will be diverted/recycled? | This concern is addressed in Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , subsection Solid Waste of the draft EIR |
| 3 | Where will the waste be taken for disposal, and is there a plan to convert or divert the residual waste into a useable resource such as energy, compost, or fuels? | Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , subsection Solid Waste of the draft EIR addresses this comment. |
| 4 | How will hazardous wastes that are extracted from the solid waste stream be disposed? | Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , subsection Solid Waste of the draft EIR addresses this comment. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 5 | The traffic analysis needs to describe the safe and adequate circulation of waste collection vehicles throughout the Valley and how it will impact the traffic flow in the area. | Traffic of all vehicles (not only waste collection vehicles) is addressed in Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation , of the draft EIR. |
| | 6 | The increased vehicle impacts on the roads should also be addressed in the noise and emissions sections as well. | This comment is addressed in the Noise and Air Quality sections, 3.18 and 3.3 , respectively, in the draft EIR. |
| | 7 | Within the land use studies, information needs to include surveys in the proposed planning areas to determine if such areas have been used as solid waste or hazardous waste disposal area in the past, and if any such area is within 1,000 feet of a planned development, a post-closure land use plan must be developed as required by CCR Title 27. | This comment will be addressed on a project-by-project basis during the review period after the completion of the draft EIR, as per <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> . |
| | 8 | If the General Plan for the proposed Planning Area includes the construction of a solid waste processing facility such as a transfer station or a materials recovery facility (MRF), all environmental documents pertaining to the construction of these must be submitted to the LEA for review and approval. | This comment will be addressed on a project-by-project basis during the review period after the completion of the draft EIR, as per <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> . |

County of Ventura Public Works Agency Transportation Department dated August 14, 2008

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | We generally concur with the comments in the NOP for those areas under the purview of the Transportation Department. However, no project specific impacts on County of Ventura roadways were identified in the NOP. | This draft EIR is for the OVOV General Plan. The project specific impacts will be addressed on a case-by-case basis in the Traffic and Transportation sections of this EIR. |
|---|---|---|

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| | 2 | The cumulative impacts of this project, when considered with the cumulative impacts of all other approved (or anticipated) development projects in the Santa Clarita Valley, are potentially significant on the roads in the County of Ventura. | The OVOV traffic study took into account the Santa Clarita Valley and the County of Ventura regional growth projections. The OVOV Plan identifies potential development that “could” occur in the Santa Clarita Valley, and the long-range cumulative analysis recognizes both this potential growth and potential growth in Ventura County. At such time that individual projects are proposed, project specific traffic analyses will address potential impacts to Ventura County roadways. |
| | 3 | It is recommended that the environmental document address the potential adverse impacts on County of Ventura roads in the area. | The concern is addressed in the draft EIR Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation. |

County of Los Angeles Fire Department dated August 19, 2008

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | The Planning Division and Land Development Unit have no current comments. | Any future comments will be addressed at that time. |
| 2 | The statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division include erosion control, watershed management, rare and endangered species, vegetation, fuel modification for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or Fire Zone 4, archeological and cultural resources, and the County Oak Tree Ordinance. Potential impacts in these areas should be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.15, Public Services; 3.8, Cultural Resources; and 3.7, Biological Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| 3 | The Health Hazardous Materials Division has no comments at this time. | Any future comments will be addressed at that time. |

County of Los Angeles Public Library dated August 25, 2008

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | The County Library’s current service level guidelines are a minimum of 0.50 gross square foot of library facility space per capita, 2.75 items (books and other libraries materials) per capita, 1.0 public access computer per 1,000 people served, 4 parking spaces per 1,000 gross square feet of building size, and a land to facility size ratio of 4:1. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.15, Public Services, (Libraries) , in the draft EIR. |
|---|---|--|

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|--|
| | 2 | Based on a valley-wide population of 213,857 (2000 US Census), the combined facility space and collection of books and library materials for these libraries do not currently meet the County Library's service level guidelines in providing library services to the existing residents of the Santa Clarita Valley. These libraries have a combined shortage of a minimum of 65,257 sq. ft. of facility space and 212,211 items (books and other library materials). | This comment is addressed in Section 3.15, Public Services, (Libraries) , in the draft EIR. |
| | 3 | Planned Service Improvements to the Valley include: Castaic Library, Acton/Agua Dulce Library, Canyon Country Jo Anne Darcy Library Expansion, and a Newhall Library Replacement. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.15, Public Services, (Libraries) , in the draft EIR. |
| | 4 | The County of Los Angeles applies a library facilities mitigation fee on new residential projects in all unincorporated areas served by the County of Los Angeles. The OVOV Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area is located in the Library's Planning Area 1 (Santa Clarita Valley). The current mitigation fee for this area, which is adjusted annually based on changes in the Consumers Price Index, is \$790 per residential unit. The fees are not levied on non-residential development projects. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.15, Public Services, (Libraries) , in the draft EIR. |

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District dated August 26, 2008

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | District staff recommends the air quality section of the draft EIR evaluate all potential air quality impacts to Ventura County that may result from the project. | The draft EIR has addressed this concern in Section 3.3, Air Quality . |
| 2 | Specifically, the air quality assessment should consider reactive organic compound, nitrogen oxide emissions, and particulate matter from all project-related motor vehicles and construction equipment. | This concern is addressed in the Section 3.3, Air Quality , of the draft EIR. |

Ventura County Watershed Protection District dated August 26, 2008

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | This element would necessitate a comprehensive Drainage Study that will provide a clear understanding of the cumulative impact of the buildout of the entire Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area (Planning Area) to County of Los Angeles, City of Santa Clarita, Santa Clarita Valley and the effect it will have to the common waterway between our counties. The EIR should also incorporate mitigation measure that would eliminate increase in runoff and increase in erosion. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality , of the draft EIR and the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan. |
|---|--|---|

| Comment | | |
|--|-----|---|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| | 2 | Water Quality: the document should consider both the temporary and permanent impacts to water quality resulting from both construction impacts and runoff from newly developed area. Some examples of impacts are erosion, siltation, and release runoff from paved and landscaped areas. |
| This concern is addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality , of the draft EIR. | | |
| South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) dated July 31, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | The SCAQMD recommends that the Lead Agency use this Handbook (CEQA Air Quality Handbook 1993) as guidance when preparing its air quality analysis. Alternatively, the lead agency may wish to consider using the California Air Resources Board (CARB) approved URBEMIS 2007 Model. |
| This concern is addressed in Section 3.3, Air Quality , of the draft EIR utilized the recommended reference materials when preparing the draft EIR. | | |
| | 2 | The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project. |
| The draft EIR addresses the air quality impacts of the OVOV General Plan effort. | | |
| | 3 | Air quality impacts from indirect sources, that is, sources that generate or attract vehicular trips should be included in the analysis. |
| The draft EIR addresses this concern in the Section 3.3, Air Quality . | | |
| | 4 | The SCAQMD requests that the lead agency quantify PM 2.5 emissions and compare the results to the recommended PM 2.5 significance thresholds. |
| This concern is addressed in the Section 3.3, Air Quality , in the draft EIR. | | |
| | 5 | In addition to analyzing regional air quality impacts the SCAQMD recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to focalized significance thresholds (LSTs). |
| This concern is addressed in the Section 3.3, Air Quality , in the draft EIR. | | |
| | 6 | It is recommended that lead agencies for projects generating or attracting vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, perform a mobile source health risk assessment. |
| This concern is addressed in the Section 3.3, Air Quality , in the draft EIR. | | |
| | 7 | An analysis of all toxic air contaminant impacts due to the decommissioning or use of equipment potentially generating such air pollutants should also be included. |
| This concern is addressed in the Section 3.3, Air Quality , in the draft EIR. | | |
| | 8 | To assist the Lead Agency with identifying possible mitigation measures for the project, please refer to Chapter 11 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook for sample air quality mitigation measures. Other measures to reduce air quality impacts from land use projects can be found in the SCAQMD's Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning. |
| This concern is addressed in Section 3.3, Air Quality , of the draft EIR utilized the recommended reference materials when preparing the draft EIR. | | |

| Comment | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| Ventura County Watershed Protection District dated September 2, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | <p>How will surface water and groundwater quantity and quality entering Ventura County from the area covered by the OVOV area plan change over time? The time interval discussed should include now, through build out of the project. Elements included in the time interval should include changes in surface water and groundwater quantity and quality.</p> <p>This issue is addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality, and 3.13, Water Services, of the draft EIR.</p> |
| Agua Dulce Town Council dated September 11, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | <p>The Agua Dulce Town Council requests Los Angeles County Regional Planning reference the Agua Dulce Community Standards District and its authority in One Valley, One Vision (OVOV) General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR).</p> <p>Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> |
| County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works dated September 22, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | <p><u>Hazards-Geotechnical</u>: All or portions of the City of Santa Clarita, including communities of Stevenson Ranch, Castaic, Val Verde, Agua Dulce, and the future Newhall Ranch are located within potentially liquefiable areas per the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map-Whitaker Peak, Sleepy Valley, Val Verde, Newhall, Mint Canyon, Agua Dulce, Simi Valley East, Oat Mountain, and San Fernando Quadrangles. All geotechnical issues discussed in the NOP should be addressed in the EIR. Geotechnical reports should be included in the EIR as necessary.</p> <p>Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> |
| | 2 | <p><u>Services-Traffic/Access</u>: The proposed Circulation Element plans for the continued development of efficient, cost-effective, and comprehensive transportation systems, which are consistent with regional plans, local needs, and the Valley's community character. It also identifies and promotes techniques for improving mobility beyond planning for construction of new streets and highways. Below are comments on the Circulation Element pertaining to traffic studies, neighborhood traffic calming, geometric design, and traffic signal operation. We recommend that you set up a meeting with the consultant and the City of Santa Clarita in order to reconcile these comments.</p> <p>See responses to comments below.</p> |
| | 3 | <p>The header on the document reads as "City of Santa Clarita General Plan," which is not representative of the One Valley One Vision Valleywide General Plan concept.</p> <p>This comment is noted and is addressed in the revision of the General Plan.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 4 | Page C-3, second bullet–Per the Los Angeles County Highway Plan, State Route 126 west of the 1-5 Freeway is classified as an expressway not a freeway. | The Circulation Element the appropriate term will be used. |
| | 5 | Page C-6, Intersection Capacity–Instead of expressing level of service exclusively in terms of delay, the County expresses level of service in terms of delay for unsignalized intersections and in terms of delay or volume-to-capacity ratios for signalized intersections. | This concern is addressed in Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation , of the draft EIR. |
| | 6 | Page C-8, second paragraph–While the Congestion Management Plan states that local jurisdictions may define acceptable levels of service up to E, the County General Plan does not specify an acceptable level of service. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 7 | Page C-11, Arterials and Collectors in the Santa Clarita Valley–The County General Plan does not specify an acceptable level of service; thus, the list of roadways not operating at level of service E or better should be revised to a list of roadways that are operating at or exceeding capacity. A capacity of 2,800 vehicles per through lane, assuming a 50-50 directional split and excluding turn lanes, should be used when determining the roadway capacity. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 8 | Page C-11, Major Roadway Improvements Underway as of 2007–Hasley Canyon Road at 1-5 Freeway Interchange improvement project should be included in this list. | The comment is included in the draft EIR, Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation . |
| | 9 | Page C-12, Transportation Management System–Public Works recently completed a traffic signal timing analysis of the traffic signals in the unincorporated area of the Santa Clarita Valley. Traffic signals at 22 intersections along The Old Road, Stevenson Ranch Parkway, Pico Canyon Road, and Copper Hill Drive were retimed to improve the overall progression of traffic. Synchronizing the signals and improving the operation and safety of the roadway significantly reduces delay and the potential for collisions, thereby alleviating motorist frustration, reducing air pollution, and decreasing vehicle operational costs. | This comment is incorporated into Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation , of this draft EIR. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 10 | In addition to the above synchronized routes, Public Works is currently working on a communications analysis to install the appropriate communications device enabling the traffic signals in the unincorporated area of Santa Clarita to be monitored and controlled from our traffic signal control system located in the Traffic Management Center in Alhambra. This traffic signal control system provides for continuous monitoring of traffic conditions and will provide once-per-second monitoring of traffic signals. | The incorporation of this comment has been noted and will be discussed by the County for the appropriate decision. |
| | 11 | Since the ultimate goal of a transportation management system is to enable monitoring via a traffic control system, it would be the County's desire to have all future signals connected to our system. Therefore, we would recommend that all future signal installations include the provision of communications to the County's central system. This communications could be via hardwire methods such as fiber optics or wireless radios, which are currently being deployed Countywide in other areas. | See response to Comment 10 above for the Los Angeles County DPW. |
| | 12 | To enable both Public Works and the City to work together to coordinate the operation of their traffic signals, we have begun discussions with City staff about connecting the City's traffic control system to the County's Information Exchange Network (IEN). The IEN is an advanced traffic management system and network capable of sharing information and control of various traffic control systems and field devices between agencies. The IEN is currently being deployed Countywide and will improve regional traffic flow with the exchange of traffic signal data among multiple agencies and will provide a coordinated response to traffic congestion and incidents. | Comment has been taken into consideration. |
| | 13 | Page C-16, Level of Service Standard—While the CMP states that local jurisdictions may define acceptable levels of service up to E, the County General Plan does not specify an acceptable level of service. Instead, the County determines whether the traffic generated by a project alone or cumulatively with other related projects, when added to existing traffic volumes, exceeds certain capacity thresholds of an intersection. | Comment has been taken into consideration. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 14 | Page C-16, Standard Cross Sections–The cross sections for the City of Santa Clarita and the County do not match and a standard should be agreed upon. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 15 | Page C-42, Street and Highway System–We recommend that the design of circulation plans for proposed schools take into account any conflicts during drop-off/pick-up hours with morning and afternoon peak-hour traffic congestion in the surrounding area. This includes a careful review of a school’s location to ensure that bicycle and pedestrian access are encouraged and if vehicles are anticipated to be used for drop-off/pick-up that the queuing created does not conflict with overall circulation. | Commenter’s opinion has been noted. Construction of new schools would be approved on a project-by-project basis. New projects would be subject to CEQA review. |
| | 16 | Page C-43, Objective C 2.2–We recommend that consistent standards are adopted in the implementation of Americans with Disabilities Act requirements such as curb ramp design, accessible pedestrian signal, etc. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 17 | Page C-44, Objective C 2.2–We recommend the design plans for traffic signal modifications or new installations include the upgrade of poles for future left-turn phasing when warranted and the installation of a time base unit for future coordination. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. This comment addresses the Circulation Element of the General Plan. |
| | 18 | Page C-44, Objective C 2.3–Policy C2.3.4 is mislabeled as Policy C2.4.3. | The comment will be used to update the Circulation Element. |
| | 19 | Page C-46, Objective C 3.2–Policy C3.2.3 is mislabeled as Policy C3.3.3. | The comment will be used to update the Circulation Element. |
| | 20 | Page C-50, Objective C 6.1–We recommend the use of commuter bikeway signage. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 21 | Page C-51, Objective C 7.1–We do not recommend the use of refuge islands for medians 4 feet wide or less. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 22 | The County also has a program to reduce cut-through traffic through neighborhood streets. The information is available on Public Works’ website at http://dpw.lacounty.gov/TNUNTMP/Page_01.cfm . | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 23 | We also agree that a priority should be given to provide a healthy and safe circulation system to address safe pedestrian walkways and bikeways. Given this priority, typical roadway cross sections recommended by the City of Santa Clarita with wider pedestrian paths (Figures 4.4-3 and 4.4-4) are preferred. Other traffic-calming measures such as bulb outs, raised medians, narrower streets, pedestrian islands for wide roadways, and road diet-type of improvements should be considered for implementation to reduce pedestrian crash risk. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element and future transportation projects that may be proposed within the OVOV Planning Area. |
| | 24 | <u>Services-Sewage Disposal</u> : The draft EIR should include discussion for the collection and disposal of the waste water that would be generated by the proposed project, especially its potential impact on the available capacity of the existing local sewer lines for both peak dry and wet weather flows pursuant with Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements, Order No. 2006-0003. The draft EIR should also include discussion on the impact of the proposed project on the existing local and trunk sewer facilities. | This issue has been addressed in the draft EIR, Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , subsection Wastewater. Project impacts on existing local and trunk sewer facilities would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. Proposed projects within the OVOV Planning Area would be required to undergo CEQA review. |
| | 25 | The City of Santa Clarita owns and Public Works' Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the local sewer collection system within the City and the unincorporated Los Angeles County. All sewer construction within the project area shall comply with Public Works' Sewer Design standards. | Project impacts on existing sewer facilities would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. Proposed projects within the OVOV Planning Area would be required to undergo CEQA review. |
| | 26 | <u>Solid Waste</u> : Solid waste generated in the County of Los Angeles currently exceeds the available permitted daily landfill capacity. The proposed project will increase the generation of solid waste and negatively impact the Solid Waste Management infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed environmental document should identify what measures will be implemented to mitigate the impact. Mitigation measures may include waste reduction and recycling programs and development of infrastructure in the project to facilitate recycling. | This concern has been addressed with mitigation measures in Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , subsection Solid Waste of the draft EIR. |
| | 27 | School Districts are encouraged to take advantage of special County programs to encourage waste diversion by calling 1(888) CLEAN LA or visiting www.888CleanLA.com . | Commenter's opinion is noted. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 28 | <u>Hazardous Waste:</u> The existing Hazardous Waste Management infrastructure in the County of Los Angeles is inadequate to handle the hazardous waste currently being generated. The proposed project may generate hazardous waste and/or household hazardous waste, which could adversely impact existing Hazardous Waste Management infrastructure. This issue should be addressed and mitigation measures provided. Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, providing new homeowners with educational materials on the proper management and disposal of household hazardous waste. The project proponent may contact Public Works for available educational materials by calling 1(888) CLEAN LA. | The comment is noted and addressed in Section 3.11, Human Made Hazards , of the draft EIR. |
| | 29 | If any excavated soil is contaminated, or classified as hazardous waste by an appropriate agency, the soil must be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. | This comment is acknowledged. |
| | 30 | <u>Storage Space for Recyclables:</u> The California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, requires each development project to provide an adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials. The environmental document should include/discuss standards to provide adequate recyclable storage areas for collection/storage of recyclable and green waste materials for this project. | This comment addresses the Safety Element of the General Plan. Future development projects within the OVOV Planning Area would be subject to CEQA review. |
| | 31 | <u>Construction and Demolition Recycling:</u> Construction projects with a total value of over \$100,000 and demolition and grading projects in the County's unincorporated areas are required to recycle or reuse 50 percent of the construction and demolition debris generated per the County's Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling and Reuse Ordinance. A Recycling and Reuse Plan must be submitted to and approved by Public Works' Environmental Programs Division before a construction, demolition, or grading permit may be issued. | This comment is acknowledged. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| | 32 | <u>Building and Safety Issues:</u> The Los Angeles County Building Code, Section 110.4, requires that buildings or structures adjacent to or within 200 feet (60.96 m) of active, abandoned, or idle oil or gas well(s) be provided with methane gas protection systems. If the project site contains or lies within 200 feet of active, abandoned, or idle oil or gas wells, this issue should be addressed and mitigation measure provided, and Public Works' Environmental Programs Division must be contacted for issuance of necessary permits. | Future development projects within the OVOV Planning Area would be subject to CEQA review. |
| | 33 | The Los Angeles County Building Code, Section 110.3, requires that a building or structure located on or within 1,000 feet (304.8 m) of a landfill containing decomposable material must be protected against landfill gas intrusion. The project site contains landfills, so this issue should be addressed and mitigation measures provided. The discussion should include subsurface lateral migration of landfill gas, migration detection, and control and protection systems for affected enclosed buildings and structures. Public Works' Environmental Programs Division must be contacted for issuance of necessary permits. | Future development projects within the OVOV Planning Area would be subject to CEQA review. The Chiquita Canyon Landfill is located within the County's Planning Area. |
| | 34 | <u>Underground Storage Tanks/Industrial Waste/Stormwater:</u> Should any operation within the subject project include the construction, installation, modification, or removal of underground storage tanks, industrial waste treatment or disposal facilities, and/or storm water treatment facilities, Public Works' Environmental Programs Division must be contacted for required approvals and operating permits. | This comment is acknowledged. |
| | 35 | Food service establishments may be required to provide a grease treatment device and will be subject to review and approval by Public Works' Environmental Programs Division. | This comment is acknowledged. |
| | 36 | All development and redevelopment projects which fall into one of the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan project types, characteristics, or activities, must obtain Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan approval by the appropriate agency. | The comment is noted and development and redevelopment projects will be evaluated on a project by project basis. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 37 | <u>Supplemental Comments:</u> A number of landfill closures have been experienced within the last few years and more closures are expected to occur in the near future. As regional disposal facilities close, there is an increasing need for regional transfer facilities to efficiently transport solid waste generated to more distant processing or disposal facilities. These transfer facilities are essential for the cities in the County of Los Angeles and the unincorporated areas to be able to properly manage solid waste in accordance with the requirements of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, also known as AB 939, provided they are found to be environmentally and technically feasible. | This comment has been addressed in Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , subsection Solid Waste of this draft EIR. |

**OVOV November 2008 Workshop Comment Cards
(City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles)
Katharine Squires**

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Blue Streams should be noted. There are developments over the location of these streams. This should also be noted. | This comment has been addressed in the Conservation and Open Space Element. |
| 2 | Glad to see that SEA's (Sig. Eco. Areas) have been included on maps. Strong language should be in place to protect these areas from development. | The comment has been addressed in the Conservation and Open Space Element. |
| 3 | All fossils/specimens found during grading etc. should really be donated to the Los Angeles County Museum to be recorded. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.8, Cultural Resources , of this draft EIR. Fossils/specimens would be donated to the Los Angeles County Museum as appropriate. |
| 4 | It is critical that development not be permitted in areas of extreme fire/earthquake danger, i.e., Lyons Cyn Ranch. | The comment has been addressed in the Safety Element. |
| 5 | It is imperative that the best paleontologist etc., be consulted. The rate of uplift in the Towsley Cyn, Area is parallel to that of the Himalayas! A very good reason to limit development. | This comment has been addressed in the Conservation and Open Space Element. |
| 6 | Limiting sprawl development is essential – continuing concern. | This comment has been addressed in the Land Use Element. |
| 7 | Having wildlife corridors on maps would be great to see. | Wildlife corridor information has been provided on Figure 3.16-1 of this EIR. |

| Comment | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|--|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| Calgrove Corridor Coalition | | |
| | 1 | <p>Conditions or New Zone Commercial Suburban for Smiser Property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35 feet height limit • 0.375 x 1,611,720 sq. ft = 604,375 sq. ft. • 0.50 x 1,511,720 sq. ft. = 805,860 sq. ft. • 0.75 x 1,611,720 sq. ft. = 1,208,790 sq. ft. |
| | 2 | <p>A beautiful entrance into the Santa Clarita Valley that feathers into the existing neighborhoods.</p> |
| | 3 | <p>Wiley Canyon – No more than 4 lanes</p> |
| | 4 | <p>Green Belts throughout the development</p> |
| | 5 | <p>Calculation does not include Caltrans property taken away for freeway development</p> |
| | | <p>Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. These numbers reflect basic community development.</p> <p>Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> <p>Wiley Canyon has been proposed for 4 lanes from Calgrove to Lyons.</p> <p>This comment has been addressed in the Conservation and Open Space Element.</p> <p>This comment has been addressed in the Circulation Element.</p> |

Sandra Cattell

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | 1 | <p>Connecting Dockweiler with Lyons will create a terrible unsafe condition for the Dockweiler residents. The Lyons crossing will create another unsafe train crossing at a time when more trains are being used for commuter transportation and movement of freight.</p> | <p>Any subject road construction will be subject to its own environmental analysis.</p> |
| | 2 | <p>All Blue Line Streams should be shown in transportation, housing, land use, safety, and circulation elements (not just floodway).</p> | <p>The General Plan does not use US Geological Survey (USGS) topography map information on blue line streams as a basis for planning and land use decisions because the most recent information is available from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps. These maps were most recently updated in 2008 and information from these maps has been included in the Safety Element, Exhibit S-4, "Floodplains." Additional information on hydrology is included in the Conservation and Open Space Element.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|---------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| | 3 | Las Lomas area land purchase options by Palmer either have or are about to expire. | This comment is acknowledged. |
| | 4 | Placerita creek, near South Fork, should be investigated as a SEA, definitely is an underground stream. | This comment is acknowledged. |
| | 5 | Would like to see most of the property owned by Casden in Placerita become open space. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 6 | Lyons Ranch project is unsafe. It is in an extreme high fire hazard area. It is also in an SEA. | This has been approved under the current General Plan and is a project-level detail comment. |
| | 7 | DO NOT ALLOW building in high fire hazard, flood hazard, and high earthquake hazard areas. We cannot afford this gambling with lives nor does the next of the community want to bear the expense. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| Tony Natoli | | | |
| | 1 | What is NET result of Down-Zone/UP-Zone density? | The OVOV Planning Area population range is 455,000 to 460,000. |
| Phil Rawlins | | | |
| | 1 | 21563 Cleardale St. Newhall, CA 91321 | The City has designated the property as NU5 to be consistent with the surrounding designation. |
| | 2 | Lot 133. No Road, No Water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Plain goes through middle of property • High risk fire zone • New zoning not compatible with surrounding properties. | This comment is acknowledged. |
| | 3 | Please find picture of property | Commenter's request has been acknowledged. |
| | 4 | SEE ATTACHED PICTURE TO COMMENT CARD | Commenter's request has been acknowledged. |
| | 5 | Property designation in Placerita Canyon | The City has designated the property as NU 5 to be consistent with the surrounding designation. |
| | 6 | Reconsider higher density residential designation along Lost Canyon Road on east side of Sand Canyon Road. | The land designation is now UR 1, two dwelling units per acre. |

| Commenter | Comment | |
|------------------------|---------|---|
| | No. | Comment Summary |
| TimBen Boydston | | |
| | 1 | Interactive mapping – City to create program similar to county re. current land use density and future land use density |
| | 2 | Check final rule federal register shows boundary for Arroyo toad |
| | | As of April 1, 2009, the City instituted an online mapping component to be a part of the OVOV website and to be integrated into the City's online mapping system. |
| | | Commenter's request has been acknowledged and the biodiversity map will be checked along with federal register rule. |

Local Groups**Friends of the Santa Clara River dated August 25, 2008**

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | 1 | The Santa Clarita area has seen vast development over the last two decades and continues to develop at a very rapid pace. Much of this development has encroached on the floodplain of the Santa Clara River and its tributaries. Yet, no agency – state, federal, or other – has adequately analyzed the cumulative impacts of this massive floodplain development that continues unabated and is a part of many projects now on the drawing board or in some phase of approval. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 2 | The One Valley One Vision EIR must remedy this situation and finally provide a substantive analysis of these impacts to the river ecosystem. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 3 | The Ventura River and Santa Clara Rivers, for example, show peak discharges over 30 times the mean annual flow for floods having a recurrence interval of 25 years. A major lesson to be learned from these facts is that these rivers, as well as many of their tributaries, are dangerous by nature and very difficult to tame. | The comment does not refer to either the General Plan or the draft EIR. Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 4 | There is a new floodplain management philosophy that is being increasingly adopted by communities across the county that works with nature, not against it. Wetlands are being protected and allowed to serve as natural flood basins. Such measures are of particular importance in southern California, which has lost over 90% of its wetlands. OVOV, since it is a "vision" of what the valley should become, should include such measures. | This concern is not addressed in the draft EIR, but in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan. |

| Comment | | |
|--|-----|---|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| Calgrove Corridor Coalition (CCC) dated August 28, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | <p>Because the changes in Land Use designations have not been disclosed, we believe that the process of review for this draft EIR is flawed, and that the information contained in this draft is incomplete and misleading.</p> <p>The changes in the land use designations have been made available on the OVOV Web site. Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> |
| | 2 | <p>Please note that we believe our response is consistent with the vision for gateway projects as outlined in the City's current General Plan – that higher density developments are not consistent with gateway locations such as the Smiser Ranch property.</p> <p>The opinion of the commenter is acknowledged for the record.</p> |
| | 3 | <p>Concerns about aesthetics regarding this property (Smiser Ranch) are therefore highly important and due special consideration</p> <p>Aesthetics are required by CEQA to be analyzed and are discussed from a General Plan perspective in Section 3.6, Aesthetics. The draft EIR will not address the visual impacts of a specific project.</p> |
| | 4 | <p>The language in the existing General Plan states we <i>"continue the established pattern of attractive greenbelts, golf courses, open space, including the protection of adjacent significant ecological areas and entertainment/recreational amenities along I-5...and to strengthen and enhance the image of the city as a pleasant and fun place to live, work, visit and play."</i> These elements of the existing General Plan must be preserved. The Specific Plan (SP) designation for the Smiser Ranch property does not come close to doing this – in fact, it eliminates all existing zoning limitations. The height and density concerns of the many residential neighborhoods, which comprise the CCC membership is a critical consideration that has not been properly addressed by the SP designation.</p> <p>The designation of the Smiser property has been revised.</p> |
| | 5 | <p>a) With increased density, traffic and circulation there will be additional negative impacts on air quality.</p> <p>a) The concerns have been addressed in the NOP and in the draft EIR.</p> <p>b) Has the SCAQMD addressed their concerns about the air quality in our Valley?</p> <p>b) SCAQMD concerns have been addressed above.</p> <p>c) Has this been addressed in the draft NOP?</p> <p>c) Air quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.3, Air Quality, of the draft EIR.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 6 | Hydrology. Existing and proposed land uses and operations must consider the consequences of degradation to groundwater or surface water that is used to replenish the groundwater supplies. | The concern is addressed in the Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality , of the draft EIR. |
| | 7 | Land Use and Planning. The SP designation is inappropriate for the Smiser Ranch property because it is extremely vague and not in compliance with the guiding principles of OVOV. The guiding principle states that “multi-family housing development’s building massing shall complement the characteristics of surrounding single-family residential neighborhoods” such as those that surround the Smiser property. The SP designation does not preserve such requirements. The applicability of SP to the Smiser property may be in question; once the Caltrans completes its plans to expand I-5 and in the process require land within the Smiser property boundaries, the remaining parcel may be too small to meet the 30-acre SP minimum. | The designation of the Smiser property has been revised. |
| | 8 | Population and Housing. We disagree with the OVOV vision for population growth in the Santa Clarita Valley. The stated numbers are simply too large and do not support the quality of life requirements of most who live here – note that high density housing in our Valley currently represents highest areas of crime. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 9 | Population and Housing. The City and County need to go back to the residents of our community to seek input about <i>their</i> vision of the future of the Santa Clarita Valley, including population and housing goals, which we believe are significantly different than proposed in the City’s OVOV view. | Please see Table 1.0-1 of this section of the draft EIR to see the numerous efforts undertaken by the City and County for outreach purposes for the OVOV planning effort. |
| | 10 | Recreation. We are now aware of a significant, last minute change to the objectives which results in a decrease in the city’s park objectives by 40 percent, from 5 acres per 1000 residents to 3 acres per 1000 residents. The City’s Guiding Principles state that parkland will be developed “with priority on locations that are not now adequately served.” This designation fits the areas adjacent to and surrounding the Smiser property. The City must address the existing parkland deficit, but not by reducing the current parkland objectives. The CCC requests that this issue be considered as plans for the Smiser Ranch property progress. | The Smiser property is a separate project whose development application to the City has been withdrawn. Parkland impacts have been addressed in Section 3.16, Parks and Recreation . |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|--|
| | 11 | Transportation and Traffic. Traffic in the Newhall Pass, especially at Calgrove Boulevard, is already problematic and poses many challenges for the residents of the surrounding communities. An SP designation for the Smiser Ranch property would only increase congestion. We believe that larger roads and freeways are not the answer to congestion problems. | The designation of the Smiser property has been revised. |
| | 12 | Transportation and Traffic. The draft EIR does not address what happens when there are major incidents on the I-5, which occur with discouraging regularity. | This comment addresses the Safety Element and Circulation Element. |
| | 13 | The CCC does not support launching any section of the EIR until all sections of the Draft EIR have been completed, including zoning definitional changes, and presented to the residents of Santa Clarita. | The draft EIR is released as a whole document. |

Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE) dated 8/29/2008

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | One issue that many of our members have brought to our attention is a concern that the melding of the City and County Plans will produce weaker protections for the planning process and the environment. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| 2 | A Development Monitoring System would ensure that expensive infrastructure needs such as sewer systems are paid for by the developers or at least all provisions to provide such required infrastructure are properly funded so that the existing residents may continue to depend on their current level of service. We therefore request that the City include the County of Los Angeles' Development Monitoring System into any combined plan as a mitigation requirement for the additional growth for which the plan will provide. | The City has chosen not to include a development monitoring system (DMS) in its General Plan. Additionally, the County has chosen not to include a DMS program in their General Plan effort as well. Historically, in 1987 the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning (DRP) initially established DMS, which was a program to ensure that in quickly expanding areas, new development, public service infrastructure, and service capacity were closely monitored for inefficiencies. The DMS program monitored the expansion costs for schools, sewers, fire stations, libraries, and water services in urban expansion areas, and |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary |
|-----------|-------------|---|
| | 2 (cont'd) | <p>ensured that from a planning perspective, services were expanded to meet future growth projections.</p> <p>The County's General Plan no longer identifies urban expansion areas, and many of the expansion costs for services are now covered by specific development fees and by CEQA. Thus the County DRP will no longer utilize DMS. Therefore, consistent with County planning the City no longer sees the need to include DMS for planning purposes.</p> |
| | 3 | <p>Where one planning jurisdiction's regulations include stronger protections for the resources and the existing community, those regulations should be the controlling ordinance for any melded plan.</p> <p>a. The City also does not have adequate protection for Significant Ecological Areas. This LA County General Plan designation has strict planning regulations to which developers must adhere whenever development is proposed in a SEA, including the requirement of producing an EIR. The City merely has an overlay designation that has not provided any real protection for these areas and the open space habitat they were meant to conserve. Evidence of this is clearly visible in the City's approval of all the development in the floodplain of the Santa Clara River and the loss of the endangered species that currently existed in those areas. Any melding of the two general plans must include the County's SEA regulations.</p> <p>b. It also appears that the County has a much stronger Oak Tree Protection Ordinance. We request that this stronger ordinance be adhered to in any melding of the two planning jurisdictions.</p> |
| | 4 | <p>The draft EIR must include a section on the effects to global warming from any increase in the number of housing units.</p> <p>Global warming is addressed in Section 3.4, Global Warming and Climate Change, of the draft EIR.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| | 5 | A "Green" Building ordinance should be developed and required as mitigation for greenhouse gas production caused by additional proposed growth. This ordinance should include standards that will increase energy and water efficiency and encourage the use of alternative energy sources such as wind and solar energy. | This comment is addressed in the Open Space and Conservation Element. |
| | 6 | The draft EIR must address the cumulative impacts of the loss of floodplains on downstream land uses and habitat, including increased velocity and erosion produced by concrete banks and the impacts of such banking on water quality (increases to pH levels as identified by the Regional Water Quality Board). The Plan must update its floodplain designation maps to comply with federal and state laws. | Please see Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality , of the draft EIR. |
| | 7 | <p>Water Supply. The DEIR should contain a Water Element that discusses how water will be provided for any future proposed growth. This discussion should disclose:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. impacts to the Sacramento Delta and any other proposed areas of origin for new water sources. b. all impediments to obtaining additional water from those sources including supply reductions from climate change, impacts to endangered species and water quality degradation both in the area of origin and locally. c. water supply during a dry, normal and wet year so that planners and the public may easily be apprised of the worst case scenario for which they must plan. d. information on water quality of existing water sources. | <p>Section 3.13, Water Service, of the draft EIR addresses impacts to the Sacramento Delta, impacts on water from climate change, water supply during dry, normal, and wet years.</p> <p>Water quality issues are discussed in Section 3.13, Water Service, and Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality.</p> <p>Biological impacts on endangered species are addressed in Section 3.7 of the draft EIR.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 8 | <p>Water Supply. Information on the alluvial aquifer should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a discussion of the Chloride problem and how additional growth will impact the sanitation districts' ability to comply with the new Chloride Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) regulation that will to into effect soon. b. full disclosure of the industrial contamination currently affecting many of the high producing wells in the Saugus aquifer c. ammonium perchlorate pollution and its health risk to children, but also the many additional cancer causing Volatile Organic Compounds in this water source. | <p>Water quality impacts are discussed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality.</p> |
| | 9 | <p>Additional state water to supply new growth will increase chloride levels in the effluent produced by the Sanitation Plants. This section should fully disclose the impacts on the Chloride TMDL of increased growth.</p> | <p>Water quality impacts are discussed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality.</p> |
| | 10 | <p>Water Supply. This section should indicate from where the water supply for increased growth will come.</p> | <p>The adequacy of water supply is addressed in Section 3.13, Water Service.</p> |
| | 11 | <p>A drought tolerant landscape ordinance should be developed and required as mitigation.</p> | <p>This comment is addressed in the Land Use Element of the General Plan.</p> |
| | 12 | <p>Recycled water systems should be required for open space and landscaped areas in all new development.</p> | <p>This comment is addressed in the Land Use Element of the General Plan.</p> |
| | 13 | <p>Water retention systems such as roof to underground cistern storage systems, downspout disconnection to storm drain and lot contouring to retain rainfall on site and encourage recharge of the local aquifers should also be required for any new development.</p> | <p>This comment is addressed in the Open Space and Conservation Element.</p> |
| | 14 | <p>Air Quality. The draft EIR should clearly and fully disclose the poor air quality that already exists in this valley due to high ozone and particulate matter pollution, and its impacts on increased asthma rates, especially in children. Further reductions in air quality due to additional proposed growth must be disclosed and mitigated.</p> | <p>Section 3.3, Air Quality, discusses the air quality in the Santa Clarita Valley and its compliance or non-compliance (as the case may be) with state and federal standards. The impacts to air quality with respect to future population growth are discussed and quantified in detail in this section.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| | 15 | Health Hazards. Contaminated sites must be fully disclosed and designated as such in the General Plan for the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Estimated clean up time for such areas must be included in the draft EIR. | Please see Section 3.11, Human Made Hazards , of the draft EIR. |
| | 16 | Education. Planning for school sites should not include locations next to or on contaminated sites and freeways. It is a well-established fact that air pollutants are extremely high in areas adjacent to freeways. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. School site selection is regulated by the state. |
| | 17 | Piece-mealing the General Plan Update. State law requires an update to a City or County General Plan every 10 years. The update to the Santa Clarita Plan is five years overdue, yet the City and the County continue to approve projects based on this plan and where needed to ensure project approval, merely amends the offending section for the developer. Also, over the past several years the City of Santa Clarita has updated individual elements of the General Plan. These updates included changes to the Air Quality, Noise, Housing, and Parks and Open Space Elements. | The OVOV General Plan will update all of the elements of the General Plan to be current with all state standards. |

Placerita Canyon Property Owner's Association dated December 23, 2008

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | Flood Concerns: | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps must list all blue line streams. • Plan must protect both blue line streams and the recharge areas along them. The normal and usual flow of a blue line stream should never be channelized, built on or altered in any way. • Homes behind the blue line streams cannot be further isolated and threatened. • The newest FEMA studies and maps must be followed; building in Floodways must be assiduously avoided. • Water flow must be considered. In Placerita Canyon, the City did an engineering study in conjunction with the backbone sewer system that showed the system did not need lifts or pump stations; it could be gravity fed to what is now considered the "Cowboy Festival" parking lot. That clearly means that water drains to that field. If it is covered with buildings and concrete, water will back up in Placerita Canyon threatening residents and property. | <p>The comment has been addressed in the Conservation and Open Space Element. See comment No. 2 to Ms. Cattell in this table.</p> <p>Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> <p>2008 FEMA maps have been used by the City and County in OVOV planning documents.</p> <p>Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> | |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|--|
| | 2 | <p data-bbox="708 275 932 302">Circulation Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="548 317 1094 596">• A recent article in the Los Angeles Times indicated most commuter rail fatalities occur at at-grade crossings. The proposed Lyons to Dockweiler at-grade crossing will be very heavily traveled and the only viable way from Placerita Canyon into the City. Projected increased rail traffic over the next years and decades will only exacerbate circulation and safety problems. <li data-bbox="548 611 1094 701">• Circulation studies on the Lyons to Dockweiler at-grade crossing must be done on “peak volume” basis. | <p data-bbox="1118 275 1440 426">This comment does not address the draft EIR. This issue is addressed in the Circulation Element of the General Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1118 604 1440 722">This comment does not address the draft EIR. This issue is addressed in a project level review.</p> |
| | 3 | <p data-bbox="691 743 948 770">Neighborhood Identity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="548 785 1094 1100">• Poor planning can destroy a neighborhood. Placerita Canyon, from the railroad tracks to Sierra Highway, is designated a Special Standards District to protect our rural equestrian neighborhood. Any development within, or adjacent to, the Special Standards District should reflect the unique heritage of Placerita Canyon. There need to be adequate circulation and buffer zones to protect and preserve the rural equestrian nature. <li data-bbox="548 1115 1094 1556">• The new MXN (Mixed Use Neighborhood) is not appropriate in a Special Standards District where up to four times the square footage of that in the Regional Mall would be allowed on the “Cowboy Festival” parking lot. The Mall is served by three major regional roads; Placerita Canyon is served by a single two-lane road. (Dockweiler, at build-out, is planned to be only a four-lane road.) Further, the area in Placerita Canyon is currently designated a Floodplain and is due to be upgraded to Floodway; it is totally unsuitable to the level of development discussed in the Land Use Portion of One Valley One Vision. | <p data-bbox="1118 743 1440 806">Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged.</p> <p data-bbox="1118 1108 1440 1199">This comment addresses the Safety Element and Land Use Element.</p> |
| | 4 | <p data-bbox="548 1577 1094 1694">Placerita Canyon Property Owners’ Association Board of Directors looks forward to presenting additional suggestions to strengthen the Special Standards District.</p> | <p data-bbox="1118 1577 1440 1633">Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged.</p> |

| Comment | | |
|--|-----|---|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| | 5 | The Preliminary Land Use map (October 6, 2008) inexplicably shows a high density project (19 DUs per acre) in the middle of Placerita Canyon. We were told this was an error and would be corrected. Please do so. |
| Calgrove Corridor Coalition dated December 29, 2009 | | |
| | 1 | This is the second NOP response from Calgrove Corridor Coalition (CCC). After receiving inaccurate and confliction deadline dates, we now understand that the final date for NOP comments is December 31, 2008. We believe the OVOV process remains flawed and has not been transparent for the residents of Santa Clarita and that public notification of revisions is almost non-existent when changes are made to the draft document. |
| | 2 | CCC has repeatedly asked to be notified when changes are made to the draft OVOV document, particularly when the changes involve the Land Use Element or the Smiser property. We cannot support the OVOV draft when City staff leaves the research of revisions up to the public. |
| | 3 | Early in the process, members of our leadership team met with Planning Director Paul Brotzman and we were assured that it was not the intent of the City to increase the density for the Smiser property. We are very concerned that the current document does not reflect prior commitments made by staff to maintain the current density. |
| | 4 | Our coalition has repeatedly seen changes in the OVOV document that could potentially more than triple the density for the Smiser property. In the December 8, 2008 OVOV revision, the designation of Mixed Use Neighborhood (MXN) integrates characteristics of 2 other Land Use Elements – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood Commercial (NC) – allows a 35' height limit and not to exceed 75 % development coverage • Community Commercial (CC) – allows a 50' height limit and development coverage of 80 % |

This comment addresses the Land Use Map.

Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.

Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.

Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.

Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | 5 | NC and CC have vastly different use requirements. Each of the 3 designations (NC, CC, and MXN) includes the language, "except as otherwise permitted by the reviewing authority pursuant to discretionary review as prescribed by the unified development code." We are concerned that these vagaries will allow developers to see the land use elements as a negotiable moving target. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 6 | Not only are we disappointed that the changes are not being communicated, as promised, we are gravely concerned that the designations do not reflect our input about density. CCC does not support OVOV in its current state and our organization is looking for a land use description that enhances the existing neighborhood and provides an inviting entrance to our city. We support the commitment made by Paul Brotzman that the zoning designation would limit development to floor are ration of no more than 0.375 and we look forward to a positive outcome. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |

Valley Industrial Association (VIA) of Santa Clarita dated February 6, 2009

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <p>Summary. SB-2 requires each City and County in California to designate at least one zoning code where Homeless Shelters and Transitional Living Centers can exist "by-right," which means that Use Permits are not required to set-up an operation. The city of Santa Clarita has decided to handle the requirement by creating an "overlay" onto the zoning code "Business Park." The boundaries of the overlay encompass most of the area of the Centre Point Business Park and the Valencia Business Park. The Centre Pointe overlay area encompasses the current location of the Winter Shelter on Golden Valley Road. The City can still contractually apply constraints to any homeless shelter operation, regulating such parameters as the number of beds, operating hours, parking, etc.</p> | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 2 | <p>Housing. First we talked about the Housing Element. The City says that it will make available sufficient land to build 4,000 low and very low income housing by 2014 at a density of 30 units per acre. The City cautioned that the City is required only to make the land available, but not to assure that the units get built. That is a "free market" issue. The City said the main problem is the lack of rentals. While nationally, the ownership to rental ratio is 65/35, in Santa Clarita Valley it is 80/20. The community shows a strong bias against rentals, because of the public's perception that crime and trouble is associated with rental developments.</p> | <p>Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. This comment addresses the Housing Element.</p> |
| | 3 | <p>Transportation. Next we talked about the Circulation Element. VIA talked about the need for more trains and more buses that start earlier in the day and leave later at night. The City responded by saying the issue is money. Trains and buses are subsidized, meaning that the fare does not cover the cost of operation. Thus, funding is needed. Santa Clarita is a part of the North LA Transportation Corridor. Thus, on every transportation project, we compete with the City of LA. We need to more actively lobby and more actively measure the needs. The City mentioned that lobbyist Arthur Sohikian is actively lobbying on behalf of the North LA County Transportation Corridor.</p> <p>VIA indicated to the City that VIA expects the City to take a leadership position in solving these problems, which means doing more than the minimum required by law.</p> | <p>Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 4 | <p>Housing Element Compliance with SB-2. As stated in the summary of the meeting, the primary purpose of the meeting was for the City to review with VIA the method of compliance to the state law SB-2, which requires that the City designate at least one zoning code where homeless shelters and transitional living centers can locate “by-right,” without any use permits. As we understand it, the City intends to comply with the requirements by designating an “overlay” onto the zoning code Business Park (BP) which encompasses most of the Centre Pointe business park and the Valencia Industrial Park on the Northwest part of town. Impact on the community will be mitigated by City processes for review and community comment, as with any other development. We also understand that transitional housing and permanent supportive housing will be allowed in the zoning code “Residential.”</p> <p>The Valley Industrial Association supports this proposal.</p> | <p>Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged.</p> |
| | 5 | <p>Housing Element and Workforce Housing. The Valley Industrial Association is a business organization, and, as such, it is our mission to support business and industry in the Santa Clarita Valley. VIA believes that in order for a city to be vibrant and successful, we not only need a variety of workers at all levels, but we need varied housing availability to support those workers and their families. This must be incorporated as a part of the City’s General Plan and housing element.</p> | <p>This comment addresses the Housing Element.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
|-----------|-------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | 6 | The Valley Industrial Association has been researching and advocating the subject of Workforce Housing for several years. We have conducted several forums, including a symposium and a panel discussion. We have also surveyed many of our member companies to identify the issues. We believe the issue can be best summarized as follows: <i>A large number of hourly and salaried workers, such as factory workers, teachers, EMT, firemen, policemen, and other essential service workers, who work in Santa Clarita cannot afford to live in Santa Clarita.</i> We are talking about workers who earn between \$30K and \$60K per year. This results in a reliance on a non-local workforce that creates a number of challenges for our employers, including: high worker turnover, loss of workdays during a disaster (when freeways are shut-down), long and costly commutes for the lower tier of wage earners, and an inadequate labor pool to draw from when trying to fill job openings. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 7 | In this context, VIA has reviewed the November 20, 2008 draft of the Housing element. VIA understands that there is a newer draft that will be available in January or February, but we worked with the version available to us. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 8 | VIA's assessment is that the November 20, 2008 draft of the City of Santa Clarita housing element is minimally compliant with the state requirements, and on many issues does not meet the needs of the businesses represented by VIA. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 9 | The biggest deficiency is in the area of Work Force housing, which encompasses Low Income and Very Low Income. The current draft of the Housing Element lumps Low Income and Very Low Income housing together into one category. These categories are very distinctly different, and should be kept in two separated categories. The draft Housing Element says that against a need of 1,256 units of Very Low Income housing, only 20 were constructed? Why? How will the City assure that this same pattern does not repeat in the next 7 years? VIA understands that sufficient zoning will be designated to meet the need. But what if the free market does not fill the need? What pro-active steps will the City take to assure that the much needed housing gets built? | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 10 | Circulation Element and Transportation. VIA commends the City of Santa Clarita for doing an excellent job with Santa Clarita Transit, with Metrolink, with the Cross Valley connector, with Traffic Flow upgrades, and with repaving of major arteries within the industrial parks (ex: Rye Canyon Rd. repaving.). In spite of this excellence, there are some transportation needs that are not being met, and VIA would like to call the City's attention to these matters. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 11 | Ultimately, the business community in Santa Clarita needs easy access to a large and stable labor pool. Ideally, the workers should be able to live in the same community where they work, without long and expensive commutes. The members of VIA understand that any solution based on development and construction of housing will be at least a decade away, considering the pace of development and community input. Thus, VIA sees improved transportation as the interim method of assuring a stable and readily available workforce. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 12 | More could be done in the Section "Travel Demand Management." This section is vague and lacking in specific measures that the City could initiate, with co-operation and support from manufacturing employers and members of VIA. For example, one of the VIA manufacturing employers offered an incentive for workers to take the train from Palmdale and Lancaster to Santa Clarita. Only 4 out of hundreds of eligible workers took advantage of the incentive? Why? The City should investigate and find out. VIA has conducted some informal inquiries to learn about the issue. The trains do not leave early enough and late enough between Palmdale/Lancaster and Santa Clarita to even support a single shift with overtime (a 10 or 11 hour workday). Thus, workers would have to sacrifice available working hours in order to take the train (using the incentive). Thus, they do not take the train. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 13 | VIA has responded to gaps in available public transportation by educating its members about the availability of van pools, and has promoted the use of several available services. The van pools can be contracted either by the employers, or by the workers directly independently of the employers. Through discussions with its members, VIA has found out that van pools and transportation incentives are extremely price sensitive, with as little as \$5 to \$10 per week being the difference between participation and non-participation. How many van pools are in operation to support Santa Clarita businesses? The City should know this, and should see van pools as an indicator of gaps in public transportation. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 14 | Transit Corridors. Missing in the Circulation Element is any discussion about the establishment of high density transportation corridors in the master plan that are specifically located in proximity to the zones and parcels designated as "high density" to encourage the development of transit oriented housing that is specifically well suited to the needs of the Santa Clarita hourly workforce. | This comment does not address the draft EIR. This issue is addressed in the Circulation Element and the Land Use Element of the General Plan. |
| | 15 | Hours of Operation. Section O. Summary of Circulation Needs. This section does not address the needs of the membership of VIA to get hourly workers from Palmdale/Lancaster/Pacoima/Santa Paula to Santa Clarita in the morning, and back at night. Also, the element does not support the transportation needs of manufacturers that would like to expand the use of their capitally intensive facilities to a two shift operation. Two shift operations would require trains and buses that leave outlying areas between 4:00 and 5:30 in the morning, and between noon and two in the afternoon, and returning in the late afternoon (after first shift) and returning after midnight (after second shift). | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 16 | Compliance with SB-375 “Anti-Sprawl” Bill. The current drafts of the Housing Element and Circulation Element do not address the requirements of SB-375. VIA strongly advocates that the drafts of these elements be upgraded to address the requirements of SB-375 in the current revisions. Otherwise, both elements will have to be reviewed and upgraded again within 2 years to comply with SB-375. The basic principle of “anti-sprawl” is that workers should live in the same community where they work, resulting in a short reasonable commute that is energy efficient and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. | This comment addresses the Housing, Land Use, and Circulation Elements. Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 17 | Both the Housing Element and the Circulation Element do not address the following question: <i>How many hourly workers in Santa Clarita do not live in Santa Clarita?</i> Is it 10,000? 20,000? How do the people who work in Santa Clarita, but live far away (Palmdale, Lancaster, Santa Paula, Frazier Park, Pacoima), get to work? When fully built out, the Industrial Parks in Santa Clarita will employ about 80,000 people. Will half of these workers face a 40 mile each way commute every day? | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 18 | The Housing Element is completely devoid of any study or survey that quantifies the number of people who work in Santa Clarita, but do not live in Santa Clarita. During the public review and community input session in August of 2008 at the Newhall Community Center, VIA requested that the City take steps to quantify the number of people who work in Santa Clarita, but cannot afford to live in Santa Clarita. So far, there is no evidence that the City has attempted to quantify this very important number. As one example, Princess Cruises employs 2,000 people in Santa Clarita. Of these workers, 1,200 live in Santa Clarita, and 800 do not. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 19 | The Circulation Element does not address the subject of making provision for low income workers to live close to their workplaces, along high density transportation corridors such as trains, trolleys, and major bus routes. How long does it take for an hourly worker to get to work by bus and/or train? How many bus transfers are required? How much does it cost per month? How does that cost compare to car pooling and van pooling? | This comment addresses the Circulation Element and the Land Use Element. This comment does not address the draft EIR. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 20 | <p>Leadership. VIA would like the City of Santa Clarita to join VIA in taking a leadership position in the Housing Element and Circulation Element, by planning for the community’s real needs, rather than what is minimally required by state law. The Industrial Community in Santa Clarita, represented by VIA, has real needs that are currently not being met in the planning and development processes. These needs are approximately summarized in this letter.</p> | <p>Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged.</p> |
| | 21 | <p>VIA would like to challenge the City of Santa Clarita to do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="545 680 1094 863">1. While VIA admires the City’s plan to comply with SB 2, we feel merely complying with minimum requirements isn’t enough for such a forward thinking city like ours. We’re so much better than that! Let’s improve on the basics. <li data-bbox="545 877 1094 1003">2. Help draft Housing and Circulation Elements that meet the needs of the business community and the hourly workers that work in Santa Clarita. <li data-bbox="545 1018 1094 1686">3. We need a more granular approach to housing. We need to make sure diverse housing across many spectrums of need is included. Each level must be clearly defined (low income and very low income should not be combined into a single level). A more granular approach is needed. The plan must be very specific. Where are single starting teachers going to live? Where are other public service employees like EMT, firemen, policemen going to live? Where is a newly graduated engineer going to live? How will the City assure that 4,000 units of low income and very low income housing are built? Simply stating that “the free market will take care of it” is not an answer. As well, we (the City and the business community) have the social responsibility to educate people about purchasing, the lending processes, and how to succeed financially. | <p>Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged.</p> <p>Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged.</p> <p>Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-------------|-------------|---|--|
| 21 (cont'd) | 4. | The planning (for assuring that workers are available) needs to go beyond housing and should incorporate transportation and mobility (circulation elements). Currently, the Housing and Circulation Elements try to answer the question: "Where do the residents of Santa Clarita work, and how do they get to work?" Now, in the new revisions, we must also answer the question: <i>"Where do the workers of Santa Clarita live, and how will they get to work?"</i> | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| 21 | 5. | Where will the high density housing be built? Special consideration should be given to locating the housing near transportation hubs, or locating transportation hubs near the housing. Residents will need effective and reasonable transportation choices to get to the workplace. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| 21 | 6. | The plan should be very specific about how properties/projects will be acquired and how the housing will be offered. Who will build it? Who will interview the applicants? If the free market does not respond (perhaps because they view the environment as "hostile") then what action will the City take to assure that there are bidders for the desired projects? | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| 21 | 7. | Will the City of Santa Clarita commit funds and/or land to Work Force housing? If so, how much? | Commenter's questions have been acknowledged. |
| 22 | | VIA will be happy to work with the City to assure that the needs of the industrial business community are met. Please note that the content of this letter is approved by the board of VIA, and thus represents the needs of the industrial business community represented by VIA. | The commenter's opinion has been acknowledged. |

| Comment | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| Private Individuals | | |
| Linda Tarnoff dated August 5, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | Special Standards were to remain for Placerita Canyon east of the MWD right of way; more need to be acknowledged. |
| | 2 | The wording in Section LU 1.2.6 for Placerita Canyon should be amended to reflect the preservation of the rural equestrian character governed by Special Standards, keeping the unique community nature at the forefront when considering development of the North Newhall Specific Plan and connections thereof. |
| | 3 | If as the plan says, the Santa Clarita Valley is a Valley of Villages, then Placerita Canyon is a village onto itself, roots lying deep from years of history and reflective of passion for the lifestyle that it represents. It is my conviction that any future planning on currently vacant land here should reflect the characteristics of this canyon, including incorporation of Special Standards, as any development indeed becomes the Placerita Gateway, the Gateway into Placerita Canyon. |
| Charles O'Connell dated August 8, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | The One Valley One Vision EIR should address the following: Adequacy of highway-freeway facilities to handle future demand as the population almost doubles. |
| | 2 | Alternate Routes should be available should the 5/14 freeway be devastated by another quake and just to handle future demand. At the very least, we need an extension of Reseda Blvd [or similar highway] over the hills to the SFV and possibly the tunnel extending San Fernando Road through to Roxford in Sylmar. |
| | 3 | The adequacy of hospital facilities to meet the needs of increased population is a MUST. The expansion of HMNMH as presently proposed is INADEQUATE to meet future needs. |
| Valerie Thomas dated August 25, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | No neighborhood meetings have been held to solicit their vision for the City over the next decade. The process needs to involve ordinary citizens and established neighborhoods before any further formalizing of One Valley One Vision is done. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| | 2 | This whole process is flawed by the inconsistency of dates for cutting off comments; Senior City Planner Hogan gives August 25 as the cutoff date for comments; Impact Sciences, Inc. gives August 28, 2008, as the cutoff date. | The City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles extended the comment period of the OVOV EIR from July 25, 2008, through December 31, 2008. |
| | 3 | Santa Clarita's original General Plan was designed for a lower population at buildout than that being considered under One Valley One Vision. What state law requires acceptance of the higher population level? Have citizens' concerns been addressed in this discrepancy? | This statement is not correct. Buildout of Santa Clarita's original General Plan was 521,977 and the proposed General Plan's range is 455,000 to 485,000. |
| | 4 | Has the process addressed how the additional population will affect resources such as water availability, air quality, etc.? | Impacts to water availability and air quality can be found in Section 3.13, Water Services , and 3.3, Air Quality , respectively of the draft EIR. |
| | 5 | Any changes made in regard to any of the planning elements should be made with the least disruption possible to existing neighborhoods and then only with discussions and negotiations with the affected neighborhoods. | The <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> requires public involvement with any change or update to a General Plan. |
| | 6 | Santa Clarita should demand as Los Angeles (city) does, that when a developer proposes a project, he lays the entire proposal out. That way, a developer would not be able to get permits for small parts of a project thus spending money and "vesting" so he more likely to be able to get permits for a larger project than would otherwise have been permitted. | This comment addresses City of Santa Clarita development procedures as opposed to comment to the EIR. |
| | 7 | Air Quality. The Santa Clarita Valley (both City and County areas) frequently has the worst air quality in the Los Angeles County basin. OVOV needs to address planning/development/traffic circulation standards to ameliorate these conditions. | The Land Use Policy Map has been designed to situate residential units in close proximity to employment area in order to reduce vehicle miles traveled and consequential air quality impacts. The General Plan Land Use Element proposes a 1.5:1 jobs/household aimed at supporting employment opportunities in the Santa Clarita Valley. Air Quality impacts are addressed in Section 3.3 of the draft EIR. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| | 8 | Hydrology. FEMA has been actively surveying the Santa Clarita Valley and drawing up new maps. While these maps are still preliminary, in many cases, FEMA foresees the likelihood of more disastrous flooding possibilities. Neither the City of Santa Clarita nor Los Angeles County should be allowed to request changes in these proposed designations or have development approved in these areas until the maps have been through the full public hearing process and formally adopted. | 2008 FEMA maps have been used by the City and County in OVOV planning documents. See response No. 2 to Ms. Cattell in this table. |
| | 9 | Santa Clarita has an ordinance that prohibits any land use that affects the flow of water either upstream or downstream of the project. That law needs to be a provision of One Valley One Vision and it needs to be implemented stringently with severe financial consequences for any developer whose project creates flooding. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 10 | In addition to concerns about flooding, recharge needs to be addressed. Since the Santa Clarita Valley gets 50% of its water supplies from local underground surfaces, areas designated by FEMA as Floodways and Floodplains need to be preserved to allow for recharge into the local aquifers. | Flooding and recharge is addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality . |
| | 11 | <p>a) The proposed One Valley One Vision Land Use Planning Map shows several areas (such as The Avenues and the North Newhall area) in the Valley designated as the SP (Specific Plan). None of those plans have been adopted. The neighborhoods have not been consulted about these proposed changes; full plans have not been presented either to the neighborhoods or to any of the planning entities.</p> <p>b) Per Land Use Policy LU 1.2.6: "In Placerita Canyon, preserve the eclectic neighborhood character, encourage provision of needed infrastructure through implementation of the North Newhall Specific Plan." Under the Present UDC, Placerita Canyon is a Special Standards District designed to preserve the rural equestrian nature of the area. The North Newhall Specific Plan has not been approved, despite the presumptive language of the Land Use Element. Nor has Santa Clarita City staff consulted Placerita Canyon residents regarding these proposed changes.</p> | <p>The designation SP has since been removed from the land use plan. The SP has been limited in the OVOV Planning Area to only an existing SP designation. In the future, SP will only be a function of the zoning code and not a function of the General Plan.</p> <p>See Ms. Tarnoff response, above. The OVOV General Plan does not propose changes to these designations.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| | 12 | No existing neighborhood should have its established zoning and nature disrupted to accommodate new neighborhoods. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 13 | Traffic flow needs to be analyzed at buildout and at the heaviest possible times-peak traffic hours and when school is in session to determine a given neighborhood can accommodate the projected development. | This concern is addressed in the draft EIR Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation. |
| | 14 | Santa Clarita should demand as Los Angeles (city) does, that when a developer proposes a project, he lays out the entire proposal. That way, a developer would not be able to get permits for small parts of a project thus spending money and "vesting" so he is more likely to get permits for a larger project than would otherwise have been permitted. | This comment addresses City of Santa Clarita development procedures as opposed to comment to the EIR. |
| | 15 | Make sure no existing neighborhoods are unequally impacted with changes in the circulation element such as Benz Road. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |

Michael A. Naoum August 28, 2008

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Overall, I feel the Land Use Element fails to adequately take into account the existing suburban quality of the City, geographic distance between jobs and housing, the lack of existing density and a constrained road network including I5 and SR 14 when trying to become an "urban center" with public transit oriented transportation. | This comment addresses the adequacy of the General Plan and Land Use Element. |
| 2 | While you indicated the General Plan should be general in nature, there are sometimes specific unapproved items mentioned in the plan that are troubling and should be removed. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Part 1D indicates that the existing Canyon Country Metrolink station is planned to be relocated. This should be deleted since it is showing specificity in what should be a general plan. b. Part 1E identifies areas such as Val Verde and Halsey Canyon developed as low-density rural areas based on their residents' desire for retreat from high-intensity urban centers. c. Special use areas Sand and Placerita Canyon should be added to the low-density rural areas list. | <p>This comment addresses the adequacy of the General Plan.</p> <p>This comment addresses the Circulation Element.</p> <p>This comment addresses the Land Use Element.</p> <p>This comment addresses the Land Use Element.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 3 | <p>Land Use Element shows a desire to preserve open space but would appear to allow dense “villages” in areas deemed to be floodplains, Significant Ecological Areas, desirable open areas and wildlife corridors.</p> <p>This is inconsistent with Guiding Principal 6b in the One Valley One Vision document dated 11/9/01 which states “a. Uses and improvements (within the Santa Clara River corridor and its major tributaries” shall be limited to those that benefit the community’s use of the river in its natural state.” And “b. Development on properties adjacent to, but outside the defined primary river corridor shall be: - located and designed to protect the river’s water quality, plants, and animal habitats, controlling the density of uses, drainage runoff (water treatment) and other relevant elements”.</p> <p>Furthermore, objective LU 1.2 states that the City will “maintain the distinctive community character of villages and neighborhoods throughout the planning area by establishing densities and design guidelines appropriate to the particular needs and goals of each area....” Policy LU 1.2.5 states that “In Sand Canyon, ensure compatibility of development with existing rural, equestrian lots and the adjacent National Forest land; provide additional recreational trail links; and protect the Santa Clara River from incompatible development.” This is contrary to the City’s statement in the Land use element that the Canyon Country Metrolink station will be relocated to a high density village proposed in the Santa Clara riverbed just below Sand Canyon.</p> | This comment addresses the Land Use Element. |
| | 4 | <p>While village concepts are promoted, the concept is new and there is no evidence that villages, especially large scale ones, far away from the bulk of the jobs in the City and tied principally to Metrolink for transportation will work to relieve congestion. If I am looking to live in a high density community served by public transit, why would I want to sit on a train for an hour just to live in Santa Clarita? If I want high density, I’ll live in a truly urban area and minimize my commute time and dollars. Additionally, unless one works in downtown Los Angeles, or near the train stations in Glendale or Burbank, Metrolink is not a very efficient form of transportation.</p> | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 5 | Having high density, low and moderate income housing, far from the major job centers employing these residents (Valencia Industrial Center and Magic Mountain) doesn't seem rational – especially when considering that a bus trip from Canyon Country to the Valencia Industrial Center takes between 60 and 90 minutes. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 6 | Why is it that the County is allowing villages without being linked to public transit? | Please see the Land Use and Circulation elements of the General Plan which tie together the concept of villages and public transit. |
| | 7 | The City is allowing greater density without a corresponding requirement for an increase in open or public spaces or any offsetting benefit for the public at large. Infill and villages with higher densities are promoted as a way to reduce land use (in theory to allow for more open space). Under the proposed plan, there is no offset required by the developers receiving these density bonuses to provide a funding mechanism to set aside those open spaces the City is selling as so important to preserve and touting as a carrot arising from promoting higher density villages and infill projects. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. Open Space is addressed within the Conservation and Open Space Element. |
| | 8 | My vision of an urban center is an area with high quality, close (meaning walkable—within 1/4 mile) public transportation, with high density residential areas, incorporating jobs, amenities, retail and entertainment so that the use of cars is unattractive. I'm pessimistic that can be accomplished here. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 9 | The transportation infrastructure needed for true urban centers in Santa Clarita will never be economic because of the lack of density and sprawling geography. We don't have the necessary density and can't get it without essentially starting the City over with density throughout the Santa Clarita valley. Santa Clarita is not Downtown Los Angeles or the Wilshire Corridor and we shouldn't be viewing developments in the same way they can. While the City has made great strides with providing Public Transportation to work and a few entertainment destinations, Public Transportation does not work for most folks in our lower density car oriented community. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 10 | <p>There appears to be an unwillingness to <u>require</u> project improvements that could add costs for development interests. The City should be looking at a number of avenues to improve the quality of life for all residents and stakeholders, not just be concerned with keeping costs at a minimum for developers and businesses.</p> <p>a. Policy LU 6.1.2 designates the Santa Clara River corridor along with its major tributaries as Open Space and restricts development within 50 feet of the stream banks. <u>THIS IS THE STATE MINIMUM!</u> Between allowing bank stabilization and this minimal setback, the City is being disingenuous when it says it will “maintain the natural beauty of the City’s rivers and streams. All too often the bike and walking trails are closed for long periods of time because CLWA is installing a new water line in the same, limited space. We should increase this setback to 250 feet to reduce the amount of bank stabilization and fill required and to allow for uses other than a walking and biking path along river and stream areas. Open space doesn’t need to be limited to just what the City buys.</p> <p>b. The City could be requiring employers of a certain size (say 100 employees) to provide showers for employees using bicycles. Instead, policy LU 5.1.3 has little to no teeth. It says the City will “require safe secure, clearly illuminated walkways and bicycle facilities in all commercial and business centers.” A bicycle facility could be viewed as a post a bike could be locked to. Other cities require these facilities. Why can’t we?</p> <p>c. The City could be requiring buildings to meet LEED requirements under LU7.1.3 rather than just “encourage development of energy-efficient buildings.” The State just revised energy efficiency codes. There is no reason why the City can’t be more of a leader on this than a follower!</p> | <p>These comments do not address the draft EIR. These comments are addressed in the Land Use Element and the Conservation and Open Space Element.</p> <p>Commenter is referred to the Land Use Element and Conservation and Open Space Element for goals, objectives, and policies on green building and sustainability.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 11 | To summarize my input on the Land Use Element, I'd like to see the Element better blend with the currently developed areas of the City (since it is mostly built out), require more than minimums for code and setback requirements, and better preserve and be clearer over what the real plan is when there are conflicts between land use, open space, environmental, transportation, safety and infrastructure goals. | This comment addresses the Land Use Element. |
| | 12 | In terms of the Housing Element, I'd like to see inclusionary requirements for low and moderate income housing-especially if the area's these developments may go must be designated in the land use plan as having 30 units per acre zoning. While the City has provided this density allowance in the past, developers have not done their part to include this element, instead choosing the market rate pricing approach. | This comment addresses the Housing Element. |
| | 13 | Additionally, since the lower income housing is needed primarily to support workers in Valencia Industrial Center, the higher density housing should be in close proximity to those jobs. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 14 | Other areas of the community could be considered for Senior Housing since Seniors burden on the transportation infrastructure occurs during non-peak hours. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |

Michael A. Naoum October 25, 2008

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Since traffic in Santa Clarita is usually cited as the most important issue by City residents, it behooves us to be diligent in our understanding, analysis, and evaluation of the Circulation Element. One should ask if the traffic impacts shown in the plan are acceptable to you as a resident and user and if the approaches to have more walking, biking, taking local buses and commuting on trains will really work given our geographic dispersion, job locations for residents and road network. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|--|
| | 2 | Only the 14 is an E Level of Service for the CMP roadways today. Under the new General Plan, all of the CMP roadways will be an E level of service including the I-5, State Route 14, Sierra Highway, Magic Mountain Parkway, San Fernando Road (Newhall\ Railroad) and SR 126 (page C-7 of the element). LOS E means significant delays and average travel speeds of 33% or less of the free flow speed . This doesn't align with Commissioner Ostroms' desire to have roads be at an A or B LOS. How would we evacuate the City if there were ever a need to do so? | This comment does not address the draft EIR. This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 3 | The Element had no statement on the Newhall Pass Level of Service either today or under build-out. Like it or not, 80% of our working residents must pass through it daily. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 4 | There is a disconnect between the planned village locations and job centers. If we are looking to reduce traffic within the City, the village locations should be at or very close to the job centers identified in the Circulation element. Having folks commute from a village in Canyon Country to west Valencia doesn't make much sense. | This comment is addressed in the Land Use and Circulation Elements. |
| | 5 | There is no "what if" included that identifies what happens to traffic if all planned roads are not built. As Mr. Smisko indicated, all of the planned roads have been on the map for some time (and many unbuilt for some time i.e., Via Princessa to Wiley Canyon). 5 new bridges over the Santa Clara River are required while only 1 in the past 15 years had been built with one under construction | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 6 | The Element indicates "the City minimizes cut-through traffic through circles, chokers and diverters." I'd like to see City Staff identify one location where we have each of these elements. They don't exist today and should not be mentioned in the Element as if we have them. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|--|
| | 7 | The traffic model identified many needed improvements. Will new development be enough to fund these improvements? If not, how will they be funded? Assuming we have 5 new major roads with bridges over the River and they cost half of the cross valley connector (\$125,000,000 each, along with 15 intersection improvements at \$4,000,000 each (eminent domain) we have \$685 million in today's costs. This doesn't include the cost of the other improvements mentioned (more parking at train stations, re-striping and widening projects, bus turnouts, bike paths, more buses, etc). We could well be looking at a \$1 Billion plus price tag by the time this is said and done. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 8 | There is no carbon footprint or greenhouse gas analysis. This needs to be present in this Plan. Analysis tools are available. The Element comment that standards and regulations concerning compliance with AB 32 are still being developed is no excuse to not use evaluation tools already in place to see if the City's plan will achieve the reductions required under AB 32. Standards and regulations like seismic codes constantly change – because they change is not a reason to ignore them. A tool developed by the California Air Resources Board, the Lawrence Berkley Lab and the California Energy Commission can be found at coolcalifornia.org. It's not like these are fly by night organizations. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.4, Global Warming and Climate Change , of the draft EIR. |
| | 9 | What are the assumptions used to drive the traffic study in the plan? Are we assuming that all new residents will work here? What are the assumed levels of bus and train ridership versus now? Why will the ratios change? | These comments address the Circulation and Land Use Elements. |
| | 10 | Re-striping of 5 roads will eliminate bike lanes. Why aren't there plans to reinstate these if bicycling is identified as an important element of the plan? | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 11 | Are we ready to use eminent domain to improve our major intersections? | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 12 | Two of our major arterials will require at grade crossings which Metrolink has been reluctant to approve. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 13 | How will bus turnouts be built on right of ways already completely full of concrete and asphalt (think Soledad)? | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| | 14 | While we are identifying that we want a pedestrian friendly community, with many of the road widening projects, the sidewalk will be immediately adjacent to the road. Furthermore, as a frequent pedestrian, crossing six and eight lane roads is not very much fun. It will be difficult to put pedestrian safe islands in roads that will need to be wall to wall traffic lanes. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 15 | The Element indicates that more turn signals will be put in place. While this may make turns safer, it also causes excess emissions because cars that could turn if the intersection is clear are not allowed to resulting in more idling. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 16 | Page C-31 refers to truck parking regulations. What are they? I continue to see trucks parked long term on our roads. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 17 | Figure C-4 shows an existing helipad at Henry Mayo. I keep reading this is not operational any longer and is contingent on the new master plan being approved. If not operational, it should be removed. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 18 | Page C-41 identifies that bike racks have been installed on all buses. This is not true. Bike racks have not been installed on Express buses going to Lancaster\Palmdale, Van Nuys, Warner Center, Century City, and Los Angeles. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 19 | Policy C.3.1.6 says to "Promote the provision of showers and lockers" for bicyclists while Policy C.6.2.3 says "showers and changing rooms should be required." Which is it? If important, they should be required. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | 20 | Please keep these items in mind when it comes time for your approval or disapproval of OVOV. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |

Sandi Franco November 10, 2008

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| | 1 | The future of Santa Clarita lays in your hands. Please do the right thing. We do not need to develop every piece of property (what little is left) to the point where it is over developed. Keeping density down in future projects will help protect the way of life we have now and for the future. We are already over burdened in our schools and on our roads. If we continue on the path we seem to be heading down, Santa Clarita will no longer be a desirable place to live and raise a family. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|

| Comment | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Commenter | No. | Comment Summary |
| Gary and Sherrie Ardnt November 10, 2008 | | |
| | 1 | <p>I would like to express my concerns along with my neighbors over the General Plan changes for our valley. Density is not a solution to tax problems and budget shortfalls. Our roads, schools, freeways, fill in the blank are all overcrowded with the plan the way it is now. The Smiser Ranch property along with Hamburger Hill and the shopping centers of Stevensen Ranch will be the final straw that sends me and my tax dollars moving out of this beautiful city. The whole reason I moved here, OPEN SPACE!!!! You saw where greed got our country and the banking system. This will have a similar ending. NO,NO,NO on higher density in SCV. We will be watching your vote and then we will vote.</p> |
| Thomas Surak January 7, 2009 | | |
| | 1 | <p>I am pleased to be able to provide the following comments regarding the draft OVOV documents. In general, the documents appear to be deficient in many areas. They do not offer Santa Clarita residents the same protections and promises which currently exist in the General Plan. Also, as having participated in many aspects of the OVOV process, I can testify to the fact that it was overly cumbersome, often confusing and not at all conducive to inviting full participation by all interested parties. Several of my specific issues and concerns are discussed below. I expect similar comments will be submitted by other residents, which will require additional public participation before the OVOV process can move forward. I can only hope that this will lead to timely and successful resolution of all issues.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 2 | <p>The City has not made a proper showing for why it is proposing significant revisions the existing General Plan. The City's flyer, "OVOV Facts and Benefits" which was widely circulated to the public, clearly states that the build-out population estimates adopted for the 1991 General Plan maxed at 521,977 people, and that the OVOV estimates a build-out population range of 444,000 to 485,000. The obvious yet unanswered question is then, "Why are increases in zoning densities, in many cases significant ones, being proposed for the OVOV?" The City cannot legitimately argue that the increased density is to accommodate non-residential development because most OVOV commercial zoning definitions allow for extremely high density (e.g., a <u>minimum</u> of 11 units per acre) residential use. These "commercial zone" residential densities overwhelm those of the surrounding neighborhoods, and such development can only be perceived as detrimental to nearby residents. As further discussed below, the City's concept of a "Valley of Villages" as laid out in the OVOV is not consistent with the principle of enhancing established neighborhoods, nor with development consistent with neighborhood community character, which are both key objectives stated in the OVOV.</p> | <p>This comment addresses the Land Use Element.</p> |
| | 3 | <p>Page L-39 of the current General Plan makes it clear that the land use designations adopted in 1991 "should not be construed as temporary holding categories awaiting higher density designations in the future." It further states, "The Plan has looked at development suitability within the entire Santa Clarita Valley and applies designations <u>for anticipated, long-term future development</u>" The draft OVOV clearly makes a mockery of this promise. OVOV zoning densities are drastically increased throughout the valley.</p> | <p>Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 4 | <p>Also, many new zoning categories are overly broad with respect to allowable types of applicable development. For example, the Regional Commercial, Community Commercial and Neighborhood Commercial zoning designations all allow for mixed use (i.e., residential) development, even though the OVOV also has separate “Mixed Use” zoning designations which more clearly convey the ability to allow such proposed developments. The General Plan is clear when it states “surrounding characteristics, preservation of neighborhood integrity and compatibility with existing uses shall also be taken into consideration in connection with new development proposals.” The guiding theme of the OVOV, “A Valley of Villages,” casts these neighborhood protections aside by <u>requiring increasing density projects</u> which are entirely inconsistent with the characteristics of surrounding neighborhoods.</p> | This comment addresses the Land Use Element. |
| | 5 | <p>The City’s concept of a “Valley of Villages” conveniently avoids discussion on the subject of different housing types having different public service requirements. For example, persistent crime hotspots in the Santa Clarita Valley are highly correlated with housing density, e.g., the largest crime problems are associated with higher density housing near downtown Newhall and in Canyon Country. The OVOV does not consider or address additional financial and emotional costs which will be imposed upon existing residents as a consequence of increased crime associated with the OVOV’s high density housing proposals.</p> | This comment addresses the Safety Element. |
| | 6 | <p>The OVOV undermines existing neighborhood protections from such high density projects. These protections are inherent in the 1991 General Plan, which many who have since settled into Santa Clarita relied on when making their decision to move here. Without a showing of benefits to existing neighborhoods, one can readily conclude that the OVOV is primarily designed to provide developers an opportunity to further increase their profit opportunities through increased zoning densities. Such opportunities are properly restricted under the existing General Plan through its embedded protections provided to residents of Santa Clarita, and these protections must be maintained.</p> | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | 7 | <p>Some basic elements of the OVOV which must be understood to ensure full participation in the OVOV process were not (and may still not be) clearly communicated to the public. For example, the proposed zoning designation of the Smiser property located in my neighborhood near Calgrove & Wiley Canyon was recently (and unknowingly) revised. At the November public workshops which showcased the draft OVOV, the Smiser property zoning designation was clearly identified as Community Commercial. A <u>completely new</u> zoning designation for this property, Mixed Use – Neighborhood (MXN), has just recently been brought to my attention. However, one cannot readily determine that there has been a new zoning designation by reviewing the revised December 19 Preliminary Land Use map posted for public review, which is the key document for purposes of OVOV review and understanding. The blue and white striped color designation assigned to this MXN zoning designation on the map completely blends in with the blue and white stripe used to assumedly delineate the city boundary which is adjacent to the Smiser property. No reasonable person could have been expected to learn of this zoning change through periodic review of this map, yet that is what was expected from those attempting to participate in the OVOV process. I can only assume that this color scheme selection was just a coincidence and unintentional. However, it does illustrate one of the many unnecessary difficulties OVOV participants have had to overcome in order to properly become engaged in the OVOV process.</p> | <p>This comment addresses the Land Use Element and Land Use Map. Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| | 8 | <p>Another example of confusion derives directly from the exclusion of a critical clarification in the General Plan from the OVOV zoning definitions. The General Plan clarifies that appropriate project intensity “is generally expected to be between the low and mid-point of the allowable floor area ratio (FAR) range.” Comparisons made by City Staff in documents and at public meetings which suggested that allowable city development under the General Plan and the OVOV were equivalent did not incorporate the lower FAR range clarification embedded in the General Plan, and thus overstated allowable development under the General Plan. Stated another way, the OVOV will allow for much denser development even at similar FAR since it no longer requires project intensity to be at the lower end of the allowable FAR range. Unless the above clarification regarding a lower appropriate project intensity is incorporated into the OVOV, representations made regarding comparable allowable development under the General Plan and the OVOV were incorrect because they minimized impacts under the OVOV, and were likely to have diminished public participation in the OVOV process.</p> | <p>This comment addresses the Land Use Element.</p> |
| | 9 | <p>Also, there is language throughout the OVOV which lessens the certainty of limiting future development to the designated zoning. For example, page I-3 states “all subsequent planning and development decisions within the Santa Clarita Valley planning area shall be determined to be consistent with these documents, except as provided herein for any land use applications pending during the plan preparation and adoption process.” This caveat completely undermines the ability of citizens to fully appreciate what is capable of being developed in their neighborhoods and other areas where they may have special concerns and interests, and effectively disengages many from actively participating in the OVOV process. In addition, this caveat is not consistent with public representations which have made. Please refer to an October 5, 2008 article in “The Signal” titled, “SCV ponders ‘one vision’ for growth” which quotes both of you [Mr. Jason Smisko and Mr. Paul Novak) as well as Paul Brotzman. This article includes the following statement: “Though general plans by definition</p> | <p>This comment addresses the Land Use Element and the Land Use Map. Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary |
|-----------|-------------|---|
| | 9 (cont'd) | <p>are general, the state mandated documents must include a map that describes exactly what type of development can occur on every inch of land." I do not recall any clarification or rebuttal to this statement having been made by City or County staff. I also believe many more residents have read "the Signal" for information on the OVOV than have read through the several hundred pages of draft OVOV documents. The development flexibility being sought in the OVOV which I cited above does not comply with this statement. Therefore information provided to the majority of residents regarding the development flexibility sought within the OVOV is misleading at best. The City and County cannot assume that residents fully comprehend this development flexibility. Therefore the OVOV cannot be allowed move forward with this intended flexibility without further public disclosure and discussion.</p> |
| | 10 | <p>The OVOV inadequately addresses how existing deficiencies in City parks and recreation facilities will be met. The OVOV states, "The Land Use Element is the City's and County's long-term blueprint for development of property to meet Santa Clarita Valley's future needs for ... parks, open space...including location for future uses within the planning area." It furthermore states, "<u>The provision of adequate park space and facilities to serve residents is not only required by State planning law, but is recognized as necessary to provide for public health and quality of life.</u>" The OVOV further recognizes that "another issue for park development is distribution of park facilities, as many local parks are concentrated within master planned communities, and outlying areas have access to fewer local parks." The OVOV confirms that the City has a "standard" (the term "requirement" is used in the 1991 General Plan, which I interpret as the true intent) of 5 acres of park facilities per 1000 residents, and yet the City currently has "only about 1.5-2 acres of developed parkland per 1000 population", which is essentially unchanged from when the General Plan was adopted in 1991. (In fact, as of October 2008 the true ratio is 1.4 acres of parkland per 1000 population as stated by the City of Santa Clarita Parks, Recreation, and Community Services</p> <p>This comment addresses the Conservation and Open Space Element and Land Use Element. Parks and Recreation are addressed in Section 3.16 of this draft EIR. Commenter's opinion is acknowledged.</p> |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary |
|-------------|--|--|
| 10 (cont'd) | Commission, which increases the magnitude of the existing parkland deficiency.) In essence, notwithstanding the claims that significant parkland has been added since 1991, due to corresponding population growth <u>there has been no significant progress made towards meeting the parkland "target" in almost two decades.</u> This is especially true in areas which were identified as being underserved throughout that timeframe, which will have to be met through land acquisition using "additional funding sources." This is because the State's Quimby Act which has been used to acquire the majority of parkland added since 1991 only provides parkland (and only at an below "target" three acres per 1000 population) for residents of new developments. | |
| 11 | The OVOV ignores the critical additional parkland requirement (per Policy LU 3.4.1) by stating that the Conservation and Open Space element "will not serve as a park master plan but will instead focus on broad policy issues relating to park planning." The OVOV just defers on this issue by identifying as City Task 8.1, "Complete and adopt a revised Park and Recreation Master Plan for the City by 2009." <u>This is unacceptable.</u> The OVOV must fully coordinate with the park master plan on a detailed level; by not doing so, the OVOV invites development of remaining open areas which must be preserved for future parkland to meet the adopted parkland "target." This need for coordination holds especially true in areas which have an identified parkland deficiency and minimal remaining acreage which can help meet that deficiency. In fact, the Final Draft of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan Update states, "Priority should be given to meeting the current (park) acreage deficit of 612 acres." However, the OVOV not only lacks any priority with respect to additional parkland in the OVOV, there are inherent barriers to the creation of additional parkland created by the OVOV. | This comment addresses the Land Use Element, Conservation and Open Space Element, City of Santa Clarita Parks and Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan Update (2008). Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|
| | 12 | For example, the Calgrove/Wiley Canyon neighborhood was identified in the existing General Plan as being “severely underserved” with respect to parks (this neighborhood is similarly identified as having a “service area gap” in the Final Draft of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan Update, which I take as a euphemism). The only remaining undeveloped land which can be used for a neighborhood park in the Calgrove/Wiley Canyon area is the Smiser property. However, not only does the latest OVOV zoning of the Smiser property not include any reference to parkland, it instead proposes to increase the density allowed for development of that property! By increasing the allowable build densities on remaining undeveloped property such as Smiser, the OVOV increases the residual value of properties which are most suitable for helping close the significant gap between target and actual park acreage. Thus the OVOV will create further barriers to meeting the park master plan objectives by unnecessarily increasing the future cost of acquiring acreage for parkland. This will undermine the ability of and likely preclude the City from meet existing, let alone future, parkland needs under the prescribed “target.” | This comment addresses the Land Use Element. Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| | 13 | The environmental aspect of the OVOV addresses climate issues only from a macro perspective; the issue of microclimate changes which are common with increased “urbanized” development such as that contemplated by the OVOV is ignored. Microclimate issues must be incorporated into the EIR study process to provide a complete and proper assessment of potential impacts from the build out proposed by the OVOV. Also, there is a lack of focus on increased noise associated with increased urban development, both during and after construction, as proposed in the OVOV. The importance of this issue cannot be ignored since increased noise pollution has the ability to undermine the tranquility that residents of Santa Clarita currently appreciate and will continue to expect in the future. | Global climate change is addressed in Section 3.4 of the draft EIR. Noise is addressed in Section 3.18 of the draft EIR. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | 14 | Also, there is a lack of focus on increased noise associated with increased urban development, both during and after construction, as proposed in the OVOV. The importance of this issue cannot be ignored since increased noise pollution has the ability to undermine the tranquility that residents of Santa Clarita currently appreciate and will continue to expect in the future. | This comment addresses the Noise Element and in Section 3.18 of the draft EIR. |
| Bob Werner February 17, 2009 | | | |
| | 1 | Where is the Traffic Analysis that this element is based on? | The Traffic Report is located in Appendix 3.2 of this EIR and at the end of the Circulation Element. |
| | 2 | How far from the roads were the noise measurements in Exhibit N-5a taken? | This comment addresses the Noise Element. |
| | 3 | Exhibit N-5a legend states that 'Leq' is used, and the explanatory text says that 'Noise measurements were made of the short-term Leq values.' (page N-13) CNEL, which is the parameter used in this element (page N-9), is a '24-hour, time-weighted energy average noise level...'. CNEL is used in the Appendix starting on page N-36 for future planning. Please clarify the correlation between what appears to be a 'snapshot' measurement (Leq) used for current conditions, and future planning estimates, which are based on CNEL. | This comment addresses the Noise Element. |
| | 4 | How did Newhall Ave. between Sierra Hwy and Valle del Oro go from 49,000 ADT (in the Masters College traffic analysis of 2008) in the interim year to 40,000 ADT in this noise analysis? Notably, for Sierra Hwy between Newhall Ave and Dockweiler, the ADTs are 9,000 (Masters College traffic analysis) and 23,000 (OVOV). Sierra Hwy between Dockweiler and Placerita Canyon is 26,000 (Masters College traffic analysis) and 39,000 (OVOV). These numbers are very different, and need explanation, especially because the traffic volume on Sierra Highway is far higher in the OVOV, but far lower on Newhall Ave in the same OVOV. | This comment does not address this program EIR. |

| Commenter | Comment No. | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|--|---|
| | | How does Newhall Ave 'NW of Valle del Oro' have 33,000 ADT (OVOV) when Newhall Ave from Sierra Hwy to Valle del Oro has 40,000 ADT? Under current conditions, there is more traffic west of VDO on Newhall Ave (50,000 ADT vs. 45,000 according to the Masters College traffic analysis of 2008). There will certainly not be a decrease of traffic on Newhall Ave. west of VDO, because some of the traffic diverted off Sierra Hwy onto Dockweiler will go down VDO and back to Newhall Ave. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | | How are you going to fit 23,000 ADTs on Newhall Ave between Market and Lyons? | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | | The 'current general plan freeway noise contour distances for freeways' has 316,000 ADTs on SR-14 between I-5 and Placerita Canyon. The 'proposed general plan freeway noise contour distances for freeways' has 230,000 ADTs for the same stretch of road. Where did 86,000 ADTs go? | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | | Dockweiler Drive has 2 segments in all the lists: Current GP OVOV Dockweiler from Sierra Hwy to mid-section 25,000 24,000 Dockweiler from mid-section to mid-section 22,000 18,000 Where is this 'mid-section' and what happens to the 6,000 ADTs that just disappear? | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| | | On page N26, the proposed policy for residential development in the I-5 corridor 'prohibits residential buildings within 150 feet from the I-5 CENTERLINE' (emphasis added). The California Air Resources Board has recommended that residences be located 500 feet from the EDGE OF THE FREEWAY (emphasis added). Estimating the width of I-5 at 200 feet in the Santa Clarita valley, the OVOV policy would permit residential development only 50 feet from the edge of the roadway, instead of the 500 feet recommended. How can this difference be justified? | This comment addresses the Noise Element. |

SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

This section provides a summary of the scoping comments received by the City and the County. The responses in **Table 1.0-3** are not intended to provide complete responses to the corresponding comment. The responses to comments are intended to be brief and to direct the reader to the appropriate section of the EIR or General Plan Element where comments are addressed in greater detail.

**Table 1.0-3
Scoping Comments and Location of Where the
Comment is Addressed in the Draft EIR**

| Comment | Where Addressed in the EIR |
|--|--|
| Keep equestrian trails open. | This comment is addressed in the Open Space Conservation Element and Section 3.16, Parks and Recreation , of the draft EIR. |
| Preserve special standards districts for Alderbrook, Placerita Canyon, Sand Canyon, Happy Valley planning areas. | This comment addresses the Land Use Element. |
| There must be consideration for bicycle and pedestrian transportation. Of concern is access to roads, bus, rail, and nighttime security lighting (Happy Valley and Sand Canyon). | This comment is addressed in Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation , of the draft EIR and the Safety Element. |
| There should be a reference to existing Community Service Districts and Special Standards Districts (include all districts). | This is taken into consideration in the Land Use Element. |
| An overlay of wildlife corridors should be shown. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.7, Biological Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| There should be a section on greenhouse gases and climate change. | This comment is addressed in Section 3.4, Global Warming and Climate Change . |
| Mineral Resources and mining resources should be discussed. | Mineral Resources is discussed in Section 3.10, Mineral Resources , of the draft EIR. |
| Existing parks and trails need to be discussed. | Parks and trails are discussed in Section 3.16, Parks and Recreation , of the draft EIR. |

| Comment | Where Addressed in the EIR |
|---|--|
| There should be floodway/floodplain and fire overlay maps prepared illustrating hazard areas. SEAs should be shown on an overlay. | Floodway/floodplain issues are addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality , in the draft EIR. SEAs are shown in Section 3.7, Biological Resources . Fire overlay maps are shown in Section 3.15, Public Resources (Fire Services) , of the draft EIR. |
| The Draft EIR will have a 120-day review period. | The draft EIR will have a 60-day review period. |
| A Development Monitoring System (DMS) needs to be adopted. | <p>The City has chosen not to include a development monitoring system (DMS) in its General Plan. Additionally, the County has chosen not to include a DMS program in their General Plan effort as well.</p> <p>Historically in 1987, the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning (DRP) initially established DMS, which was a program to ensure that in quickly expanding areas, new development, public service infrastructure, and service capacity were closely monitored for inefficiencies. The DMS program monitored the expansion costs for schools, sewers, fire stations, libraries, and water services in urban expansion areas, and ensured that from a planning perspective, services were expanded to meet future growth projections.</p> <p>The County's General Plan no longer identifies urban expansion areas, and many of the expansion costs for services are now covered by specific development fees and by CEQA. Thus the County DRP will no longer utilize DMS. Therefore, consistent with County planning the City no longer sees the need to include DMS for planning purposes.</p> |
| Alternative energy sources should be encouraged (if not required)—such as wind and solar. | Alternative energy sources are addressed in the Land Use Element. |
| Financial incentives to encourage solar energy should be pursued. | Alternative energy sources are addressed in the Land Use Element. |
| The General Plan amendment process should be clearly defined and how the changes affect the different elements of the Plan. | A future amendment will be processed in accordance with state law and UDC. |

| Comment | Where Addressed in the EIR |
|---|---|
| Input from adjacent communities should be solicited on the land use plan. | Please see the section above and Table 1.0-1 addressing the considerable public outreach undertaken for the OVOV planning effort. |
| There is concern regarding “urban villages.” | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| There was a suggestion that workshops to inform the community of changes to the land use plan should be conducted. | Please see the section above and Table 1.0-1 addressing the considerable public outreach undertaken for the OVOV planning effort. |
| Impacts of urban center and transition of land uses should be discussed. | This issue is addressed in Section 3.1, Land Use , of the draft EIR. |
| Flood channels should not be lined in concrete. Placerita Creek should remain recreational. | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| Concern was voiced regarding the destruction of ridgelines and oak trees. Specific language should be included to restrict destruction of ridgelines and to require oak relocations. | The noted comments are addressed in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan. |
| There is a concern with the revision to the General Plan “opening up” the codes. | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| There is a perception that the developer has flexibility and more development opportunity with the use of Specific Plans. | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| There was a request to see a comparison of changes from old to new. | Due to the comprehensive nature of this update a comparison is only possible by reviewing the old General Plan. This is not an update to the existing General Plan but is a new General Plan. |
| A request was made to compare the County General Plan overlay to the City General Plan-where does the new General Plan begin and end with relationship to the County’s new Area Plan. | The commenter will need to review both General Plans at the same time to see changes from the existing General Plan to the new General Plan. |
| A concern was voiced regarding the overall changes proposed for the General Plan. | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| Low-income residents should be targeted: teachers, government workers, and police. | This comment is addressed in the Housing Element. |
| Advancements in water planning should be explored including conservation. | This comment is addressed in the Land Use Element. |
| The Smiser Specific Plan was mentioned noting a concern that when it is rezoned—that it be rezoned with certainty. There was discussion that Specific Plans allow too much leeway. More restrictions need to be included in the Specific Plans-particularly in the Calgrove Corridor-Santa Clarita Valley Gateway). | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |

| Comment | Where Addressed in the EIR |
|---|--|
| There was a concern with growth in the community. | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| The City should implement a “feathering” method of developing a transitioning zone between new and existing developments. If there is not room for “feathering” then square footage should be limited. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| There is a concern with focusing low incomes in high density areas. | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| All existing waterways should be shown in the General Plan. | This comment is addressed in Sections 3.7, Biological Resources, and 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the draft EIR. |
| There is a concern that high density areas not be limited to low-income residents. | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| With regard to the Circulation Element, when was the last time that the traffic model was updated? New traffic counts should be taken because commute patterns have shifted. Solid traffic assumption must be used in the traffic analysis. The freeway must be considered in the traffic analysis. | Discussion regarding traffic counts, traffic model updates are discussed in Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation of this EIR, which also addresses SR-14 and I-5. This comment also addresses the Circulation Element. |
| The Circulation Element should show one-two alternative roads outside of the Valley. | Alternatives are discussed in Section 6.0, Alternatives. |
| An income vs. cost of housing analysis needs to be prepared-fiscal analysis. | A fiscal analysis is not a part of the draft EIR. |
| Identify land use areas for mitigation banking. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| Energy efficiency and green building should be investigated. | Energy efficiency and green building are addressed in the Land Use Element. |
| Cultural resources need to be addressed in terms of public facilities for art/cultural uses. | Cultural Resources are addressed in Section 3.8 of the draft EIR. |
| Workforce housing and inclusionary zoning must be addressed. | Housing is addressed in the Housing Element and Section 3.19, Population and Housing, of the draft EIR. |
| The hospital and public health facilities must be addressed. | Hospital issues are addressed in the draft EIR Section 3.14, Community Services. |
| Impacts occur when urban villages are situated adjacent to existing neighborhoods. This concept must be monitored (land use and traffic) in order to keep safety and harmony in existing neighborhoods. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| A concern was voiced regarding placing future high density in rural areas. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| There needs to be a balance between urban and non-urban areas. | This comment addresses the General Plan and not the draft EIR. |
| Traffic and open space must be looked at integrally when considering the trail connection to open space areas. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |

| Comment | Where Addressed in the EIR |
|--|--|
| The City should consider using language found in the Santa Barbara and Pasadena General Plans with regard to the importance of public input and the role that the public has in this process. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| The Circulation Element must address the I-5/405 bottleneck. | This comment addresses the Circulation Element. |
| There needs to be a "reality check" of roadways at buildout conditions. The EIR must consider that not all roadways will be built at the time of development buildout. | Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation, of the draft EIR will address roadway conditions at buildout. |
| How will people located in the unincorporated areas of the County be noticed? All property owners would be notified of new proposed zoning. | The General Plan process will meet all legal notifying requirements. |
| Better out-reach for the General Plan is needed. | Please see the section above and Table 1.0-1 addressing the considerable public outreach undertaken for the OVOV planning effort. |
| Senior housing and an aging population is a critical issue which needs to be addressed. | This issue is addressed in the Housing Element and Section 3.19, Population and Housing, of the draft EIR. |
| Low-income housing for seniors will be needed in the future. | This issue is addressed in the Housing Element. |
| Water supply in the Calgrove corridor needs to be addressed. It was stated that water quality is poor in this area. | Water supply is addressed in Section 3.13, Water Service, of the draft EIR. Water quality is addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality. |
| Senior housing and an aging population is a critical issue which needs to be addressed. | This issue is addressed in the Housing Element. |
| The floodplain in the Calgrove area needs to be addressed. | Floodways are addressed in Section 3.12, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the draft EIR. |
| There is concern with the Lyons Canyon project located in unincorporated Los Angeles County and its impact at the I-5/Calgrove interchange. This project should be reviewed in combination with the proposed Smiser project. | This is a project specific comment and does not address the OVOV draft EIR. |
| Local residents do not want to see the City develop as a "Century City." Restrictions and limitations on height should be required. No more than 4-5 stories. | Commenter's opinion is acknowledged. |
| Development should be buffered around wildlife corridors and open space areas. | This issue is addressed in Section 3.7, Biological Resources. |
| There is a concern with the known contaminated areas in the City: NTS, Whitaker-Bermite, High Shear, Kaiser Century. The General Plan should designate these sites as Brownfield sites. | The City does not designate sites as Brownfield sites. This effort is undertaken by the EPA. |

| Comment | Where Addressed in the EIR |
|--|--|
| Traffic mitigation for urban villages must be analyzed on new on/off-ramps to SR-14 and I-5. | Whether or not new ramps are needed for I-5 or SR-14 will be addressed as a part of project-specific environmental analysis for any village project. |
| The General Plan should specifically address Agua Dulce. This discussion should include statements acknowledging that the area is dependent upon water wells. Consequently, the water supply must be protected. Furthermore, commercial projects proposed for this area must be studied closely—especially gas stations that could possibly impact the water source. | Agua Dulce is included in the OVOV Planning Area. |
| The Agua Dulce area could use commercial use code enforcement attention. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| Placerita Canyon is already a village. | This is a specific comment and does not address the OVOV draft EIR. |
| North Newhall Specific Plan area has taken away 20% of this community. | This is a specific comment and does not address the OVOV draft EIR. |
| What are the alternatives of the General Plan? Would the existing General Plan be an Alternative? | Alternatives are found in Section 6.0, Alternatives , of the draft EIR. |
| Urban Villages should include trails to existing neighborhoods. | This issue is discussed in the Land Use Element. |
| Golf carts should be allowed on trails. | Commenter’s opinion is acknowledged. |
| Examine the possibility of providing energy alternatives. | Alternatives are found in Section 6.0, Alternatives . |
| What percentage of this effort is under the jurisdiction of the City and County? | This is a joint project between the City and the County. |
| The City should become self-reliant for water and energy as much as possible. | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| There is a concern with freeway levels of traffic in neighborhoods. | This comment is acknowledged, but does not address the draft EIR. |
| Water- expanded use of reclaimed water because there are no treatment plants on the eastern side of town. | This comment has been addressed in the draft EIR in the Section 3.17, Utilities and Infrastructure , subsection Wastewater. |
| Lack of reclaimed water doesn’t support expansion. | |
| CEMEX Mine must be stopped. | This comment is acknowledged. Refer to Section 3.10, Mineral Resources , of this EIR. |
| Mine use is not compatible with area as it relates to today’s population and development. | This section has been addressed in Section 3.10, Mineral Resources , in the draft EIR. |
| They bring noise, traffic, and air pollution. | |
| Not a large source of employment brought to the community. | |

| Comment | Where Addressed in the EIR |
|---|--|
| <p>Recommended by CCC:</p> <p>Conditions or New Zone Commercial Suburban for the Smiser Property.</p> <p>35 Feet Height Limit.</p> <p>0.375 x 1,611,720 Sq. Ft. = 604,375 Sq. Ft.</p> <p>0.50 x 1,611,720 Sq. Ft. = 805,860 Sq. Ft.</p> <p>0.75 x 1,611,720 Sq. Ft. = 1,208,790 Sq. Ft.</p> | <p>This comment has been acknowledged but does so in a Project level style of detail. The OVOV document is a program EIR and addresses the policies set forth for future growth of the City's Planning area.</p> |
| <p>A beautiful entrance into the Santa Clarita Valley that feather into the existing neighborhoods.</p> <p>Wiley Canyon = No more than 4 lanes.</p> | <p>This comment is acknowledged but does not address the draft EIR.</p> <p>This comment is addressed in Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation, of the draft EIR.</p> |
| <p>Green Belts throughout the development.</p> | <p>This issue is addressed in Section 3.16, Parks and Recreation, of the draft EIR.</p> |
| <p>Calculation does not include Caltrans property taken away for freeway development.</p> | <p>This comment has been acknowledged but does not address the draft EIR.</p> |
| <p>Noise – Golden Valley noise has more than doubled. Need evergreen trees to buffer noise. Kohl's noise bounces off of hill.</p> | <p>Noise is addressed in Section 3.18, Noise, of the draft EIR. Noise is also addressed in the Noise Element.</p> |
| <p>Lights from Kohl's/Lowe's go into homes.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Lights go out of parking area only ¼ of lights are on.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Sign light stays on.</p> | <p>The draft EIR addresses these concerns in Section 3.6, Aesthetics. The OVOV document is a program EIR and sets the policies for future growth and does not address specific issues.</p> |
| <p>Turn – off lights (store) when closed e.g., LA Fitness.</p> | <p>This comment has been addressed in Section 3.6, Aesthetics, of the draft EIR.</p> |
| <p>Traffic on Isbella between Via Princessa and Golden Triangle</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A lot of speeding and traffic.</p> | <p>This comment has been acknowledged and is addressed in Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation, of the draft EIR. Also refer to the Circulation Element.</p> |
| <p>If Via Princessa goes all the way through to Golden Valley the noise and traffic will get worse.</p> | <p>This comment has been acknowledged and is addressed in Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation, of the draft EIR.</p> |