



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

ITEM 1

1

2 >> SUP. LINDSEY HORVATH: AYE.

3

4 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: SUPERVISOR HORVATH, AYE. SUPERVISOR
5 HAHN.

6

7 >> SUP. JANICE HAHN: YES.

8

9 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: SUPERVISOR HAHN, AYE. SUPERVISOR SOLIS.

10

11 >> SUPERVISOR HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: AYE.

12

13 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: SUPERVISOR SOLIS AYE. MOTION CARRIES 4-
14 0.

15

16 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: WE ARE NOW MOVING TO THE PUBLIC
17 HEARING ITEM. EXECUTIVE OFFICER, PLEASE SWEAR IN THE MEMBERS
18 OF THE PUBLIC WHO ARE REQUESTING TO ADDRESS THE BOARD ON THIS
19 ITEM.

20

21 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, INCLUDING IN-
22 PERSON AND REMOTE SPEAKERS WHO ARE REQUESTING TO ADDRESS THE
23 BOARD ON THE PUBLIC HEARING ITEM, PLEASE STAND AND RAISE YOUR
24 RIGHT HAND TO BE SWORN IN. PLEASE NOTE IN THE TESTIMONY, YOU
25 SOLEMNLY SWEAR TO TELL THE TRUTH AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH. SO



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 HELP YOU GOD. THANK YOU. YOU MAY BE SEATED. WE WILL NOW MOVE
2 ON TO ITEM 1 HEARING ON APPEAL OF PROJECT NUMBER 2015-01232 TO
3 AUTHORIZE A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE
4 C-1 ZONE AND IN THE DESIGNATED HILLSIDE MANAGEMENT AREA, WITH
5 TWO MODIFICATION REQUESTS TO EXCEED THE HEIGHT LIMIT OF 35
6 FEET FOR A TOTAL MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 65 FEET. AND TO REDUCE THE
7 FRONT YARD SETBACK AREA FROM 20 TO 15 FEET, LOCATED WITHIN THE
8 UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY OF LADERA HEIGHTS/VIEW PARK, WINDSOR
9 HILLS WITHIN THE WEST SIDE PLANNING AREA. FOR MEMBERS, TO
10 COMMENT ON THIS ITEM, USE THE RAISED HAND FEATURE IF ON-LINE
11 AND STAR 3 IF ON TELEPHONE. DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT SUBMITTED
12 AND CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED. AMY BODEK, DAVID DE GRAZIA, JOSH
13 HUNTINGTON, FIRE CHIEF AND LOUISE RAMIREZ, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF
14 PUBLIC WORKS AND BRIAN BARETTO, AND MARK, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
15 FOR CALIFORNIA AMERICAN WATER COMPANY AVAILABLE FOR QUESTIONS.
16 DEPARTMENTAL SPEAKERS STATE YOUR NAME AND TITLE FOR THE RECORD
17 WHEN YOU ADDRESS THE BOARD.

18

19 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: ANY COLLEAGUES THAT HAVE REMARKS
20 OR QUESTIONS? WHY DON'T WE GO AHEAD AND BEGIN. THANK YOU.

21

22 >> AMY BODEK: MADAM CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, THANK YOU
23 FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE HERE TODAY. WE ARE HERE FOR THE
24 APPEAL OF AN ACTION BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ON A
25 PROPOSED HOUSING PROJECT AT 5101 SOUTH HILL DRIVE, IT IS 88



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 UNIT FOR SALE CONDO PROJECT. THAT WOULD BE ABOUT 65 FEET IN
2 HEIGHT. THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION DID APPROVE THE
3 PROJECT AND IT IS BEFORE YOU TODAY ON APPEAL. THIS PROJECT
4 DATES BACK SEVERAL YEARS. THERE WAS A MITIGATED NEGATIVE
5 DECLARATION THAT WAS BROUGHT TO THE BOARD AND APPROVED BACK IN
6 2017. THAT PROJECT WAS LITIGATED AND COURTS DID DETERMINE,
7 THAT LITIGATION WAS INADEQUATE AS RELATED TO TRAFFIC AND
8 CIRCULATING. THE BOARD IN 2020 WAS REQUIRED BY COURT ACTION TO
9 WITHDRAW THE APPLICATION AND RESCIND ALL OF THE ENTITLEMENTS.
10 WE WERE DIRECTED TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL
11 REVIEW. WE HAVE DONE SO. AND WE ARE BRINGING THE PROJECT AS
12 PREVIOUSLY DESIGNED AND AS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED FORWARD TO YOU
13 NOW. IT IS ON APPEAL BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY AND SO THIS
14 IS AN APPEAL HEARING. THAT CONCLUDES MY REPORT, I AM HAPPY TO
15 ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MIGHT HAVE. ALSO MEMBERS OF THE
16 PUBLIC WORKS AND FIRE DEPARTMENT AS WELL AS AMERICAN WATER
17 COMPANY HERE FOR QUESTIONS.

18

19 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: SUPERVISOR MITCHELL.

20

21 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: THANK YOU VERY MUCH MADAM CHAIR.
22 AND THANK YOU. I DO HAVE A SERIES OF QUESTIONS FOR ALL OF
23 THOSE WHO ARE ON THE PANEL TODAY. AGAIN I JUST WANTED TO KIND
24 OF FRAME TODAY'S CONVERSATION. THANK YOU MRS. BODEK. THIS IS
25 BEFORE THE BOARD OVER A DECADE AGO. NOW BACK IN FRONT OF US



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 AFTER THE COURT ORDERED COUNTY TO UNDERGO AN UPDATED MORE
2 RIGOROUS TRAFFIC SAFETY STUDY AND ASSOCIATED MITIGATION
3 MEASURES TO COMPLY WITH CEQA, THAT IS HOW WE GOT HERE. AMY,
4 THANK YOU FOR THE PRESENTATION. I DO HAVE A QUESTION. SO CAN
5 YOU EXPLAIN WHY THE DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING ONLY
6 REVISITED THE TRAFFIC AND SAFETY COMPONENT OF THE EIR INSTEAD
7 OF THE ENTIRE PROPOSAL APPLICATION?

8

9 >> AMY BODEK: CERTAINLY. THANK YOU FOR THAT QUESTION
10 SUPERVISOR MITCHELL. THE COURT ORDERED REVIEW OF THE CEQA
11 DOCUMENT BUT ONLY FOUND THE TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION SECTION TO
12 BE DEFICIENT. THAT MEANT ALL OF THE OTHER CEQA COMPONENTS
13 ADEQUATE AND ACCEPTABLE TO THE COURTS. UNFORTUNATELY, THE WAY
14 THAT CEQA IS STRUCTURED, YOU DON'T HAVE A PROJECT IF CEQA IS
15 NOT APPROVED. CEQA MUST COME FIRST. THEY REQUIRED TO RESCIND
16 THE APPLICATION, ENTIRE APPLICATION BUT DID NOT REQUIRE THAT
17 THE PROJECT BE REDESIGNED OR CHANGED. ONLY REQUIREMENT OF THE
18 COURT WAS FIX THE DEFICIENCY OF THE TRAFFIC CIRCULATION
19 PATTERNS. THAT RESCINDS THE PROJECT AS ORIGINALLY APPROVED IS
20 BEFORE YOU TODAY BUT FOR THE ADDITIONAL WORK THAT WE DID ON
21 THE TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION.

22

23 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: AS ORDERED BY THE COURT IN 2019.

24

25 >> AMY BODEK: YES.



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1

2 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: MAKE SURE I HAVE BEEN FACTS
3 CORRECT. FOR PUBLIC WORKS, I HAVE HEARD FROM CONSTITUENTS AND
4 COMMUNITY MEMBERS THAT ARE DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT HOW THIS
5 PROJECT WILL POTENTIALLY AFFECT PEDESTRIAN AND TRAFFIC SAFETY
6 IN THE AREA. IT IS AN AREA THAT IS SQUARELY IN THE MIDDLE OF
7 THE VISION, AND YOU KNOW WELL, BECAUSE YOU CAME AND SPENT TIME
8 WITH ME AT A TOWN HALL MEETING WE CONVENED BECAUSE OF THE
9 TRAFFIC DEATHS THAT OCCURRED AT THE OVERHILL INTERSECTION. CAN
10 YOU SHARE HOW THEY MITIGATED THE TRAFFIC PROCESS, AND
11 SECONDLY, HOW WILL YOU CONTINUE TO ADDRESS THE CONCERNS LATER
12 ON IN THE PLANNED CHECK PROCESS?

13

14 >> STEVE BURGER: THANK YOU FOR THAT QUESTION SUPERVISOR. STEVE
15 BURGER, DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR TRANSPORTATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS. I
16 WANT TO REFLECT BACK ON OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMMUNITY'S
17 CONCERNS ABOUT SAFETY. IN FACT, YOU PROBABLY REMEMBER, THIS
18 WAS THE VERY FIRST COMMUNITY THAT WE ENACTED A COMMUNITY
19 TRAFFIC SAFETY PLAN. VERY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. INCLUDED THE
20 COMMUNITY. WE REVIEWED THIS PROJECT AND REVIEWED THIS PROJECT
21 IN THE CONTEXT OF THAT PLAN. WE DID COME TO THE CONCLUSION
22 THAT WE APPROVE DRESSED ALL SAFETY AND MOBILITY CONCERNS AS
23 WELL. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, THE DRIVEWAYS WE HAD WORKED, WORKED
24 WITH THE DESIGNERS TO RESTRICT ACCESS TO ONE OF THE DRIVEWAYS.
25 MAKE SURE THAT IT IS DONE SAFELY AND CONVINCED THAT BEING DONE



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 SAFELY. IN ADDITION, WE ALSO IDENTIFIED SOME PEDESTRIAN
2 IMPROVEMENTS THAT WERE SORELY NEEDED AND THE DEVELOPER IS
3 GOING TO BE PUTTING IN ABOUT 1500 FEET OF SIDEWALKS THAT IS
4 GOING TO INCREASE MOBILITY AND SAFETY FOR THE COMMUNITY.
5 DOUCHING PLAN CHECK, WE WILL MAKE SURE THAT THEY WILL COME
6 THROUGH WITH THAT. GIVEN THE CONTEXT OF THE SAFETY PLAN, THIS
7 WILL ACCOMPLISH THIS.

8

9 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: AGAIN IT IS NOT JUST WHAT THE PLAN,
10 WHAT YOU HAVE ALREADY APPROVED BUT THROUGH PLANNED CHECK
11 PROCESS YOU WILL CONTINUE TO BE ENGAGED TO MAKE SURE WHAT THEY
12 COMMITTED TO DO, COME TO FRUITION.

13

14 >> STEVE BURGER: ABSOLUTELY.

15

16 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: I DON'T KNOW IF YOU OR AMY, ANY
17 RECOURSE IF THEY DON'T?

18

19 >> AMY BODEK: SO THE RECOURSE IS THAT THEY DON'T GET THEIR
20 PLANNED CHECK PERMIT ISSUED. SO THEY WILL BE CONDITIONS OF
21 APPROVAL AND BOTH THE CEQA DOCUMENT AND PERMIT CONDITIONS OF
22 APPROVAL MUST BE CHECKED OFF AND COMPLIED WITH BEFORE PUBLIC
23 WORKS WILL ISSUE A PERMIT. THAT IS THE PRETTY STANDARD, BASIC
24 ANSWER I SHOULD SAY.

25



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: THAT IS HELPFUL. AGAIN, PUBLIC
2 WORKS. AGAIN, CONCERNS THAT THE PROJECT APPLICATION IS BEING
3 REVIEWED UNDER OUTDATED STANDARDS. SO IF YOU CAN WALK ME
4 THROUGH OR GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN 2017
5 AND 2025 BUILDING CODES AT THIS PROJECT WOULD HAVE TO COMPLY
6 WITH.

7

8 >> LUIS RAMIREZ: GOOD MORNING SUPERVISOR. LOUISE, DEPUTY
9 DIRECTOR OF MUNICIPAL SERVICES. TO START OFF, IT IS IMPORTANT
10 TO KNOW THAT THE PROJECT WILL NEED TO COMPLY WITH WHATEVER
11 CODE IS IN PLACE WHEN THEY SUBMIT A BUILDING PERMIT
12 APPLICATION TO PUBLIC WORKS. ASSUMING DONE IN THE NEAR FUTURE.
13 2026 LA COUNTY BUILDING CODE. WHICH AS YOU RECALL, THE BOARD
14 APPROVED ORDINANCES LAST -- ORDINANCES TO IMPLEMENT THE BUILD
15 WITHIN CODE IN NOVEMBER. IT WENT INTO EFFECT JANUARY OF THIS
16 YEAR. A LOT HAS CHANGED SINCE 2017 AND 2026. ONE OF THE
17 BIGGEST CHANGES THAT WE HAVE SEEN IS A MOVE TOWARDS
18 ELECTRIFICATION OF BUILDINGS. THIS HAS BEEN DONE WITH THE
19 INTENT OF LOWERING GAS EMISSIONS AND DECARBONIZATION GOALS
20 THAT THE COUNTY AND STATE ARE LOOKING WORKING TOWARDS. SO
21 BUILDING APARTMENT BUILDINGS LIKE THIS, WE ARE MAKING THEM
22 LOOK ALL ELECTRIC AND ELECTRIFICATION, CODE FAVORS, HEATING,
23 COOKING, COOLING, ALL OF THOSE SYSTEMS WILL BE ELECTRIC. THE
24 NEW CODE ALSO INCLUDES STRICTER REQUIREMENTS WHEN IT COMES TO
25 STRUCTURAL SEISMIC EVALUATION OF BUILDINGS. YOU MAY RECALL,



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 THE STATE RELEASED FAULT MAPS, WITH NEW CODE REQUIRES, THESE
2 BUILDINGS DO A DEEPER DIVE INTO HOW THESE PROXIMITY OF FAULT
3 LINES WILL IMPACT THE STRUCTURE AND REQUIRES HIGHER STRUCTURAL
4 DESIGN TO MAKE SURE THAT THE BUILDINGS ARE ABLE TO WITHSTAND
5 SEISMIC ACTIVITY.

6

7 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: THOSE ARE IS SIGNIFICANT GIVEN THE
8 GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF THIS PROPERTY. AND AS I HAVE HEARD
9 CONSISTENTLY FROM COMMUNITY MEMBERS AND CONSTITUENTS, THEY ARE
10 CONCERNED ABOUT THE PROXIMITY TO OIL FIELDS AND THE HISTORY OF
11 HYDRAULIC FRACTURING IN THAT AREA AND WHAT THAT PRACTICE HAS
12 DONE TO SOIL STABILITY. SO I GUESS THE FACT THAT THIS WAS
13 DELAYED FROM 2017 TO 2026 ULTIMATELY IS GOOD THING IN THAT WE
14 NOW, YOU KNOW, WHEN YOU KNOW BETTER, YOU DO BETTER. WE HAVE
15 MORE STRINGENT SEISMIC ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS.

16

17

18 >> LUIS RAMIREZ: THAT IS CORRECT SUPERVISOR.

19

20 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: THANK YOU. THANK YOU CHIEF MARRONE
21 FOR BEING HERE. QUESTION FOR FIRE. AND I'M ASSUMING THE FIRE
22 CODE HAS ALSO CHANGED FROM 2017. TO NOW. AND IN WHAT WAY?

23

24 >> CHIEF MARRONE: GOOD MORNING SUPERVISOR. ANTHONY MARRONE,
25 FIRE CHIEF, THAT IS A GOOD QUESTION, LIKE PUBLIC WORKS, OUR



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 FIRE CODE HAS CHANGED. CURRENT CODE, THE FIRE HAZARD SEVERITY
2 ZONE FOR THIS 1.8 ACRE PROPERTY USED TO RESIDE IN THE VERY
3 HIGH FIRE HAZARD SEVERITY ZONE. THE STATE HAS DECREASED THAT
4 TO THE HIGH. HOWEVER, THE DEVELOPER WILL BE BUILDING THIS
5 PROJECT AS IF IT WAS LOCATED IN THE VERY HIGH. SO IT WILL BE
6 WHAT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT REFERS TO AS A TYPE 3A CONSTRUCTION
7 WHICH MEANS THAT IT HAS ONE HOUR OF FIRE RESISTIVE BUILDING
8 CHARACTERISTICS. SO IT WILL BE BUILT TO THE HIGHER
9 REQUIREMENT, EVEN THOUGH THAT THE STATE HAS LOWERED THAT
10 REQUIREMENT BY GOING FROM THE VERY HIGH DOWN TO THE HIGH. THAT
11 IS MAJOR CHANGE FROM 2017 TO PRESENT.

12

13 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: I APPRECIATE THAT. WE'VE GOT
14 REPRESENTATIVES HERE FROM THE CALIFORNIA AMERICAN WATER
15 COMPANY. I APPRECIATE YOU BEING HERE. I UNDERSTAND THAT BASED
16 ON TODAY'S PRESENTATION AND BOARD LETTER, THAT THE PROJECT
17 WILL BE REQUIRED TO INSTALL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE THAT WILL
18 SERVE THE NEW DEVELOPMENT AND WILL NOT NEGATIVELY IMPACT THE
19 SURROUNDING AREA. SO I DO HAVE QUESTIONS ON THAT. BECAUSE THAT
20 CONTINUES TO BE AN ISSUE THAT I HEAR ABOUT CONSISTENTLY FROM
21 CONSTITUENTS. WHAT POINT IN THE PLAN CHECK OR DEVELOPMENT
22 PROCESS DO YOU VERIFY THAT A PARTICULAR PROJECT HAS MET THE
23 REQUIREMENTS LAID OUT IN THE WILL SERVE LETTER AND DOES THAT
24 PROCESS INCLUDE TESTING BOTH THE NEW AND EXISTING
25 INFRASTRUCTURE?



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1

2 >> MARK RIFER: THANK YOU SUPERVISOR MITCHELL. MARK RIFER WITH
3 CALIFORNIA WATER, ENGINEERING MANAGER FOR THE SOUTHERN
4 DIVISION. RESPONSE TO THAT WOULD BE, WE GO THROUGH A FIRE FLOW
5 TEST AT BEGINNING OF THE PROJECT, IF A DEVELOPMENT COMES IN.
6 DURING THAT, WE UNDERSTAND WHAT THE FLOW REQUIREMENTS ARE, AND
7 SO FORTH. IF, IMPROVEMENTS ARE NEEDED, AS PART OF THE PLAN
8 CHECK REVIEW PROCESS AND PLANNING PROCESS FOR A PROJECT, THEY
9 MIGHT COME IN AND SAY, WE NEED A CERTAIN FIRE FLOW AM. WE THEN
10 WOULD BRING IN OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS, AND ENGINEERING FIRM,
11 CONFIRMING THAT WHAT IMPROVEMENTS MIGHT BE NEEDED AS FAR AS TO
12 BRING THEIR SYSTEM UP TO STANDARDS. BASICALLY, ANY NEW
13 PROJECT, ANY NEW DEVELOPER PROJECT WE WOULD MAKE SURE THAT
14 WHATEVER IS DONE BASICALLY BRINGS THEIR SYSTEM UP TO CURRENT
15 STANDARDS AND CURRENT, BASE I DIDN'T, WITH THOSE CURRENT
16 STANDARDS, POTENTIALLY COULD ALSO HELP OTHERS WITHIN THE
17 COMMUNITY.

18

19 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: HAS THAT HAPPENED ALREADY? IS THAT
20 WHAT WILL HAPPEN?

21

22 >> MARK RIFER: THAT IS WHAT WILL HAPPEN. YES.

23

24 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: WHAT HAPPENED ALREADY? AND I'M
25 ASKING THAT BECAUSE NEIGHBORING CONSTITUENTS, THEY SHOWED ME



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 MAPS, SHOWED AREAS THAT HAVE ALREADY HAVE QUESTIONED THE WATER
2 FLOW WHERE THEY ARE DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT WALTER PRESSURE
3 HYDRANTS. AND SO THE EXISTING COMMUNITY IS LOOKING AT 88 NEW
4 UNITS COMING ON-LINE SAYING, WE ALREADY HAVE WATER FLOW
5 ISSUES. HOW WILL THEY CREATE INFRASTRUCTURE TO THIS
6 DEVELOPMENT? THAT IS THE --

7

8 >> MARK RIFER: IN GENERAL, TWO METHODS. ONE, NEW DEVELOPMENT.
9 TWO, CALIFORNIA AMERICAN WATER DOES REGULAR COMPREHENSIVE
10 WATER STUDY. LOOKS AT STUDIES AND SYSTEMS, MAKE UPGRADE. WE
11 ALSO GO THROUGH RATE CASE PROCESS TO GET APPROVAL AND DO THOSE
12 IMPROVEMENTS. IN THIS CASE, IT IS A DEVELOPMENT SPECIFICALLY
13 JUST FOR THAT DEVELOPMENT IS THE IMPROVEMENTS THAT ARE NEEDED.
14 WE WOULD BASICALLY MAKE PIPELINE IMPROVEMENTS AGING
15 INFRASTRUCTURE AS WELL AS POTENTIALLY CAPACITY INCREASES AND
16 SO FORTH, THEN PROVIDE DEVELOPMENT, FIRE FLOW AND WATER
17 BASICALLY.

18

19 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: AGAIN THAT ANALYSIS HASN'T HAPPENED
20 BUT WILL HAPPEN.

21

22 >> MARK RIFER: CORRECT.

23

24 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: WHEN?

25



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 >> MARK RIFER: DURING THE PLANNING, DURING THE PERMITTING
2 PROCESS AND SO FORTH.

3

4 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: LET'S SAY THAT YOU DO THAT ANALYSIS
5 AND THERE ARE CONCERNS IN TERMS OF WATER FLOW. WHAT DO YOU
6 THEN DO?

7

8 >> MARK RIFER: LIKE I SAID, WE WOULD WORK WITH THE DEVELOPER,
9 AS WELL AS THE OUTSIDE CONSULTANT, DEVELOP WHAT IMPROVEMENTS
10 ARE NEEDED AND THEN AS THOSE IMPROVEMENTS ARE CONFIRMED AS
11 WELL AS SUBMITTED WITH LA COUNTY FIRE -- WITH THE FIRE
12 DEPARTMENT, AND APPROVED, THEN WE WOULD WORK WITH AN INSPECTOR
13 AND CONTRACTOR TO MAKE SURE THAT THE IMPROVEMENTS ARE DONE. AT
14 THE END, WE WOULD ALSO RUN A FIRE FLOW TEST TO CONFIRM THAT
15 THE FIRE FLOW NEEDED IS THERE.

16

17 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: AGAIN NEW DEVELOPMENT.

18

19 >> MARK RIFER: YES.

20

21 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: I'M SURE YOU HEARD AS I HAVE, ABOUT
22 THE CONCERN ABOUT CURRENT INFRASTRUCTURE AND HOW DO YOU
23 RESPOND?

24

25 >> MARK RIFER: I WOULD SAY SOME AREAS THAT THERE ARE



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 DEFICIENCIES. THAT IS AREA THAT WE ARE TRYING TO IMPROVE WITH
2 CAPITAL PROJECTS AND THROUGH THE, BASICALLY COMPREHENSIVE
3 STUDY. WE TRY TO MAKE A MAIN IMPROVEMENT THAT HELPS MORE THAN
4 ONE FIRE HYDRANT AND BRING UP TO CURRENT STANDARDS. BUT YEAH,
5 ON A REGULAR PRIORITIZED BASIS WE DO THAT.

6

7 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: YOU ARE SUGGESTING THAT THE TWO ARE
8 NOT CONNECTED. THAT THE WORK YOU WILL DO AND THE
9 INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE NEW DEVELOPMENT HAS NO BEARING ON THE
10 EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES?

11

12 >> MARK RIFER: IN THE SENSE THAT THE IMPROVEMENTS RECOMMENDED
13 FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, DEFINITELY COULD HELP AND IMPROVE SOME OF
14 THESE AREAS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY. A LARGER DIAMETER MAIN,
15 POTENTIAL STORAGE, ANYTHING LIKE THAT. WOULD DEFINITELY HELP
16 OTHERS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY THAT ARE LOOKING TO DO
17 IMPROVEMENTS.

18

19 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: SO I HAVE HEARD LOTS OF QUESTIONS
20 AND DESIRES ABOUT THE HYDRANT FLOW TEST. I UNDERSTAND THAT
21 PUBLIC UTILITIES WILL CONDUCT THEM IF CUSTOMERS REQUEST THEM.
22 PUBLIC UTILITIES. I UNDERSTAND THAT THESE TESTS COST MONEY.
23 CAN YOU SHARE, IF OR WHEN, YOUR CUSTOMERS ARE ABLE TO REQUEST
24 HYDRANT TESTING, EVEN IF THEY ARE WILLING TO PAY FOR IT.

25



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 >> BRIAN BARETTO: SURE. GOING TO -- GOOD MORNING SUPERVISOR
2 MITCHELL, BRIAN BARETTO, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, CALIFORNIA AMERICAN
3 WATER. WE HAVE A HYDRANT TESTING PROCESS FOR PROJECTS, FOR
4 EXAMPLE, LIKE THIS DEVELOPER PROJECT OR WHEN A CUSTOMER IS
5 INTERESTED IN UPGRADING THEIR HOME OR BUILDING ADU. THEY WOULD
6 CONTACT US OR CONTACT LA COUNTY FIRE PREVENTION. AND THE
7 COUNTY FIRE PREVENTION MUCH WOULD SUBMIT A REQUEST ON BEHALF
8 OF THE RESIDENT OR ON BEHALF OF THE DEVELOPER. WE WOULD RUN
9 THOSE TESTS, FIRE FLOWS, MARK AND HIS TEAM, THE ENGINEERING
10 TEAM WOULD THEN MODEL IT. AND THEN GIVE THOSE RESULTS TO THE
11 DEVELOPER, TO THE RESIDENTS, AND ALSO TO LA COUNTY TO
12 DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THEY COULD GET THEIR PERMIT FOR THEIR
13 PROJECT. AND THEN THEY WOULD ALSO GO THROUGH AND IDENTIFY
14 INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS. TO OUR SYSTEM. IN THE AREA ON
15 THAT SPECIFIC BLOCK. I WILL SAY THAT CALIFORNIA WATER HAS AN
16 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE PROGRAM WHERE WE DO EVERY FIVE YEARS TEST
17 THE HYDRANTS ON ROLLING BASIS. IN 2027, WE ARE GOING TO GO TO
18 YEARLY HYDRANT TESTING PROGRAM WHERE EVERY SINGLE HYDRANT IN
19 THE SYSTEM WILL BE TESTED ON A YEARLY BASIS GOING FORWARD.

20

21 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: I UNDERSTAND, THERE WAS A REQUEST,
22 FOUR PARTICULAR HYDRANTS BE TESTED. I DON'T KNOW THE LAST TIME
23 THAT THEY WERE TESTED. THAT IS NOT INFORMATION I HAVE. IS
24 THERE A REASON WHY THEY WOULD BE DENIED HAVING IDENTIFIED
25 TESTED?



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1

2 >> BRIAN BARETTO: I CAN TELL YOU WE HAVE ONGOING CONVERSATION
3 WITH THE HOA AND THE COMMUNITY. WE HAVE RECEIVED A NUMBER OF
4 LETTERS AND E-MAILS FROM THEM. WE HAVE RESPONDED TO THEM. I
5 BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE PROVIDED A RESPONSE, OUR RESPONSES TO YOU
6 FOR YOUR REVIEW. WE ARE MORE THAN HAPPY TO TALK WITH THEM. IF
7 ADDITIONAL HYDRANTS THEY HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT, WE WOULD BE MORE
8 THAN HAPPY TO SEND OPERATIONS TO TAKE A LOOK AT. IF THEY NEED
9 MAINTENANCE, WE WOULD BE MORE THAN HAPPY TO DO MAINTENANCE ON
10 THEM. WE DO ON A DAILY BASIS. IF THERE IS A SPECIFIC PROJECT
11 THAT A HOMEOWNER IS INTERESTED IN UPGRADING THEIR HOME OR
12 BUILDING AN ADU THAT REQUIRES FIRE FLOW TESTING WE WOULD BE
13 MORE THAN HAPPY TO DO THAT FOR THEM.

14

15 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: OKAY. I APPRECIATE THAT. I HOPE
16 THEY HEARD YOU LOUD AND CLEAR. I ASK THAT YOU KEEP MY OFFICE
17 ENGAGED IN THAT PROCESS. I KNOW THAT THERE ARE SOME THAT ARE
18 RESULT OF ADU CONSTRUCTION AND THERE ARE SOME THAT JUST HAVE
19 HAD SOME LONG STANDING CONCERNS NOT BECAUSE OF NEW
20 CONSTRUCTION BUT JUST BECAUSE IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN A PROBLEM. I
21 WOULD LIKE TO STAY CONNECTED AND APPRECIATE UNDERSTANDING THAT
22 EVERY FIVE YEARS HYDRANTS ARE TESTED. CORRECT ME IF I'M
23 MISSTATING.

24

25 >> BRIAN BARETTO: ON A ROLLING BASIS.



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1

2 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: COME 2027, EVERY HYDRANT WILL BE
3 TESTED ANNUALLY.

4

5 >> BRIAN BARETTO:: THAT IS CORRECT.

6

7 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: GREAT. I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT I
8 HEARD THAT CORRECTLY. THANK YOU ALL FOR BEING HERE AND
9 ANSWERING MY QUESTIONS. LET ME JUST SAY, MADAM CHAIR IN
10 CLOSING, THAT MY TEAM AND I HAVE HAD ONGOING MEETINGS AND
11 ENGAGED CONSTITUENCY, WITH CONCERNS ABOUT THE PROJECT. AND THE
12 PROJECT HAS CHANGED FROM THE INITIAL SUBMISSION IN 2017. YOU
13 HAVE HEARD SOME OF THE EXAMPLES. STREET AND SIDEWALK
14 INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS, EXTENDING UP TO 1500 OUTSIDE OF
15 THE PROJECT SITE TO IMPROVE TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY. IT
16 IS AN AREA THAT I TRAVERSE REGULARLY. LITERALLY NO SIDEWALKS,
17 OVERHILL, THAT AREA, THIS IS A GOOD THING FOR THE COMMUNITY AS
18 A WHOLE. INCREASE OF AFFORDABLE UNITS WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE
19 BUILDING FROM 5-10. I KEEP SAYING AFFORDABLE. IT IS MODERATE
20 INCOME. THIS IS OWNERSHIP. DOUBLING THAT NUMBER. AGAIN
21 PROVIDING HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES TO MODERATE INCOME
22 HOUSEHOLDS. AND MAKING HALLWAY AND BATHROOM WINDOWS MORE
23 OPAQUE TO ADDRESS PRIVACY CONCERNS THAT NEIGHBORING HOMES HAVE
24 TALKED ABOUT. AGAIN WE HAVE HAD MANY CONVERSATIONS AND THROUGH
25 ALL OF THAT, THROUGH MY TEAM READING THE APPEAL FROM THE



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 HOMEOWNERS, ME ENGAGING IN MULTIPLE MEETINGS AS RECENTLY AS
2 YESTERDAY, I AM CLEAR ABOUT THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE FACTS
3 AND WHAT THE COUNTY IS OBLIGATED TO DO UNDER STATE LAW. THAT
4 IS THE CRITICAL ISSUE HERE. THIS IS, HAS BEEN A PROTRACTED
5 PROCESS. IT IS COMPLEX. AND THIS DECISION REALLY DIDN'T COME
6 EASY FOR ME. YOU KNOW, FRANKLY, I WISH THE PROJECT WERE
7 SMALLER. I DO. AND UNDERSTOOD IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE
8 DEVELOPER ALSO ABOUT THE FACT THAT WOULD NOT MAKE THE PROJECT
9 FISCALLY FEASIBLE. I GET HIS PERSPECTIVE AS WELL. YOU KNOW,
10 I'M HYPER SENSITIVE TO THE UNIQUENESS OF THIS STILL LARGELY
11 AFRICAN-AMERICAN SINGLE FAMILY HOME COMMUNITY. THE DESIRE OF
12 CONSTITUENTS THERE, TO MAINTAIN THE INTEGRITY OF THE
13 COMMUNITY. I'M ALSO HYPER SENSITIVE TO OUR NEED ACROSS LA
14 COUNTY TO BUILD HOUSING. AND TO BUILD ACROSS THE SPECTRUM OF
15 HOUSING. NOT JUST UNITS FOR RENT, BUT ALSO HOME OWNERSHIP
16 OPPORTUNITIES. I THINK THAT FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, IT IS, IT IS
17 EVEN MORE CRITICAL IN COMMUNITIES LIKE THIS TO MAKE SURE THAT
18 HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES ARE AVAILABLE AS WE HAVE TALKED
19 ABOUT THE TRANSFER OF WEALTH, ALL OF THAT IS SO IMPORTANT IN
20 THIS COMMUNITY. SO GIVEN ALL THAT I HAVE LEARNED AND
21 UNDERSTAND, I WILL BE VOTING TO SUPPORT THE REGIONAL PLANNING
22 COMMISSION'S DECISION TO DENY THE APPEAL AND SUPPORT THE
23 CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE AND
24 THANK YOU FOR YOUR DILIGENCE AND RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION.
25 WE WILL CONTINUE TO ENGAGE ON THE ONGOING CONVERSATION ABOUT



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 WATER PRESSURE MAKING SURE THAT THE NEW CONSTRUCTION HAS WHAT
2 THEY NEED AND THAT THE NEIGHBORING COMMUNITY HAS A HIGHER
3 DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE. THEIR HYDRANTS AND THE PRESSURE THAT
4 COMES INTO THEIR HOMES. THANK YOU MADAM CHAIR.

5

6 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: THANK YOU SUPERVISOR MITCHELL. ALL
7 VALID POINTS. ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU INHERIT A PROJECT THAT HAS
8 BEEN SO OLD AND KIND OF ON HOLD, SO, THANK YOU FOR YOUR
9 QUESTIONS AND IT HELPS TO ENLIGHTEN ALL OF US. THE THINGS THAT
10 WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH AS WE TRY TO BUILD MORE AFFORDABLE
11 HOUSING AND PERMANENT HOUSING. EXECUTIVE OFFICE, I THINK THAT
12 WE ARE GOING TO HEAR?

13

14 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: APPELLANT WILL BE JOINING US REMOTELY
15 DUE TO A WEATHER RELATED FLIGHT APPLICATION.

16

17 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: WE'LL HEAR FROM APPELLANT BEVERLY
18 PALMER, A TOTAL OF TWO MINUTES. SHE IS HERE. SHE --

19

20 >> MODERATOR: BEVERLY PALMER, YOUR LINE IS OPEN. PLEASE BEGIN.
21 BEVERLY PALMER.

22

23 >> BEVERLY PALMER: SORRY. CAN YOU CONFIRM THAT YOU CAN HEAR
24 ME? YES. THIS APPEAL -- THANK YOU. I'M SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF
25 UNITED HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION. THIS IS AN APPEAL OF 88 UNIT



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 NEARLY 65 FOOT BUILDING THAT REQUIRES THE CUP. THE UHA ASK
2 THAT THIS BOARD TAKE A CLOSER LOOK AT THREE MAJOR SAFETY
3 ISSUES. THESE ARE THINGS THAT SUPERVISOR MITCHELL WISELY
4 RAISED. WATER AND FIRE FLOW. WE HEARD FROM CAL AM REGARDING
5 THE PROCESS FOR REVIEWING THE WATER AND FIRE SAFETY ISSUES
6 HERE. THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK UNDER WHICH YOU ARE APPROVING THE
7 CUP REQUIRES THAT NEW USES WITH GREATER WATER SUPPLY NEEDS
8 THAN THE EXISTING USE, MUST SHOW THAT THEY MEET THE WATER
9 SUPPLY STANDARDS. THIS APPROACH THAT YOU HEARD FROM CAL AM IS
10 BACKWARD. THEY ESTABLISHED HOW IT WORKS. THEY REVIEW. HAVEN'T
11 EVEN REVIEWED THE ENGINEERING FOR HOW THEY WILL IMPROVE WATER
12 SAFETY, FIRE FLOW AND FIRE SAFETY WATER REQUIREMENTS IN THE
13 NEIGHBORHOOD. CAL AM AND THE DEVELOPER ASSUME THAT WHATEVER
14 CONDITIONS THAT EXIST THAT HAVE CREATED THIS ACKNOWLEDGED
15 INADEQUATE SERVICE CAN BE FIXED AND NOT EVEN TAKING INTO
16 ACCOUNT THE EXISTING PROBLEMS OF THE COMMUNITY IN THIS
17 ANALYSIS. IT IS BACKWARDS AND GIVEN THE CUP REQUIREMENT THAT
18 YOU DEMONSTRATE THAT THERE IS EXISTING ADEQUATE SERVICE, IT
19 SHOULD BE DONE FIRST. THE GEO TECHNICAL REPORT FOR THE
20 PROJECT, SECOND ISSUE. THAT STALE, THE COUNTY ENGINEERING
21 MANUAL REQUIRES THAT GEO TECHNICAL REPORTS BE UPDATED WITHIN
22 ONE YEAR OF THE SUBMITTAL DATE. THIS REPORT IS FROM NOVEMBER
23 2014. STAFF SAID THAT YOU COULD APPROVE THE PROJECT AND GET
24 THE GEO TECHNICAL REPORT UPDATED LATER. THAT IS NOT EVEN A
25 CONDITION OF APPROVAL. THIRD, ON TRAFFIC. THERE HAS NOT BEEN



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 AN ADEQUATE ANALYSIS OF SAFETY FOR THAT NORTHERN DRIVEWAY OF
2 THE PROJECT. UHA LICENSED TRAFFIC ENGINEER IDENTIFIED SPECIFIC
3 CONCERNS BUT HASN'T BEEN ADDRESSED IN DETAIL. WE RESPECT --

4

5 >> MODERATOR: THANK YOU.

6

7 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: OKAY. THAT IS IT. I'M SORRY. NOW
8 WE WILL HEAR FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE APPLICANT ELLIA
9 THOMPSON, ESQUIRE, A TOTAL OF TWO MINUTES.

10

11 >> ELLIA THOMPSON: HELLO, THOMPSON, THEY WILL STAND. STARLA
12 CORALS, SCOTT TRAN FROM P CAPITAL, DEVELOPERS AND HERE TODAY.
13 WE ALL WANT TO THANK EVERYONE FOR THE TIME AND ENERGY THAT IT
14 HAS TAKEN IN THE PAST NINE YEARS TO GET HERE. I AM THE LEGAL
15 ATTORNEY, THE ATTORNEY ON THIS PROJECT AND BEEN THROUGH THE
16 ENTIRE PROCESS. A COUPLE OF POINTS, THAT WERE MADE AND YOU SAW
17 MY LETTER. DATED EARLIER, LATE LAST WEEK, MY APOLOGIES,
18 SUPERVISOR SOLIS I DID NOT REALIZE THE CHAIR CHANGED. MY
19 APOLOGIES, THE LETTER SHOULD HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO YOU. YOU
20 HEARD FROM THE EXPERTS ABOUT FIRE AND WATER FLOW. I WON'T
21 BELABOR THAT. IN REGARDS TO THIS IDEA THAT THIS PROJECT NEEDED
22 TO HAVE, OR THAT WE DIDN'T TAKE INTO EFFECT THE TRAFFIC AND
23 CIRCULATION IS JUST FALSE. WE HAVE BEEN THROUGH SO MANY
24 DIFFERENT REVIEWS AND SCENARIOS IN TERMS OF HOW TO MAKE THESE
25 DRIVEWAYS, HOW TO MAKE THE ROADWAY IN FRONT OF OUR PROJECT



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 BETTER, SAFER, THERE IS RESTRIPING, THERE IS RECALCULATION IN
2 TERMS OF HOW THE DRIVEWAYS WORK. THERE IS DIFFERENCE IN
3 QUEUING, THE SIDEWALKS, THE SIGNAGE, THE PROHIBITION OF TURNS.
4 THIS IS NOT ABOUT MAKING THIS PROJECT SAFER, THIS IS A LONG
5 CAMPAIGN TO STOP THIS PROJECT FROM EVER BEING BUILT. SO WE
6 HAVE LOOKED AT EVERYTHING REGARDING TRAFFIC OVER THE LAST FIVE
7 OR SIX YEARS. PLANNING DEPARTMENT HAS WORKED. WE HAVE AN
8 ENTIRE ENVIRONMENTAL TRAFFIC TEAM THAT HAS WORKED EXTENSIVELY.
9 WE WORKED EXTENSIVELY WITH PUBLIC WORKS. THE IDEA THAT
10 EVERYTHING WASN'T DONE APPROPRIATELY IS JUST RIDICULOUS. IN
11 TERMS OF THE GEO TECH REPORT, AGAIN, THIS PROJECT WAS VESTED
12 IN 2016. SO ALL OF THE REPORTS ARE AT THAT TIME, IF ANYTHING,
13 NEEDS TO BE UPDATED, YOU HEARD THESE GENTLEMEN, WE SIMPLY
14 WON'T GET THE PERMITS AND THAT WILL HAPPEN.

15

16 >> MODERATOR: THANK YOU.

17

18 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS FROM MY
19 COLLEAGUES? SUPERVISOR MITCHELL? TURN YOUR MIC ON PLEASE.

20

21 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: REGIONAL PLANNING, IF THEY COULD
22 RESPOND TO THE FIRST WITNESS ' COMMENT ABOUT KIND OF THE ORDER
23 THAT SUGGESTING THAT, YOU KNOW, THAT SOME OF THIS TESTING IS
24 BEING DONE AFTER THE FACT. IT IS JUST, EITHER ILLOGICAL OR
25 NOT, ACCORDING TO STATUTE. THAT BE THE ORDER OF THE TESTING.



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 IF YOU COULD RESPOND TO THAT.

2

3 >> AMY BODEK: CERTAINLY. I HEARD THREE COMMENTS FROM THE
4 APPELLANT RELATED TO WATER FIRE FLOW, GEO TECHNICAL AND
5 TRAFFIC. PARTICULARLY RELATED TO THE TIMING OF THE WATER FIRE
6 FLOW AND THE GEO TECHNICAL. PRIOR TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING
7 COMMISSION DECISION IN NOVEMBER, CAL AM WATER DID PROVIDE A
8 BRAND NEW WILL SERVING LETTER. THAT IS A CONDITIONAL WILL
9 SERVE LETTER THAT IS NECESSARY FOR US TO ACTUALLY PROCEED WITH
10 THE APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT IN CONCEPT. WE CALL THAT PROJECT
11 ENTITLEMENTS. HOWEVER WHEN THEY THEN TRANSITION TO COMPLETING
12 THEIR APPLICATION FOR PLAN CHECK, THEY HAVE TO COMPLY WITH ALL
13 NEW DEVELOPMENT OF CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS, AND THEY HAVE TO
14 UPDATE ALL OF THEIR TECHNICAL REPORTS TO THE SATISFACTION OF
15 PUBLIC WORKS. PUBLIC WORKS WILL NOT REVIEW GEO TECHNICAL
16 UNLESS THE GEO TECHNICAL REPORT IS UPDATED AT THAT TIME. SO IT
17 WAS NECESSARY FOR THE GEO TECHNICAL REPORT TO BE DONE BACK IN
18 2017 FOR THAT CEQA DOCUMENT. IT IS ALSO NECESSARY AND TRUE
19 THAT THE GEO TECHNICAL REPORT MUST BE UPDATED FOR THE PLANNED
20 CHECK PROCESS AND THAT WILL OCCUR LATER. HOPEFULLY THAT
21 ANSWERS THAT QUESTION. OKAY.

22

23 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: VERY GOOD. THANK YOU. I THINK THAT
24 AT THIS TIME, WE CAN GO TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, EXECUTIVE
25 OFFICER. THOSE THAT HAVE SIGNED UP.



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1

2 >> MODERATOR: FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS COME FORWARD AND STAFF
3 WILL ASSIST YOU. HELEN, TONY, IRIS, KATHYN, ALICIA, NICOLE,
4 CLAUDIA ANDREAS, MICHELLE. MADAM CHAIR, NO REMOTE SPEAKERS TO
5 ADDRESS THE BOARD ON THIS ITEM. WE WILL CONCLUDE REMOTE
6 PARTICIPATION FOR ITEM 1. IN-PERSON SPEAKERS PLEASE BEGIN.

7

8 >> IN-PERSON SPEAKER: I'M IN DISTRICT 2, MITCHELL. DURING
9 BLACK HISTORY MONTH, I HONOR MY LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERVISOR
10 HOLLY J. MITCHELL. IN THE WORDING, I'LL JUST SAY, YOU GO GIRL.
11 THAT IS WHAT WE VOTE FOR YOU FOR. TO HANDLE THE BUSINESS. THAT
12 IS WHAT YOU ARE DOING. I LOVE HOW YOU REALLY TALK ABOUT THE
13 CONSTITUENCY BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT IS IMPORTANT, IS WHAT THE
14 CONSTITUENCY THINKS ON THIS. I JUST, JUST TO SEE ALL OF THAT
15 IN ACTION I'M IN AWE HAVE YOU HOLLY J. MITCHELL. YOU ARE BAD.
16 SHE ALWAYS IS HAS EVENTS FOR US. I ALWAYS KEEP THE BAGS. AGAIN
17 IT IS HARD FOR BLACK WOMEN TO GET ELECTED. I WANT TO MAKE SURE
18 THAT DURING BLACK HISTORY MONTH, I'M COMING AND HONORING MY
19 HOLLY J. MITCHELL BECAUSE NOT ONLY HERE, BUT YOU KNOW
20 FEDERALLY, NATIONALLY, STATEWIDE, SO JUST THANK YOU. I WANT TO
21 HONOR YOU. AND I BELIEVE THIS PROJECT --

22

23 >> MODERATOR: THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER PLEASE.

24

25 >> IN-PERSON SPEAKER: I'M DR. HELEN SELLERS, I LIVE BEHIND



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 THIS PROJECT IN WINDSOR HILLS. PLEASE SUPERVISORS, DO NOT VOTE
2 FOR THIS DANGEROUS PROJECT! PEOPLE WILL DIE. I APOLOGIZE THIS
3 PROJECT HAS BECOME YOUR RESPONSIBILITY NOW. WHY HAS IT DRAGGED
4 ON AND ON? IN 2004, SUPERVISOR BURG SHUT IT DOWN BECAUSE SHE
5 KNEW THE DANGER OF THIS PARTICULAR LOT TO THIS COMMUNITY AND
6 ANYONE TRAVELING THROUGH IT. THE DEVELOPER, STRATEGICALLY
7 WAITED FOR HER TO TERM OUT, AND ALL OF A SUDDEN, TEN YEARS
8 LATER, MARK THOMAS, WHO TOOK AND GAVE MONEY, DONATIONS, THAT
9 THEY GAVE TO HIM AND ALL OF A SUDDEN, HERE IS A PERMIT
10 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT BEING PUSHED THROUGH. WE KNOW THAT IT
11 IS NOT SOMETHING THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE. DON'T LET A JUDGE

12 --

13

14 >> MODERATOR: NEXT SPEAKER.

15

16 >> IN-PERSON SPEAKER: I'M TONY MCDONALD, PRESIDENT OF UNITED
17 HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION. I'M HERE TO EXPRESS MY CONCERN FOR
18 WHAT I STRONGLY BELIEVE EGREGIOUS ERROR IN APPROVING THIS
19 PROJECT. IN DECEMBER OF 2025, LA COUNTY FILED AN ENVIRONMENTAL
20 LAWSUIT AGAINST SENTINEL PEAKS, ALLEGING THEY DIDN'T PLUG
21 WELLS, TO COMMUNITY WITH INGLEWOOD OIL FIELD. WE ASK YOU TO
22 APPLY SAME LEVEL OF CAUTION TO THE VIEW PROJECT THAT POSES
23 SIGNIFICANT RISK TO THE COMMUNITY AND REJECT THE
24 RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT AS PRESENTED. ON A
25 DIFFERENT NOTE, WE HEARD OVER THE YEARS THAT PROPERTY OWNERS



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 RIGHTS MAY BE A FACTOR IN THE DECISION PROCESS. I WOULD AGREE
2 THAT PROPERTY OWNERS HAVE PROPERTY RIGHTS. WHEN THEY INFRINGE
3 ON THE COMMUNITY, 4600 PROPERTY OWNERS RIGHTS TO BE SAFE IN
4 OWN HOME AND NEIGHBORHOOD, SURELY SAFETY AND PRESERVATION OF
5 LIFE SHOULD PREVAIL HERE.

6

7 >> MODERATOR: THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER PLEASE.

8

9 >> IN-PERSON SPEAKER: I'M IRIS KLEIN, I RESPECTFULLY REQUEST A
10 NO VOTE FOR THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF THE VIEWS FIVE STORY
11 CONDO WITH A THREE STORY SUBTERRAINING PARKING STRUCTURE. PEAK
12 OF THE HILL WITHIN THE NEW PORT INGLEWOOD FAULT ZONE. THIS
13 FAULT ZONE IS A LONG ACTIVE STRIKE SLIP FAULT AND IT IS ONE OF
14 THE MOST DANGEROUS SEISMIC THREATS IN THE UNITED STATES.
15 BUILDING DEEP UNDER GROUND IN SUCH A GEOLOGICALLY UNSTABLE
16 AREA IS RISKY AND IT IS IRRESPONSIBLE. EARTHQUAKE SCIENTISTS
17 HAVE WARNED US ABOUT THE MAGNITUDE OF DESTRUCTION THIS FAULT
18 IS CAPABLE OF PRODUCING. EXCAVATING THREE STORIES DOWN INTO
19 THE EARTH RIGHT AT THE FAULT LINE SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASES THE
20 POTENTIAL FOR STRUCTURAL FAILURE DURING EARTHQUAKE. WE MUST
21 TAKE THAT WARNING SERIOUSLY, PRIORITIZE SAFETY OVER
22 DEVELOPMENT AND HIGH RISK ZONES.

23

24 >> MODERATOR: THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER PLEASE.

25



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 >> IN-PERSON SPEAKER: I'M KATHYN, 59 YEARS IN VIEW PARK. AND I
2 AM OPPOSED TO THE PROJECT FOR REASONS OF SAFETY OF ITS OWN
3 RESIDENTS AND OUR COMMUNITY. THE OIL FIELD INTERACTS WITH
4 COMMUNITY AND CONSTRUCTION. AND HENCE THE OIL, IN ORDER TO
5 MAKE OUR COMMUNITY A SAFE ENVIRONMENTALLY JUST PLACE TO LIVE
6 IN. I EMPHASIZE THAT THE OIL FIELD SITS ON TOP OF A MAJOR
7 EARTHQUAKE FAULT IN THE MIDDLE OF A VERY DENSE URBAN
8 POPULATION. IT IS WELL DOCUMENTED THAT MAJOR EARTHQUAKES
9 TRIGGER FIRES. IF YOU APPROVE OF THIS PROJECT, IT WILL THEN
10 INCREASE THE POPULATION --

11

12 >> MODERATOR: THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER PLEASE.

13

14 >> IN-PERSON SPEAKER: I'M ALISHA, MY HUSBAND AND I LIVE IN THE
15 CREST DRIVE. WE LIVE THERE, THE WHOLE TIME THAT THEY BEGAN
16 FIGHTING THIS PROJECT IN 2004 WHEN YVONNE BURG DENIED IT. SHE
17 SAW THE DANGERS BACK THEN. A TODAY THE SAME ISSUES OF PUBLIC
18 SAFETY AND PROTECTING LIVES ARE MORE THREATENED. PALISADES AND
19 ALTADENA WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES ON FIRE JANUARY 7 OF LAST
20 YEAR. WE HAD TWO FIRES THAT ERUPTED THAT SAME NIGHT, ALMOST
21 SIMULTANEOUSLY. A SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON SUBSTATION FIRE
22 ON STALKER AS WELL AS THE FIRE IN THE OIL FIELDS. BOTH LOCATED
23 DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET FROM THE PROPOSED VIEW PROJECT.
24 THIS PROJECT IS NOT FOR THE GREATER GOOD OF OUR COMMUNITY. WE
25 HAVE AN EMPTY RESERVOIR, WE ARE IN A HIGH FIRE HAZARD ZONE



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 WITH DOCUMENTED OVERBURDENED LOW WATER PRESSURE AND FIRE
2 HYDRANTS NOT OPERATING. CALIFORNIA AMERICAN WATER AFTER
3 NUMEROUS WRITTEN REQUESTS, WOULD NOT --

4

5 >> MODERATOR: THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER PLEASE.

6

7 >> IN-PERSON SPEAKER: I'M ANDRÉOUS, ONE OF THE RESIDENTS THAT
8 LIVE ON THE CREST, ONE OF THE HOMES MOST DIRECTLY IMPACTED BY
9 THIS NEW PROJECT. I OPPOSE IT BECAUSE IT WILL JUST BE A DRAIN
10 ON OUR COMMUNITY. AND WHILE AT THE SAME TIME, NOT REALLY
11 PRESENTING ANY REAL BENEFITS TO US. THEY CALL IT THE VIEW,
12 BECAUSE THE VIEW THAT THE NEW RESIDENTS WILL ENJOY. SAME TIME,
13 DESTROYING ALL OF THE VIEWS EVER THE CURRENT RESIDENTS THAT
14 LIVE THERE. THEY SAY THAT THE WATER INFRASTRUCTURE IS GOING TO
15 BE IMPROVED WHILE AT THE SAME TIME, WE KNOW THAT IT IS GOING
16 TO BE A MAJOR DRAIN ON THE CURRENT INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE AREA.
17 WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYTHING PENCILS OUT FOR THE
18 DEVELOPER BUT AT THE SAME TIME, IT WILL HAVE A DIRECT NEGATIVE
19 IMPACT FOR ALL OF THE CURRENT RESIDENTS AS WELL. IT SEEMS THAT
20 THERE IS JUST POOLING ON ALL OF THE RESOURCES FROM THE
21 COMMUNITY WITHOUT ADDING ANY REAL BENEFITS. WE ARE NOT AGAINST
22 DEVELOPING OF THIS, OF A PROJECT THERE WITH A PROJECT OF THIS
23 SIZE JUST MAKING NO SENSE. IT DRAINS --

24

25 >> MODERATOR: THANK YOU. MADAM CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 THAT CONCLUDES PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS ITEM.

2

3 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: MADAM CHAIR, THE PUBLIC HEARING IS
4 CLOSED. ITEM ONE BEFORE YOU.

5

6 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: SUPERVISOR MITCHELL, ANY LAST
7 COMMENTS YOU WANT TO MAKE? NO. VERY GOOD. MOVED BY SUPERVISOR
8 MITCHELL. SECOND, IT. PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

9

10 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: SUPERVISOR MITCHELL.

11

12 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: AYE.

13

14 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: SUPERVISOR MITCHELL, AYE. SUPERVISOR
15 HORVATH.

16

17 >> SUP. LINDSEY HORVATH: AYE.

18

19 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: SUPERVISOR HORVATH, AYE. SUPERVISOR
20 HAHN.

21

22 >> SUP. JANICE HAHN: YES.

23

24 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: SUPERVISOR HAHN, AYE. SUPERVISOR SOLIS.

25



THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS

1 >> SUPERVISOR HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: AYE.

2

3 >> EXECUTIVE OFFICER: SUPERVISOR SOLIS AYE. MOTION CARRIES. WE
4 WILL NOW MOVE ON TO ITEM 9 AND ITEM 9. THIS ITEMS TAKEN UP
5 TOGETHER. FOR THOSE COMMENTING, PLEASE USE THE RAISED HAND
6 FEATURE, IF ON-LINE, OR STAR 3 ON THE TELEPHONE. STEVE BURGER,
7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, JEFFREY DEEDRICK, COMMANDER
8 AND TINA AREVALO, ACTING CAPTAIN, SHERIFF DEPARTMENT WILL BE
9 AVAILABLE FOR QUESTIONS. DEPARTMENTAL SPEAKERS PLEASE STATE
10 YOUR NAME AND TITLE FOR THE RECORD WHEN YOU ADDRESS THE BOARD.

11

12 >> SUP. HILDA SOLIS, CHAIR: SUPERVISOR MITCHELL, YOU WISH TO
13 BE RECOGNIZED ON THE ITEMS.

14

15 >> SUP. HOLLY J. MITCHELL: LET'S HEAR FROM THE DEPARTMENT
16 FIRST. THEN I WILL. SOL DPW. READY GO.

17

18 >> STEVE BURGER: STEVE BURGER, DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC
19 WORKS, ONCE AGAIN. WENT DIDN'T HAVE A PRESENTATION TODAY. BUT
20 WHAT COMES BEFORE YOU TODAY IS ORDINANCE THAT IS RESTRICTING
21 THE PARKING OF OVERSIZED VEHICLES. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT OVER
22 THE YEARS AND ESPECIALLY OVER THE LAST YEAR WHEN WE WORKED
23 WITH THE COMMUNITIES TO DEVELOP THIS, IT BECAME APPARENT THAT
24 IT WAS CONCERN OF MANY COMMUNITIES. LINE OF SIGHT ISSUE,
25 PEOPLE CAN'T SEE AROUND THE VEHICLES WHEN IT CAME OUT OF THE