

Mary Cusick

Subject: FW: Comments on the Mapping Process

Importance: High

From: Scott Rafferty [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, May 1, 2023 6:13 PM

To: Draw Santa Clarita <DRAWSC@santa-clarita.com>; michael cruz [REDACTED]

Subject: Comments on the Mapping Process

CITY WARNING: This email was sent from an external server. Use caution clicking links or opening attachments.

The agreement required the council to confer on common revisions to the joint map BEFORE the second hearing. Although I serve as counsel to the petitioners in this collaboration, I was unaware of any revisions other than Circle J. The council required me to speak first, and then proposed many changes sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce and some additional changes that were proposed by the demographer. We were blindsided and ambushed, and Member Weste indicated that the changes should be accepted unilaterally without regard to the court order.

This wasn't the process we bargained for. We kept our word, and we are grateful for the suggestions by Members Miranda and Smythe for their efforts to get the process back on track. The fact remains that the council departed from the joint map without notice and without even giving us an opportunity to respond at the meeting.

The changes in question had been proposed by a single special interest without any testimony from individuals in the affected neighborhoods. By contrast, Mr. Ferdman's map complies with the FAIRMAPS Act because it does not split Happy Valley and is a much more effective remedy.

At this point, we anticipate conferring with Mr. Ferdman and the many residents who prefer a variation on his map and presented it to the court for approval. It's a better map, since there is not currently anything left of the collaborative approach that the basis for our compromises.

My clients wish this collaborative process had worked and perhaps it still can. Otherwise, we will let the court decide.

Scott Rafferty
[REDACTED]