



12.9 WRITTEN COMMENT CARDS FROM SEPTEMBER 23, 2008 CITY COUNCIL HEARING



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9/23/08 Agenda item number: 10

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: GREG AMSLER

Street Address: 25548 Housman Pl City: STEVENSON Ranch

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): _____

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: _____ Signature: [Signature]

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

WCC1

(written comment continued)

Strongly support hospital Master Plan.

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.



**WCC1. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM GREG AMSLER,
SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.**

WCC1-1. The Commentator has expressed their support for the proposed project. No CEQA-related issues were raised; thus no further response is required.



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9/23/08 Agenda item number: 10.

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: Henry Mayo Master Plan

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: Cathy Richardson

Street Address: 29901 Banyan Pl. #218 City: Santa Clarita

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): Approve hospital expansion --
The growing community needs & deserves this.

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: _____ Signature: _____

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

(written comment continued)

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.

WCC2



**WCC2. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM CATHY
RICHARDSON, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.**

WCC2-1. The Commentator has expressed their support for the proposed project. No
CEQA-related issues were raised; thus no further response is required.



City of SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9/23/08 Agenda item number: 10 -

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: HMMNH Master Plan

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: Daniel Luthé

Street Address: 25552 Via Impresc City: Valencia 91355

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): How long are we going to post-pone the inevitable? SCU needs a competent facility

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: _____ Signature: Daniel Luthé

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

(written comment continued)

ready to meet the demands of our growing and changing valley. I urge the council to move forward with the plan and give SCU residents what we need, quality and local healthcare!

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.

WCC3



**WCC3. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM DANIEL
LUTHE, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.**

WCC3-1. The Commentator has expressed their support for the proposed project. No
CEQA-related issues were raised; thus no further response is required.



City of SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 4/28 Agenda item number: -

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: Henry Mayo

Please check one: [] Support Recommendation [X] Oppose Recommendation [] Neutral

Name: Jim Kiswandy

Street Address: Via Ladera City:

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary):

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: [Signature] Signature: self

[] Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

(written comment continued)

No matter how many meetings we have you can't fit 10 LBs of stuff in a 5LB box. If we are to build a Hospital, put the thing along the cross town Parkway or the 126 or out along the 5! (Where we can get to it and we have room to build it)

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.

WCC4-1



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9/23 Agenda item number: _____

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: _____

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: J. Kiswardy

Street Address: 23732 Via Lupona City: _____

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): _____

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: Self Signature: [Signature]

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

(written comment continued)

This meeting should be very insulting to you. The proponents of this project talk to you like you don't know the difference between a hospital and a office building.

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.

WCC4-2



**WCC4. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARDS FROM JIM
KISWARDY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.**

WCC4-1. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

WCC4-2. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.



City of SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9/23/08 Agenda item number: #10 HMH EXPANSION

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: CASE 04-325

Please check one: [] Support Recommendation [X] Oppose Recommendation [] Neutral

Name: Tom McCoy

Street Address: 25553 PARMA CT City: Valencia

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): I am not opposed to expansion, I am opposed as to how it should expand. Having seen the

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: myself Signature: [Signature]

[] Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

(written comment continued)

project changes over the last three years, we are getting close. If the patient tower was reduced one more story, I think it would work. The council needs to remember that the health needs for our valley are not going to be supplied by HM in all, we need to look at a master plan that will serve all of us... across the valley.

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.

WCC5



**WCC5. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM TOM MCCOY,
SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.**

WCC5-1. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 09-23-08 Agenda item number: Public Hearing #10

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: H.M.N.M.H. MASTER PLAN

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: RICHARD DREW

Street Address: 15500 NASTURTIUM DR City: Canyon Country

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): I OPPOSE THIS DEVELOPMENT UNLESS HOSP. BEDS & EXPANSION OF ACTUAL HOSPITAL IS GUARANTEED

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: _____ Signature: [Signature]

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

(written comment continued)

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.

WCC6



**WCC6. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM RICHARD
DREW, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.**

WCC6-1. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council
Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 09-23-08 Agenda item number: 10

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: Henry Mayo Expansion

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: Linda McCoy

Street Address: 25853 Parma Ct. City: Valencia

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): Our hospital needs to expand for our community but our "master" →

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: myself Signature: Linda S. McCoy

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

WCC7

(written comment continued)

planned community" was never intended for serving such a large area. M Bean Parkway + Old Orchard used to be beautiful boulevards but are now becoming like freeways.

Too much expansion for our residential area!

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.



**WCC7. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM LINDA MCCOY,
SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.**

WCC7-1. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: Sept. 23, 2008 Agenda item number: 04-325

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: Henry Mayo Hospital Master Plan

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: Christine Emerson

Street Address: 24638 Varese CT. City: Valencia

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): This "Master Plan" is adding 1.2 million feet of structures in a residential area. This over-crowding of this site

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: Smart Growth Signature: Christine Emerson

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

(written comment continued)

does not guarantee any hospital expansion, will over-crowd McBean Pkwy, many mature trees will be removed, will add additional air pollution to our neighborhood, deteriorates our home values & because of the lack of parking being offered, will throw excess vehicles onto our residential streets. The only one that wins is G+L Realty.

As a 44 year resident of SCV, I beg you to do what our city government promised to do - Represent your citizens!

In addition, we have 2 City Council members that have not acted in our interest - they should not be allowed to vote on this matter

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.

WCC8



WCC8. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM CHRISTINE EMERSON, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.

WCC8-1. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

The topics of aesthetics, traffic, parking, and air quality were analyzed in Sections 5.3 through 5.6, respectively in the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR.

Section 5.4 includes the following mitigation measures to improve traffic flow on McBean Parkway:

TR1 In order to address impacts along McBean Parkway at the Magic Mountain Parkway intersection, the following improvements shall be required:

- ◆ Add a third through lane for the westbound direction (re-striping). This improvement shall be implemented in conjunction with the construction of MOB1.
- ◆ Add right-turn overlap phasing for the westbound right-turn movement (signal modification). This improvement shall be implemented in conjunction with the construction of MOB1.
- ◆ Add a third through lane for the eastbound direction (re-striping). This improvement shall be implemented in conjunction with the construction of the Inpatient Building/MOB2.

TR5 The project applicant shall pay fees to the established Valencia Bridge and Thoroughfare District, in accordance with City policy, in order to provide a fair-share contribution of funds for future traffic system improvements.

TR6 In order to address impacts along McBean Parkway at the Orchard Village Road intersection, the following improvement shall be required:

- ◆ Restripe the hospital driveway to reconfigure the first through lane to a shared left-turn/through lane. This improvement shall be implemented in conjunction with the construction of MOB3.

TR7 In order to address long-term (2030) impacts along McBean Parkway at the Valencia Boulevard intersection, the following improvement shall be required:

- ◆ Add a fourth westbound through lane (requires the widening of Valencia Boulevard).

The project's fair share equals 4.3 percent of the cost of this improvement (refer to Table 5.4-16, Share Summary). If a fair share program has been



adopted or if these improvements have been added to a district, such as a Bridge & Thoroughfare District, payment of fair share costs shall be made prior to the issuance of a building permit for MOB3. This fair share payment shall be considered this project's full compliance of Mitigation Measure TR7 and, if a funding program is established, would reduce impacts to less than significant.

TR8 In order to address long-term (2030) impacts along McBean Parkway at the Orchard Village Road intersection, the following improvement shall be required:

- ◆ Add a separate eastbound right-turn lane (requires the widening of McBean Parkway).

The project's fair share equals 30.5 percent of the cost of this improvement (refer to *Table 5.4-16, Share Summary*). If a fair share program has been adopted or if these improvements have been added to a district, such as a Bridge & Thoroughfare District, payment of fair share costs shall be made prior to the issuance of a building permit for MOB3. This fair share payment shall be considered this project's full compliance of Mitigation Measure TR8 and, if a funding program is established, would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Section 5.6, Aesthetics, Light, and Glare, discusses the mature trees would need to be removed for the proposed project, but that the project applicant would be required to mitigate the loss of the trees, consistent with Mitigation Measure AES4, restated below.

AES4 Landscaping shall be installed in conformance with the approved Master Plan conceptual landscaping plans and in compliance with the conditions of approval prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each building and parking structure.

The text below from page 5.3-24 of the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR notes the specific number of trees that would be removed and replaced as part of the proposed project. The last sentence of the paragraph notes that following project implementation the number of trees will increase from 115 to 133, thus maintaining the visual character of McBean Parkway and the hospital site.

McBean Parkway

Buildout of the proposed Master Plan would include the removal of trees along McBean Parkway to accommodate both future on-site buildings and traffic-related improvements. The location and type of tree to be removed is shown on *Exhibit 5.3-13, Tree Removal Plan Along McBean Parkway*. Specifically, tree removals are necessary to accommodate MOB1, MOB2, PS1, and the surface parking area (PS4)



to the west of MOB1. Presently there are a total of 115 trees along McBean Parkway, which includes the site's area fronting the street and the trees located within the median. A total of 69 trees would remain in place as part of project implementation (46 McBean Parkway median trees and 23 hospital campus trees along the McBean Parkway frontage). To accommodate the proposed development, 46 trees would be removed (12 McBean Parkway median trees and 34 hospital campus trees along the McBean Parkway frontage). Upon completion of the proposed Master Plan, a total of 133 trees would be located within the areas described above (53 McBean Parkway median trees and 80 hospital campus trees along the McBean Parkway frontage), which includes on-site trees that would remain along with new tree plantings. Overall, trees in the vicinity of the McBean Parkway frontage would increase from 115 trees to 133 trees.

Section 5.6, Air Quality, of the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR includes an analysis of the proposed project's impacts during both construction and operation. For an operational standpoint, impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. However, impacts during construction even with mitigation remain significant and unavoidable.

Section 5.5, Parking, of the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR concludes that the proposed project has complied with the City's Unified Development Code by providing 2,231 on-site parking spaces, which exceeds the Code requirement of 2,204 spaces. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur in this regard.



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9-23-08 Agenda item number: 10

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: Hospital Expansion (College)

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: WANDA L. BROWN

Street Address: 25636 N. ESTORIL ST. City: VALENCIA, CA, 91355

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): _____

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: SELF Signature: Wanda L. Brown

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

(written comment continued)

Lobbyist Registration: Under § 7.03.010 of the Santa Clarita Municipal Code, lobbyists are required to register with the City Clerk's Office. A "lobbyist" means any individual or entity employed, retained or otherwise engaged for compensation to communicate with any elective or appointed official, any officer or employee or any task force, committee, board, commission, or other body of the City for the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action.

A regular employee of an organization, communicating to the City during the course of their employment, an individual communicating on behalf of a group or organization and not receiving compensation for such action, or an individual communicating on their own behalf would NOT be considered a lobbyist.

WCC9



**WCC9. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM WANDA
BROWN, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.**

WCC9-1. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.



City of
SANTA CLARITA

(WITHDRAW REQUEST TO SPEAK)
Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9/23/08 Agenda item number: 10

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: MASTER CASE 04-325: HENRY MANON NEWALL MEM. HOSPITAL MP

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: DONALD E. WEGGINS

Street Address: 26906 MONTECENAVE City: VANCLIA

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): SEE ATTACHED

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

MEMBER OF:
Representing: SMART GROWTH SCV Signature: Donald E. Weggins

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

WCC10-1

HONORABLE MAYOR KELLAR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

I am a member of Smart Growth SCV and supporter of David Gauny's and others efforts to redirect this so called "Master Plan Project" to a project that will really benefit the community, and the health care professionals at Henry Mayo Hospital. I am also the recipient of a failed back surgery that took place on June 28, 2004, David may recall my fiasco. The day of my surgery it was scheduled to take place in the main hospital but due to a surgery case ahead of me that started much later than scheduled but also took much longer than scheduled, My surgeon was faced with the decision to reschedule my surgery (after my vitals had already been taken) or move it to the ambulatory center. The latter was chosen because of the "shortage" OR rooms which is one of the real issues that have not been adequately addressed. To make a long story short, my surgery was not a complete success. This is not what I want to make an issue with.

WCC10-2

I am wondering if this project were started over today with the obvious more than adequate number of new medical office buildings recently opened and being constructed in Valencia/Santa Clarita with more than ample parking and not adverse traffic impact if it would look different. You probably are aware of the medical office buildings I am referring to which include the following:

WCC10-3

1. 27420 Tourney Road
2. Under construction across the street on Tourney Road
3. Under construction at Bridgeport Market (Newhall Ranch Rd & McBean Pkwy)

I have personal doctors that have moved out or will be moving out of the current G&L Buildings to these newer and more attractive buildings that are definitely more convenient for their patients. The fact that they are not on the campus of Henry Mayo is actually appealing.

WCC10-4

I have had previous experience of administering a lease with G&L at their Mission Hills building across from Holy Cross/Providence Medical Center. The fee for parking there was not a pleasant experience or convenient arrangement for our medical staff and patients. By the way the OR/Patient Bed Ratio at Holy Cross/Providence is what Henry Mayo should be striving for in their Master Plan for Hospital Expansion.

WCC10-5

Ronald Duggins
26906 MONTEREY AVE
VALENCIA, CA 91355
661-253-1100
9/23/08



WCC10. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM DONALD E. WIGGINS, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.

WCC10-1. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

WCC10-2. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

WCC10-3. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

WCC10-4. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

WCC10-5. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9/23/08 Agenda item number: 10

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: Henry Mayo

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: Martha Willman

Street Address: 25869 Parma Ct City: Valencia

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): see accompanied letter on no restrictions on heliport

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: Martha Willman Signature: Martha Willman

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

WCC11-1

Sept. 23, 2008

Honorable Mayor Bob Kellar
and Members of the City Council
City of Santa Clarita
23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

Re: Henry Mayo Newhall Campus Expansion
Master Case No. 04-325

Dear Mayor Kellar and Honorable Members of the City Council:

I am deeply concerned by the recent change in procedure for this master plan development. Just last month, we learned that careful controls and conditions traditionally imposed on hospital heliport operations have vaporized.

Until now, Conditional Use Permits mandated flight paths, regulated noise levels, provided for periodic reviews and monitoring of flight frequencies and hours of operation. There were set procedures to register complaints or concerns with the city. Specifically, the applicant was required to maintain compliance with the city's noise standards.

POOF! None of those protections are in this new draft master plan. Two heliports are entitled in this plan—with only one condition: that they can operate simultaneously “during a city-declared emergency.”

Residents' recourses are further limited under another “condition”—it allows residents to attend an annual “open house,”—provided they live within 1,000 feet of the campus.

So when those helicopters barely skim the rooftops along Anzio Way—as so many of us have witnessed—or send residents frantically tumbling out of their beds at 3 a.m., there will be no procedure for resolution.

Let's say one of those “medical specialists” in new offices wants to hop a chopper for a Wednesday golf round at Pebble Beach. Easy to do from Henry Mayo—there are no rules in this plan to stop her.

WCC11-2

The 28-page document setting conditions of approval protects us from planting an overpopulation of agapanthus. But it says nothing about an overpopulation of whirlybirds. In fact, it limits enforcement of the city's noise ordinance to construction only.

WCC11-3

The EIR studied a projected maximum of 15 to 17 flights a month. It concluded there would be no significant impact. But there was no attempt made to determine at what frequency and under what conditions impacts would occur, although it found that night flights exceed the city's noise limits. Keep in mind that medical air transport generally benefits victims in outlying regions. Residents must rely on ground transport along ever more crowded roadways.

WCC11-4

Periodic reviews, conditions and accountability of heliport operations must be written into this agreement.

WCC11-5

I strongly support hospital expansion and improved health care in Santa Clarita. We are long overdue for more beds, more operating rooms, a cardiac cath lab and neonatal unit. But now, we don't even have a TCU.

WCC11-6

When hospital CEO Roger Seaver was asked by the L.A. Times what benefits his development would provide, he said: more doctors on site, specialty medical services, *increased emergency air transport* and more jobs.

WCC11-7

Are those really the key factors in providing a better hospital to serve Santa Clarita? Think about it.

Sincerely,



Martha Willman

P.O. Box 55734

Valencia, CA 91385-0734



WCC11. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM MARTHA WILLMAN, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.

WCC11-1. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

WCC11-2. The topic of helicopter noise is addressed in Section 5.7, Noise, in the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR, which concluded that impacts were less than significant. In addition, refer to Topical Response No. 4 and Project Issue 29 in Topical Response No. 7, which address this issue further.

WCC11-3. The Commentator states that specific conditions of approval for the now expired 2004 Minor Use Permit for the construction and operation of an elevated helipad structure on the hospital campus were not included in the HMNMH Master Plan Conditions of Approval. Although these issues are already regulated by existing federal, state and local mandates, to address this concern, three conditions were added into the Conditions of Approval (PL9 through PL11). The HMNMH Master Plan Conditions of Approval include the following conditions related to helipad operations:

Helipad Operations

PL8. The proposed project includes the construction and maintenance of two helipads. The first helipad will be constructed on Parking Structure 1 and serve as the primary helipad until the Inpatient Building is operational. The second rooftop helipad to be constructed on the Inpatient Building will serve as the primary, long-term helipad. Only one helipad shall be designated for operation at a time, unless operation of both helipads is needed during a City-declared emergency.

PL9. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of OSHPD (Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development) with regard to operation of the helipads.

PL10. The applicant shall conduct a noise study within three months of construction of the helipad on Parking Structure 1 and the Inpatient Building to ensure compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and local standards. This noise study shall conform to the standards, methodology and scope of the Helicopter Noise Analysis conducted for the Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital by BridgeNet International.

PL11. The applicant shall store all chemicals in compliance with the applicable standards relating to the storage of hazardous chemicals and shall obtain the appropriate approvals from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, OSHPD, and other affected agencies for the storage of hazardous chemicals relating to a helipad.



- WCC11-4. Refer to Response WCC11-2.
- WCC11-5. Refer to Response WCC11-3.
- WCC11-6. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.
- WCC11-7. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9/23/2008 Agenda item number: #10

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: #10 Master Case No 04-325

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: Laura Stotler

Street Address: 25820 Parada Drive City: Valencia

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): letter to Council & comments on revised draft EIR for hospital expansion, (5 copies of letter provided)

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: myself Signature: Laura Stotler

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

WCC12-1

Re: Master Case 04-325 Henry Mayo Hospital Expansion, Revised DEIR and
Development Agreement

Dear City Council,

I am opposed to the proposed expansion of the Henry Mayo Newhall Medical Offices and Hospital Complex as designed. I am not opposed to expansion of the hospital, but the proposed site design, numerous medical office buildings, parking structures, and proposed square footage is unacceptable given the site constraints and existing neighborhood conditions. This project does not guarantee a substantial increase in inpatient hospital beds, but does guarantee significant, unmitigated impacts to surrounding streets and neighborhoods including the Village Homes North and Village Homes South, Valencia Meadows, Valencia Glen, and the Summit.

WCC12-2

The following are my concerns with the Draft EIR.

WCC12-3

A) The Traffic Study does not provide data for the traffic impacts that will occur to the intersection of Singing Hills Drive and McBean Parkway. When traffic congestion occurs at the intersections of McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Drive or McBean Parkway and Tournament Road, drivers in the area cut through the Vista Valencia shopping center driveway to Singing Hills Drive and through the Summit neighborhood to avoid those intersections. The DEIR indicates severe, unmitigated traffic impacts are anticipated at McBean and Orchard Village and a significant decrease in LOS is anticipated at the intersection of McBean and Tournament. This means that there will be an influx of cut-through traffic through the Vista Valencia shopping center to Singing Hills Drive and through the Summit.

WCC12-4

The traffic study is deficient for not identifying existing and increased cut-through impacts to the Vista Valencia shopping center to Singing Hills Drive and through the Summit as a result of the hospital expansion. Traffic calming mitigation measures must be required to reduce the likelihood of cut-through traffic impacts to the Vista Valencia shopping center – Singing Hills Drive and should include the following:

WCC12-5

1) The addition of a minimum five-foot wide landscaped parkway along the east side of Singing Hills from McBean Parkway south to Altamonte Avenue in order to buffer neighboring single family homes from increases in traffic and noise caused by the hospital expansion. Additionally, the addition of a landscaped median in this location could help mitigate landscaping impacts to the Village Homes South neighborhood that will occur with removal of large trees along McBean parkways and medians proposed as part of required roadway expansion to accommodate the additional “hospital” medical offices.

WCC12-6

2) The construction of a landscaped traffic circle at the intersection of Singing Hills Drive, the Vista Valencia shopping center driveway and Altamonte Avenue. Such

WCC12-7

a traffic circle would reduce traffic speeds adding to safety, eliminate the “no man’s land” characteristics of this wide driveway and ill-defined intersection in which drivers are often confused as to who has the right of way, particularly cut-through drivers making rolling stops and left turns from the shopping center onto Singing Hills Drive.

WCC12-7

- B) The visual impact analysis in the DEIR is shameful. It is misleading to take an existing photo of the site, enhance it with photoshop trees, and then state that the public and neighboring residents will not see the buildings because the landscaping will screen them. The applicant should be required to do a real photo simulation, showing the building elevations as they will be, sans landscaping and then one depicting a true example of what the site may look like after 5 years of replacement tree growth, not 30 years of tree growth. This is particularly important since proposed roadway widenings, elimination of street trees along McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Road, elimination of trees in parking areas for construction of subterranean parking and building basements, will result in less tree canopy, rather than more, at least for the foreseeable future. Additionally, with many existing liquidambar, sycamore and other deciduous tree varieties on site, the visual analysis should show what the site will look like in winter months when visual impacts will be greatest.

WCC12-8

- C) The DEIR appears to ignore the Stevenson Ranch fault which was identified following the 1994 Northridge earthquake. Evidence of fault rupture was noted in Stevenson Ranch in an area by Holmes Drive and half a mile from the hospital. Is ignoring this fault during preparation of the DEIR consistent with the criteria for evaluating seismic hazards in accordance with Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California? This appears to be an oversight and impacts of potential movement on the Stevenson Ranch Fault upon the project should be analyzed.

WCC12-9

- D) The City’s noise element shows that exterior noise impacts are already significant for single-family homes within approximately 100 feet of the centerline of McBean Parkway in the Village Homes South, Village Homes North and Valencia Meadows neighborhoods. The noise impact analysis indicates an increase in exterior noise levels due to traffic and construction along the McBean and Orchard Village corridors, but no mention is made of impacts to existing interior noise levels which will also rise and are subject to a lower threshold of significance. The homes in the Village South neighborhood were constructed in 1975-1977, prior to requirements for wall insulation and dual pane glass which help lessen interior noise impacts. Homes in this area are particularly susceptible to interior noise problems at night when noise from McBean, Orchard Village Road and the freeway become more apparent as does noise from helicopter landings at the hospital. While there is not much to be done for exterior noise impacts as traffic increases, mitigation measures are available to reduce interior noise impacts to acceptable levels in older homes. The DEIR should study the

WCC12-10

increase in interior noise levels anticipated to affect the older homes impacted by noise increases from this project. Any increase in interior noise above minimum general plan levels is a tipping point and should be mitigated at the cost of the developer, including retrofitting with dual pane windows and insulating ceilings and walls.

WCC12-10

The proposed development agreement does not provide for substantial public benefit as required by state law. The following are my concerns with the development agreement:

WCC12-11

A) The Traffic Study indicates that intersection widening is necessary for the intersection at McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Drive to function adequately. The section of McBean between Avenida Navarre and Allegro Drive and the intersection of Orchard and McBean are projected to function at LOS F at buildout of the hospital. These routes provide the sole vehicular access to the Santa Clarita Valley's only hospital and are critical emergency routes for public safety. While the DEIR identifies widening of the roadway as an option to mitigate traffic impacts to allow this section of McBean Parkway and its intersection of Orchard Village Road to function adequately at buildout, the development agreement specifically states that the City will not invoke its powers of eminent domain to allow for widening of portions of McBean Parkway and the Orchard Village Road intersection to occur. Thus, it is clear that the City Council does not intend to make the applicant fully mitigate traffic impacts (and indeed the development agreement attests to that fact). Instead, the City Council and increases the risk to public safety by significantly reducing the effectiveness of the only vehicular emergency access to the only hospital in the valley. Where is the significant public benefit in this action?

WCC12-12

B) At one time the hospital had a Transitional Care Unit (TCU) but this use was stopped because of current hospital expansion into the area previously occupied by the TCU according to the DEIR. The development agreement says that one of the public benefits proposed by this project is that they will pay \$250,000 toward a future TCU. If the hospital is merely replacing a pre-existing use that they needed to eliminate because of current construction activities, how is this new public benefit? This is a business decision for the hospital and it is customary for TCUs to be affiliated with hospitals. While I think it is important for the valley to have a TCU affiliated with the hospital, funding of such is a regular function of hospital business and does not rise to the level of a significant public benefit. The proposed \$250,000 could be used for true public benefits that would offset some of the impacts this project will cause to neighbors.

WCC12-13

C) The neighborhoods most impacted by the proposed hospital and medical office buildings expansion are Village Homes North, Village Homes South, Valencia Glen, Valencia Meadows and the Summit. The development agreement should include public benefits to assist these neighborhoods. Council should ask for the following additional development agreement considerations:

WCC12-14

- 1) That the developer is required to add landscape berms along the south side of McBean between Singing Hills Drive and Orchard Village Road to help reduce noise impacts from additional traffic.
- 2) That the developer is required to fund needed improvements to Valencia Meadows Park and Valencia Glen Park, including upgrading landscaping, pool and recreation room facilities to be more “green” and sustainable.
- 3) That the public elementary schools serving these impacted neighborhoods, Meadows Elementary School and Valencia Valley, are provided funds for upgrading school facilities and libraries.

WCC12-14

D) The \$500,000 for future realignments on McBean Parkway is a good start. However, the cost to the developer to mitigate the true cost of traffic mitigation to widen McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Road—including purchasing at least 5 existing residences and realigning several neighborhood streets—to mitigate impacts from the “hospital” medical office use expansion is many times this cost. Comparing the “benefit” of a \$500,000 payment to the City vs. the City not requiring the developer to pay the cost of eminent domain (at perhaps a cost of \$500,000 plus legal costs for each house purchased), does not result in a net benefit to the community, but rather a giveaway to the medical office building developer. In addition to the \$500,000 requested for future realignments on McBean Parkway, the City Council should ask for at least an amount equal to the true cost to construct traffic improvements to Orchard Village Road and McBean Parkway.

WCC12-15

Why do the medical office buildings that support a hospital need to be placed adjacent to the existing hospital? There is adequate commercial zoning to support additional office buildings within a couple of miles of Henry Mayo on Lyons Avenue, Valencia Blvd, San Fernando Road and McBean Parkway. In fact, other medical offices do exist along those major arterials, where additional traffic impacts can be accommodated without destroying existing residential neighborhoods, and without turning the roadways that provide emergency vehicular access to the hospital into a parking lot.

WCC12-16

Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital is a critical facility for the Santa Clarita Valley and reasonable expansion of the hospital and supporting offices is to be expected. However, the proposed Master Plan is too ambitious for the existing hospital property and ignores the existing site constraints, namely locations of existing single-family homes, rights-of-way width constraints, and capability to expand McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Road to accommodate the square footage of uses requested. This project is trying to put 10 pounds of flour into a 5 pound sack. It just doesn't work.

WCC12-17

It is true that the Council can legally adopt a statement of overriding considerations and accept the impacts as proposed by the developer. There is nothing illegal about the Council making a stupid decision. However, the wise decision is to allow two or three medical office buildings similar in size to the ones already there and direct the applicant to look for other suitably zoned land along major arterials to build new medical office

WCC12-18

buildings. Ensure that the carrying capacity of McBean and Orchard Village Road does not deteriorate to the point where public safety is at risk because emergency vehicles cannot get to the hospital. Do not approve a development agreement where the public benefits are not truly "above and beyond".

Sincerely,



Laura Stotler
25820 Parada Drive
Valencia, CA 91355

WCC12-18



WCC12. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM LAURA STOTLER, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.

WCC12-1. This comment card is an introduction to comments that follow. No further response is required.

WCC12-2. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

WCC12-3. This comment is an introduction to comments that follow. No further response is required.

WCC12-4. Appendix E of the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR contains a detailed operational analysis for the McBean Parkway corridor between I-5 and Decoro Drive, including the intersections of McBean Parkway and Singing Hills Drive and McBean Parkway and Tournament Road identified by the Commentator. The analysis includes a delay and level of service summary, which shows that when project mitigation is implemented, conditions at these intersections do not exceed City of Santa Clarita performance criteria as specified in *Table 5.4-2, Arterial Intersection Performance Criteria*. Therefore, no further mitigation is warranted. Further, the Draft EIR states that project-generated traffic, in and of itself, does not result in significant traffic impacts to the intersection of McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Road. However, traffic generated by the project would contribute to long-term cumulative traffic impacts at this intersection in Year 2030, beyond the 15-year time frame of this project. Mitigation Measure TR8 would require the project to pay its fair share of needed improvements to this intersection prior to issuance of a building permit for MOB3. Payment of the increased fee would fully mitigate the project's contribution toward cumulative impacts at this intersection.

WCC12-5. The *Traffic Impact Assessment* shows that proposed project impacts at the intersection of McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Road are reduced to less than significant levels with the identified project mitigation measures. The *Traffic Impact Analysis* also shows that the Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection of McBean Parkway and Tournament Road/Rockwell Canyon Road does not change due to the proposed project. The mitigation measures identified for the intersection of McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Road are shown to result in reduced average vehicle delay in relation to the comparable no-project conditions by approximately 46 seconds during the PM peak hour. As such, the proposed project would not result in increased cut-through traffic through the Vista Valencia shopping center, the Summit residential neighborhoods, the Village Homes South neighborhood and Goldcrest Drive (collector street). The *Traffic Impact Assessment* addresses the additional trips due to the proposed project and the resulting effect on LOS at the intersections of McBean Parkway at Singing Hills Drive in *Section 5.4, Operational Analysis*. The suggestion that additional traffic calming measures are needed to reduce cut-through traffic impacts to the Vista Valencia shopping center-Singing Hills Drive is noted.



However, since the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR indicates that no significant impacts occur at this location for traffic, it is not necessary to include the suggestion as mitigation. The comment, including suggested mitigation, expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

WCC12-6. For the reasons stated in WCC12-5, the comment regarding the construction of a landscaped parkway and median on Singing Hills Drive to mitigate traffic, noise, and landscaping impacts associated with the project are not necessary to include as mitigation. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

WCC12-7. Refer to Response WCC12-5. This recommendation regarding the construction of a landscaped traffic circle at the intersection of Singing Hills Drive, the Vista Valencia shopping center driveway and Altamonte Avenue to reduce traffic speeds associated with this project is noted. However, since the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR indicates that no significant impacts occur at this location for traffic, it is not necessary to include the recommendation as mitigation. The comment provides factual background information with regard to existing traffic conditions and will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not raise an environmental issue regarding the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.

WCC12-8. Visual simulations are an accurate representation of landscaping conditions at the time of issuance of certificate of occupancy for specific buildings. The Draft EIR includes analysis of the long-term aesthetic impacts of the project as seen from three viewpoints using state-of-the-art visual simulations. Digitized photographs portray one “before” and three “after” views of the project. The simulations depict how the project would appear at the time of construction, after 15 years and after 25 years. The project tree removal and conceptual landscape plan were utilized in depicting the “after” views to show the various species and number of proposed trees and approximately where each tree would be planted. The Commentator’s suggestion that additional visual analysis should be provided to show how the hospital campus would appear without the addition of any new trees is not warranted as this scenario would not occur at any time. Trees would be planted at various times throughout construction of the project, some of which would be planted within 120 days of project approval.

WCC12-9. Section 5.8, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, of the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR provides an accurate list of active faults considered capable of producing strong ground motion at the site. The Commentator makes reference to the Stevenson Ranch fault; however, there is no known active fault with that name. The Commentator is correct in noting a rupture in Stevenson Ranch resulting from the 1994 Northridge earthquake. This comment is supported by the following information from the United States Geological Survey (USGS). The Northridge earthquake in 1994 occurred on a blind thrust fault known as the Northridge Thrust or the Pico Thrust, and caused numerous ground surface failures across southern



California. The failures included zones of ground fissures and extensional cracking, lateral displacements, settlements with vertical displacements, and compressive deformation in the form of soil and pavement warps and buckles. No evidence of primary surface rupture was associated with the fault capable of producing an earthquake, also referred to as a seismogenic fault. However, surface ruptures at Portero Canyon and Stevenson Ranch were located along the hinge of a fold where the seismogenic fault projects to the ground surface, but neither occurrence appears to be associated with the seismogenic fault. The Stevenson Ranch ruptures appear to be related to folding above the blind thrust fault.¹

The information and analysis provided in the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR is accurate. There is no need to analyze the Stevenson Ranch fault, given that there is no active fault by that name.

- WCC12-10. The areas along McBean Parkway are exposed to traffic noise levels ranging from 69 dBA CNEL (south of Orchard Village Road) to 70 dBA CNEL (north of Orchard Village Road). Under the Long-Range Cumulative Year, these areas will be exposed to 70 dBA CNEL (south of Orchard Village Road) and 71 dBA CNEL (north of Orchard Village Road), with or without the proposed project. Project-related traffic would result in 0.2 to 0.5 dBA CNEL. This range of noise level changes is small and not perceptible by the human ear. With the traffic noise along McBean Parkway dominating the ambient noise levels in this neighborhood, noise associated with construction activity on the project site would be mostly masked by traffic noise. Title 24 of California Code of Regulations address interior noise levels attributable to exterior noise sources that exceed 45 dBA CNEL for new buildings that can be mitigated during construction. For existing homes along McBean Parkway in this neighborhood, even with the assumption that these homes meet the EPA's exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 12 dBA with windows open and 24 dBA with windows closed, the interior noise levels for these homes would exceed the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard under the future no project scenario ($70 - 24 = 46$ dBA CNEL). The proposed project would not have any measurable or perceptible changes on the exterior (70 and 71 dBA CNEL) and interior (46 and 47 dBA CNEL) noise levels for homes in this neighborhood.
- WCC12-11. This comment is an introduction to comments that follow. No further response is required.
- WCC12-12. Unless mitigated, cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Road in Year 2030, including the proposed project, would result in a significant impact. The Draft EIR includes mitigation that would fully address the project's contribution toward these impacts. In order to acquire additional right-of-way for future intersection improvements at this location, the project proposes to dedicate sufficient right-of-way along its McBean Parkway frontage to accommodate needed improvements. In addition, the project proponent would be required to pay

¹ Source: USGS Response to an Urban Earthquake – Northridge “94, The Cause and Effects of Liquefaction, Settlements, and Soil Failures, <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/1996/ofr-96-0263/groundf2htm>, accessed on October 7, 2008.



their fair share of the cost of the improvements, fully mitigating their contribution toward cumulative traffic impacts at this intersection.

- WCC12-13. The impacts on surrounding neighborhoods suggested by the Commentator are not identified. The Draft EIR fully addresses impacts and requires all feasible mitigation to reduce or eliminate project impacts to the extent feasible. For these reasons, it is not necessary to include the Commentator's recommendations to provide additional public benefits to assist these residents beyond what is already required as a part of this project. This comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.
- WCC12-14. Refer to Response WCC12-13.
- WCC12-15. The project proposes to dedicate sufficient right-of-way along its McBean Parkway frontage, therefore, there would be no need to acquire additional land in order to construct needed improvements in the future. The project in and of itself does not result in significant traffic impacts to the intersection of McBean Parkway and Orchard Village Road and is therefore not required to construct these improvements. Eminent domain is not required for the implementation of the HMNMH Master Plan project or needed to mitigate traffic impacts along McBean Parkway. By providing up to 12 additional feet along the HMNMH/G&L properties, McBean Parkway could be realigned to create space on the southern side for a right-turn pocket onto Orchard Village Road. For this reason, residential eminent domain is not required for future roadway improvements. As described in Exhibit "K" to the Development Agreement, the applicant will be required to construct project-required right-turn lanes and traffic signal modifications along the project's McBean Parkway frontage at their ultimate right-of-way location.
- WCC12-16. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required. In addition, refer to Project Issues 14 and 16 in Topical Response No. 7, which address these issues further.
- WCC12-17. The comment addresses general subject areas, which received extensive analysis in the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required. However, the comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. In addition, refer to Project Issue 15 in Topical Response No. 7, which addresses this issue further.
- WCC12-18. The topic of emergency response is addressed in Section 5.12, Sheriff Services, of the September 2008 Revised Draft EIR, which finds that the proposed project would not conflict with the City's Emergency Preparedness Plan. In addition, the transport



of off-site grading material would be limited to the hours of 9:00 AM and 2:00 PM in order to avoid weekday peak traffic conditions. Thus, no further mitigation is required. In addition, refer to Project Issue 14 in Topical Response No. 7, which addresses this issue further.

With respect to the other issues raised in the comment, they express the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.



City of
SANTA CLARITA

Santa Clarita City Council

Written Comment Card

Please complete this form to register your written comments to the Santa Clarita City Council, in lieu of speaking, and turn it in to the City Clerk. Your written comments will be considered part of the official proceedings. (Please print clearly.)

Meeting date: 9-23-08 Agenda item number: 10

Agenda title or subject to be addressed: MASTER CASE 04-325 HUMAN MASTER PLAN

Please check one: Support Recommendation Oppose Recommendation Neutral

Name: CARL D. PORTER

Street Address: 25694 CHANNERY ROCK RD City: VALENCIA

Written Comment (Use other side if necessary): See attached

Council requires that persons registering written comments who represent other individuals, groups or organizations disclose that relationship.

I DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Representing: _____ Signature: _____

Please check here if you are a registered lobbyist with the City of Santa Clarita (see back of card for more information).

WCC13-1

September 23, 2008

Council Members

As a lowly citizen, I come before this august council to present my opposition to the proposed, "Master Plan for the Expansion of the HMNMH Campus".

WCC13-2

But you sit up there, two or maybe three feet above me, obviously in the position of power, with absolutely no reason to listen to my input. Therefore I request that you come down to my level. Sit here on the floor with the common citizens and exchange the pros and cons of the proposed expansion. Let me sit in your place and ask the questions as to the validity of this proposal.

WCC13-3

To me it is a very simple question of money ruling governmental decisions. We all want the best hospital and medical care that can be provided. The question is "How do we provide it?" The current proposal, "The Master Plan" for HMNMH campus, provides only medical office buildings for profit to G&L Realty on not for profit land without any assurance that the true need of additional operating rooms or hospital beds will ever be achieved.

WCC13-4

What has been proposed is a sham and a lie. Two medical office buildings can be built without ever having an addition to the hospital. Now I would assume that each of you are not stupid and can see the fallacy of "improved health care" WITH NO IMPROVEMENT TO THE HOSPITAL, or you are politically motivated to support whatever your benefactors want.

WCC13-5

There is another answer, to demand a hospital expansion without "medical office buildings". If Mr. Seaver cannot finance the only hospital in the Santa Clarita Valley with no competition, then you should find another CEO.

WCC13-6

But I am only a single citizen, trying to illuminate the right. Now I hope you have the courage to separate wrong from right.

WCC13-7

Carl Porter
Valencia, CA



**WCC13. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENT CARD FROM CARL PORTER,
SEPTEMBER 23, 2008.**

- WCC13-1. The Commentator has expressed their opposition to the proposed project. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.
- WCC13-2. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.
- WCC13-3. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.
- WCC13-4. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.
- WCC13-5. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.
- WCC13-6. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.
- WCC13-7. The comment expresses the opinions of the Commentator. The comment will be included as part of the record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project. However, because the comment does not address or question the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.