

CONSERVANCY COMMENTS

Ms. Stevens said that Mr. Calleia was a member of the sub-committee for the Rim of the Valley public hearings and the record should reflect that.

Mr. Riley said Assemblyman Katz represented to Assemblywoman Tanner that none of the proposed boundaries would include any proposed landfills. Mr. Riley said he now has questions, with the boundary changes, whether we are holding to the intent of Assemblyman Katz' legislation.

Executive Director said Assemblyman Katz' legislation did not make the change in the boundary it was Senator Davis', SB 509. There are no landfill sites added in what is being discussed in the staff report. Towsley Canyon site was added by SB 509.

Mr. Riley asked if this action is to comply with SB 1516 which is different than Assemblyman Katz represented.

Executive Director said Rim of the Valley boundary was modified by SB 509 which includes Towsley Canyon. Rocky Peak, including Blind Canyon, was already included in the original boundary which was drawn in 1982. Half of Elsmere Canyon was included in original boundary and AB 1516 would include all of Elsmere.

Mr. Riley what happens if Conservancy doesn't proceed as planned tonight with the June 30 deadline. Attorney General said he would have to check.

Executive Director said the BKK proposal area can always be excluded. Mr. Riley said Public Works and Assemblywoman Tanner are still considering Towsley for a proposed landfill site.

Ms. Stevens said Towsley has been in our jurisdiction since January due to SB 509. Nothing in this plan affects Towsley either way. She suggests the Executive Director be directed to speak to Assemblymembers Katz and Tanner and get this straightened out and then get back to Mr. Riley and the County. If there was such an agreement between Mr. Katz and Ms. Tanner it should be honored.

Mr. Calleia asked what the effect of excluding or including landfill sites is. Executive Director responded that the effect is on areas where we can expend our funds that affect landfill sites. He said he assumes the Sanitation District is concerned with the potential repetition of the proposed acquisition the Conservancy had last October. They don't want us acquiring in areas where they have proposals.

There was discussion of having another meeting within the time frame of the submission of the plan to the legislature, in order to resolve the boundary variations.

Ms. Skei said she would not recommend having another meeting on this issue but would consider a motion to adopt the rim study and move the boundary line down from the Elsmere area. She asked Mr. Riley if the Sanitation District just informed him of this. He said yes.

Mr. Calleia asked where the boundary is in relation to Elsmere. Executive Director showed the areas on the map. Mr. Calleia asked if it is acceptable to accommodate the County by trading a link right there and adopting the plan tonight.

Ms. Stevens said it is acceptable to the Chair if it is to the County's representative. There have been four public hearings on this plan and there has not been any language in the bill that deals

with landfills. She said she would be willing to accommodate the information that has been provided by Mr. Riley and instructing the Executive Director to have a conversation with Mr. Katz regarding his conversations with Ms. Tanner. Then at the Executive Director's discretion, he can delete Elsmere. We should not be dilatory in our obligation to meet legislative deadline.

Executive Director said statutorily there is a 30 day period when the whole plan can be vetoed. If there is anything we can do, it should be done now. We should not take a chance that Assemblywoman Tanner might come in and get the majority of the votes. All this work could be for naught. Since the hearing committees or staff had no indication of concern, this may need to be negotiated.

Mr. Calleia asked if the Board can table this item and have the Executive Director reach Assemblyman Katz tonight.

Ms. Stevens said there was adequate time for County Sanitation to communicate to the Conservancy any agreement between Assemblymembers Katz and Tanner and the legislation does not refer to any agreement. She doesn't want to see the plan destroyed after all this work for want of a simple courtesy call from County Sanitation on something we could have checked out and then satisfied their concerns.

Mr. Riley asked if the Conservancy submitted the plan to them.

Mr. Calleia asked since when does County Sanitation have review power over state agencies. He said this matter has been public and they have the responsibility to come to us.

Mr. Riley said he is not prepared to vote for the plan, absent satisfying the County.

Executive Director said the legislation was written to promote consensus. He is concerned that Assemblyman Katz may have an understanding or, even if there is not, if there is opposition on the part of Sanitation, it could impose a veto in this plan.

Ms. Stevens said the proposal met with very positive responses from both the local jurisdictions and public in the various hearings. She is loath to put the bill in jeopardy now. She asked Mr. Riley to suggest a resolution that won't upset County Sanitation and that would allow the intent of the legislation to be upheld.

Mr. Riley said a conversation with Tanner and Katz as to what the representations were is needed. Tanner may not want boundaries going through proposed landfill sites and Katz supposedly made the representation it wouldn't happen. Mr. Riley suggested excluding trails in all proposed landfill areas might have been in her mind.

Executive Director said staff has tried unsuccessfully to reach Assemblyman Katz. He recommends the Board adopt everything but that the boundary modification be tabled until a special meeting on the 30th. Mr. Riley said he isn't available.

Mr. Dangermond suggested excluding the Elsmere Canyon area rather than the whole extension of the northeast corner.

Executive Director requested tabling this item. The meeting was recessed at 9:25 p.m. by the Chair so Mr. Riley and the Executive Director could confer. The Chair introduced Mr. Rosen and Item 7.

7. Presentation and discussion of Las Llajas and Rocky Peak Trails.

Al Rosen presented a film on the Las Lajas and Rocky Peak areas. He explained how the fires affected this area and gave some background on the road used for the film "Burma Road" which is in this area.

The Chair called the meeting back to order at 9:50. p.m.

[Further discussion on Item 5, Rim of the Valley Trail Corridor]

Executive Director said based on the discussion with Mr. Riley, this would be in the form of an empowerment to the General Manager of the County Sanitation District to take an eraser to the Rim of the Valley plan those things that would impact on an existing or proposed landfill. This would be a jurisdictional question since no one has the power but the Legislature to adjust the plan after adoption. Staff will meet with the Sanitation District at a meeting to be set up by Mr. Riley. The language will be as follows: The General Manager of Los Angeles County Sanitation District may delete any boundary or trail segment added by this plan that he determines would impact on a landfill, existing or proposed, or the City and County of Los Angeles JPA regarding Elsmere Canyon.

Ms. Stevens said the 1983 legislation that created the Rim of the Valley Trail Corridor, and SB 509 are already law.

Mr. Gertmenian asked if we are trying to keep out of any negotiations that City and County have that has anything to do with dumps. The Executive Director said what we are trying to do is not embroil the plan with concerns of the Sanitation District that trails would be used against them by giving them the authority to erase those trails they don't like. It is a drastic power to give to an unelected official but we don't know how to resolve it since Mr. Riley and Mr. Calleia can't be available to meet on Friday. This is a grossly imperfect solution.

Mr. Gackenbach asked if the Board can give the Executive Director the power to negotiate this with the General Manager. The Executive Director said that if we can say to the legislature that we gave the General Manager an eraser and he didn't use it, then we have a good argument before the legislature if he tries to tube us.

Mr. Calleia said the Board can footnote or caveat what is adopted saying that the Conservancy relinquishes jurisdiction over any area that the Sanitation District may seek. Executive Director said we don't yet know their full concerns.

Mr. Calleia said he understands they want to be outside our zone so we can't purchase land in any areas they have under consideration. He asked if saying that the Conservancy will never establish by owning, or by less than fee ownership, some trail within the immediate environs of Elsmere would satisfy Mr. Riley.

Mr. Riley said he is only addressing the Rim of the Valley Trail at this point. Executive Director said Towsley Canyon could be affected by saying no trails around Towsley.

Mr. Calleia said we are giving up what Senator Davis gave us. Executive Director said the Conservancy can't change that which was amended under the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy Act. The trail in Towsley could be excised though.

Ms. Stevens said she is prepared for that eraser on Elsmere but not on trails and land within our jurisdiction already. She requested that "where an existing boundary is proposed to be changed" be added to the wording.

Executive Director said this does not diminish the recreation and trail potential in Towsley as it already exists. Existence of that trail would not be a reason for stopping the landfill. The language gives us a good faith footing. Sanitation District does have the power to beat us and we would hate to see the bill defeated. Ms. Tanner is interested only in landfill aspects.

Mr. Gackenbach asked if the trail can be identified later. Executive Director said it doesn't preclude recreational use of the facility or land acquisition.

Chair asked Mr. Riley to clarify what the position of the County Sanitation District is. Mr. Riley said they were concerned about Elsmere and Towsley and the proposed impact of trails on landfill sites. Existence of trails may derail their landfill and they would oppose it. Brown, Blind, Mission, Rustic and Sullivan are also concerns.

Executive Director said the Conservancy can't change what is already adopted such as Mission, Rustic and Sullivan, only the new areas of Towsley and Elsmere. We can't designate a trail the Sanitation District doesn't like, but they can't change what is on property they don't own. What the action does preclude is someone making a public statement that you can't or shouldn't put the landfill here because it would interfere with the Rim of the Valley Trail. This does not put us out of the park business in this area. Would have been preferable to deal with this on a trail by trail basis but that can't be determined tonight.

Mr. Calleia asked for Mr. Dangermond's input on this issue.

Mr. Dangermond suggested continuing the meeting. He said he feels that the wording allowing the Sanitation District to delete a boundary that doesn't already exist seems the best way to accomplish this in the time available.

Executive Director said the meeting can be continued for 24 hours but we won't know about the Sanitation District issue. By hearing about it this late, it seems like the best recommendation. The onus is on the Sanitation District.

Mr. Gackenbach asked if the language will be "boundary or trail that doesn't exist." The Executive Director said any trails or boundaries "added by the plan" not that already exist.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Ms. Palmer asked if this language could affect the Calabasas landfill or Cold Creek trail which are proposed but not existing.

Mr. Brown said the wording is too open ended. The definition of boundaries is needed and the Board should set limits on what they can eliminate. They should have no access to trails and parks already in our areas.

Mr. Hunt asked if this is only for areas being added. Ms. Thompson said the changes don't touch the trail mentioned by Ms. Palmer.

Mr. Brown asked if this could apply to future landfill sites that haven't yet been identified. Executive Director said no, because it is jurisdictional. Both of us lack the ability after June 30, 1990 to change it. Executive Director said the plan can't be changed after the Legislature's approval. The Attorney General has advised us that the deadline is jurisdictional so an act of the Legislature would be needed to extend the time limit.

Mr. Hunt said the Moorpark City Council has not yet taken a position on boundary revisions.

Mr. Green said the County seems to want to continue this item. He suggests we postpone it until June 29, 1990. Executive Director stated that without a voting representative of the County, there may be a negative reaction from them toward us. He urges acceptance of the modification. The choice is to either lose some with an eraser or lose it all if it fails in the Legislature. We seem to have the implicit good will of Mr. Riley to bring the parties together to resolve this.

Ms. Skei moved adoption of the Master Plan with the proviso as suggested by the Executive Director "to delete or modify by County Sanitation District the trails or boundaries", seconded by Mr. Calleia.

The following resolution was adopted by a vote of 6 yes and 0 no.

- That the Rim of the Valley Master Plan prepared pursuant to AB 1516, is adopted with the proviso that the County Sanitation District can modify new trails or boundaries they chose to where an existing boundary is proposed to be changed.

(Full text of the resolution is on file with the Conservancy)

9. Resolution authorizing the acquisition by Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority of the Holland property, Santa Clarita Woodlands.

Executive Director stated that this property gives us access to Rice, East and Leaming Canyons. He showed this parcel on the map in relation to our other properties in the area. This is commercially zoned property which accounts for its cost. There is an ample staging area for an equestrian center and the corrals and stables are already there. The property farther back is less costly but it is wiser to put our money into the access points first and then acquire the big landowner's parcels down the road.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Sigworth asked the price of the Holland property. The Chair said it is \$2.8 million.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Dave Brown said the properties east of this parcel are unique. He said he understands the strategy but the land is expensive and suggests that we keep all options open with respect to future disposition.

Mr. Green said the money issue is deceptive in light of the strategic importance of the acquisition. He supports it.

Mr. Berger asked if there are any easements through the property. Executive Director said there are utility easements but no road access easement.

On motion of Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Berger, the Advisory Committee recommended adoption of the staff recommendation.

CONSERVANCY COMMENTS

On motion of Ms. Skei, seconded by Mr. Calleia, discussion continued.