

Environmental Checklist Form (DRAFT Initial Study)
County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



Project title: “Sloan Canyon Residential Project” – The Reserve / Project No.R2014-00285-(5) / Case No(s) TR072680, Zone Change RPPL2016003663, RCUP201400014, ROAK201400008, RENV201400027.

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Contact Person and phone number: Steven Jones, (213)974-6433

Project sponsor’s name and address: Claremont Homes Inc., 380 Civic Drive, Pleasant Hill, CA 94513

Project location: Sloan Canyon Road

APNs: 2865-018-033, 2865-018-034, 2865-023-006, 2865-023-007, 2865-023-019, 2865-023-021, 3247-026-055, 3247-026-056, and 3247-068-002 USGS Quad: Val Verde

Gross Acreage: 186.45

General plan designation: N/A

Community/Area wide Plan designation: RL2 (Rural Land 2 [NU4 – Non-Urban 4], 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres)/ RL1 (Rural Land 1 [NU5 – Non-Urban5], 1 dwelling unit per 1 acre).

Zoning: A-2-2 (Heavy Agricultural, 2-Acre Minimum Required Lot Area), A-2-1(Heavy Agricultural, 1-Acre Minimum Required Lot Area), Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD).

Description of project: The proposed project is a vesting tentative tract map to create 137 single-family residence lots, four (4) open space lots, two (2) private recreation lots and 14 public facility lots, a zone change request to authorize zones A-2-2 to zone RPD-8,000-0.74U, a conditional use permit request to authorize a development program associated with a zone change request, development within a hillside management area, a density-controlled development and grading exceeding 100,000 cubic yards and an oak tree permit request to authorize the removal of 18 protected oak trees and the encroachment within the protected zones of four (4) protected oaks on 186.45 acres.

Three single family residences on separate parcels are currently located within the project site. The total disturbed area would be 58 acres. The proposed density-controlled development would involve the creation of building pads intended for single family residences within approximately 46 acres of the 186-acre project site, including the residences, private recreation lots and open space for passive recreation and secondary open space, including graded slopes restored to natural vegetation communities, equestrian, hiking and bicycle trails, landscaped areas adjacent to streets, private drives, fire lanes sidewalks and trails, and public facility lots for stormwater control and water quality and debris management.

The project proposes 600,000 cubic yards of cut and 600,000 cubic yards of fill balanced on the project site.

A portion of this project's disturbance area overlaps with the disturbance area and construction footprint associated with build-out of the Castaic High School – East Access Road Project located west of the project site. These access road improvements are expected to be constructed prior to the development of VTM 72680; therefore, these impacts would be mitigated as outlined in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for Castaic High School (The Planning Center/DC&E 2012) and the Final Supplemental EIR - Castaic High School (State Clearinghouse Number 2004031110) (FSEIR; Meridian 2014).

Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site is located within the western portion of the unincorporated community of Castaic, Los Angeles County, California. It lies within the Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Plan Area, Castaic Area CSD, Hasley Canyon subarea. Specifically, the project site is located primarily north of Sloan Canyon Road, approximately one mile west of Interstate 5 (I-5). The nearest incorporated city, Santa Clarita, is located approximately eight miles to the southeast. The site is bordered by the following uses vacant land, open space and single-family residences.

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun? No. No response received.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
<u>Department of Public Works</u>	<u>Final Map</u>
<u>Department of Public Works</u>	<u>Building and Safety</u>
<u>United States Army Corps of Engineers</u>	<u>Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit</u>
<u>Regional Water Quality Control Board</u>	<u>Section 401 Water Quality Certification or Waste Discharge Requirements</u>
<u>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</u>	<u>Streambed Alteration Agreement</u>

Major projects in the area:

<i>Project/ Case No.</i>	<i>Description and Status</i>
<u>Project 04-137/RCUP200900133</u>	<u>A request for authorization to establish a 28,162 square foot automobile impound yard, approved July, 1, 2010.</u>
<u>PM19149-2</u>	<u>To create four single-family residence parcels on 20 acres, tentatively approved December 7, 2010.</u>
<u>TR46443</u>	<u>To create 96 single-family residence lots on 193.25 acres, final map recorded January 5, 2000.</u>
<u>TR52584</u>	<u>To create 209 single-family residence lots and a golf course on 430.4 gross acres, tentatively approved November 19, 2002.</u>
<u>RTR52584-1</u>	<u>To revise TR52584 to create 564 lots on 430.4 gross acres, tentatively approved February 1, 2017.</u>
<u>TR52729</u>	<u>To create 39 lots on 80 acres, pending tentative approval.</u>
<u>TR53933</u>	<u>To create 70 single-family residence lots, three commercial lots, four open space lots, one private park lot and one public facility lot on 47.2 gross acres, tentatively approved February 14, 2012.</u>
<u>PM069961</u>	<u>To create four single-family residence parcels on 80 acres, pending tentative approval.</u>

PM070839

To create four single-family residence parcels on 12.44 acres, denied due to inactivity.

TR072126

To create 483 lots on 1,167 gross acres, pending tentative approval.

TR072630

To create 53 lots on 180 acres, pending tentative approval.

TR072631

To create 13 lots on 6.14 acres, denied due to inactivity.

Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Agencies

- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
 - Los Angeles Region
 - Lahontan Region
- Coastal Commission
- Army Corps of Engineers

Special Reviewing Agencies

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- SCAQMD
- Castaic Union Elementary School District
- William S. Hart Union High School District

Regional Significance

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- Department of Housing and Community Development
- Air Resources Board
- Caltrans

Trustee Agencies

- None
- State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- State Lands Commission
- University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

County Reviewing Agencies

- DPW

- Fire Department
 - Planning Division
 - Land Development Unit
- Sanitation District
- Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)
- Sheriff Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee
- Library

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture/Forest
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities/Services
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature (Prepared by)

2019 AUG 8

Date



Signature (Approved by)

08/08/2019

Date

1. AESTHETICS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansion views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. Aesthetic components of a scenic vista generally include (1) scenic quality, (2) sensitivity level, and (3) view access. The project is located entirely within the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles and could affect significant ridgeline in the area. There are at least four primary significant ridgelines that touch the property. The proposed project is a 139-unit residential development with private recreation areas, open space and trails. The residences would be one and two stories. The project would change the views of and through the project site. The project site contains slopes and valley areas. The residential lots would be clustered in the lower valley areas of the site. Due to the height of the proposed residences, the views of the surrounding hillsides from Sloan Canyon Road would not be blocked by the project. The project will not obstruct views to or from any scenic resource, degrade the character of a scenic highway, or disrupt a scenic vista.

Additionally, the project includes the planting of trees along the roadway frontage along Sloan Canyon Road.

There are no borders of the subject property with cities adjacent to or near the project site; and

Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially change scenic views of or through the project site.

The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located in a rural area within the western portion of the unincorporated community of Castaic, Los Angeles County and within the Santa Clarita Valley Plan Area. Currently, the project site is mostly undeveloped, but three residences are located on the project site. The project site is located in an area containing significant ridgelines. Sloan Canyon Road, which runs through the project site, is identified as part of the Adopted County Trail System. The proposed project is a 139-unit residential development with a park, open space and trails and would be visible from a regional riding or hiking trail. The project would change the views of and through the project site. The project site contains slopes and valley areas. The residential lots would be clustered in the lower valley areas of the site. The residences would be one to two stories tall. Due to the height of the proposed residences, the views of the surrounding hillsides from Sloan Canyon Road would not be blocked by the project. Additionally, the project includes the planting of trees along the roadway frontage along Sloan Canyon Road. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially change scenic views of or through the project site. The impact would be less than significant.

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact.

The project site is located over 2,500 feet west of I-5, which is not officially designated as a state scenic highway. Views to the site from I-5 are blocked by intervening topography and development. Due to the lack of visibility of the project site from I-5 and the fact that I-5 is not a state scenic highway, the project would have no impact to scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Development of the proposed project could result in a significant impact if it results in substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and surroundings. Degradation of visual character or quality is generally defined as a substantial adverse change to the existing site appearance as a result of new development. As discussed above, the project site is located in a rural residential area.

The project site is mostly vacant with three existing homes and is bordered by vacant land to the north and south, Castaic High School is currently under construction to the west, and low density residential to the east. The proposed residences would be one to two stories tall and located in the valley areas of the site. The development would be visible from some residences in the area, from Sloan Canyon Road, and not from Castaic High School when it is completed. For purposes of aesthetics, Castaic High School is not considered a sensitive receptor. While construction of the proposed residential development would represent a change to the site's visual character, views of the ridgelines surrounding the project site would still be available above the structures. Additionally, views of the project from neighboring residences to the south and east would be partially obscured by the topography of the site and surrounding area. Lastly, the height and massing of the proposed residences would be generally consistent with existing one and two story residences located east and south of the project site and would not include any features that would substantially degrade the appearance of the vicinity. The proposed project would change, but not degrade the visual quality of the site and surrounding environment. Therefore, impacts to visual character would be less than significant.

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project's interior and exterior building lights would be visible from surrounding areas. On-site building and security lighting would be installed consistent with California Building Code and the County of Los Angeles Rural Outdoor Lighting District requirements (Part 9 of Chapter 22.44) to minimize light spillover onto adjacent parcels. Potential sources of glare as a result of project implementation would include vehicles parked on the streets or in driveways. The proposed residences would be separated from abutting land uses

and roadways by vegetated open space and topography that would minimize glare impacts resulting from any reflective surfaces. While light and glare emanating from the site would increase from existing conditions, the project would comply with lighting code requirements by including design features, such as automatic control devices and complete shielding for outdoor lighting. Impacts would be less than significant.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact.

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) produces maps and statistical data that are used for analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources. Agricultural land is rated according to soil quality and irrigation status; the best quality land is called Prime Farmland. The maps are updated every two years with the use of a computer mapping system, aerial imagery, public review, and field reconnaissance. FMMP produces Important Farmland Maps, which are a hybrid of resource quality (soils) and land use information. The California Land Conservation Act of 1965--commonly referred to as the Williamson Act--enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. Local governments receive an annual subvention of forgone property tax revenues from the state via the Open Space Subvention Act of 1971.

Review of the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation confirmed that neither the project site nor adjacent land is designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the FMMP (California Department of Conservation, California Important Farmland Finder). The project site is designated Other Land and Grazing Land. In addition, the County of Los Angeles does not designate the project site as an Agricultural Opportunity Area (Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, GIS-NET3).

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact.

The only Williamson Act contract lands in the County are located on Catalina Island and held by the Catalina Island Conservancy as set asides for open space and recreational purposes. Therefore, there are no agricultural Williamson Act contracts in the remainder of the unincorporated County.

Agricultural Opportunity Areas (AOAs) are a County identification tool that indicates land where commercial agriculture is taking place and/or is believed to have a future potential based on the presence of prime agricultural soils, compatible adjacent land uses, and existing County land use policy. In addition to AOAs, the County has two agricultural zones: A-1 (Light Agriculture) and A-2 (Heavy Agriculture).

The project site is zoned A-2 (Heavy Agriculture); however, it is not enrolled in a Williamson Act contract. In addition, the County does not designate the project site as an Agricultural Opportunity Area (Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, GIS-NET3). The project site has not been used for agriculture and is largely hilly with three residences. Zoning south of the site is RPD. The applicant is seeking a zone change from A-2-1 and A-2-2 to RPD. If the zone change is approved, the proposed project would not conflict with any zoning designations designed to promote agriculture. No impacts would occur.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?

No Impact.

California Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) defines forest land as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.” California Public Resources Code section 4526 defines timberland as land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection as experimental forest land that is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Commercial species shall be determined by the State Board of Forestry and fire Protection for each district after consultation with the respective forest district communities. California Public Resources Code Section 51104(g) defines Timberland production zones" or "TPZ" as an area that has been zoned and is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses.

The County contains important and prime farmland, and the Angeles National Forest and a portion of the Los Padres National forest are also located in the County. The County does not have any zone that is strictly used for forest uses or timberland production. However, the Angeles National Forest, and a portion of the Los Padres National forest are located in the County, and the Watershed Zone allows for any use owned and maintained by the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, and any authorized leased use designated to be part of the Forest Service overall recreational plan of development, including logging. In addition, Los Angeles County has been mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to identify the different categories of land cover capable of being sustained therein, including forests, woodlands, wetlands, and shrubs, for example.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact.

The main portion of the site is undeveloped. The project site is currently zoned A-1 which allows single-family residential use. The project site is surrounded by non-urban development. The proposed project would not convert forest land to a non-forest use. Likewise, the project site would not contribute to environmental changes that could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impacts to forest land resources would occur and no mitigation is required.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact.

The project site is currently zoned A-1 and A-2 which allows single family residential use. The site is not located in a forest and does not have a land use designation or zoning as forest. It is also not used for agricultural production. The proposed project would not convert farmland to a nonagricultural use. Likewise, the project site would not contribute to environmental changes that would indirectly result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur, and no mitigation is required.

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>		
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A project is consistent with the regional Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) if it does not create new violations of clean air standards, exacerbates any existing violations, or delays a timely attainment of such standards. The project is located within the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which is the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the South Coast Air Basin. The SCAQMD develops rules and regulations; establishes permitting requirements for stationary sources; inspects emissions sources; and enforces such measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary. The SCAQMD is directly responsible for reducing emissions from stationary (area and point), mobile, and indirect sources. It has responded to this requirement by preparing a sequence of Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs).

The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and thus not subject to air quality plans of Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD). The local air quality management agencies are required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that state and federal air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards.

The SCAQMD Governing Board adopted an updated 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) on February 1, 2013 (SCAQMD 2013). The purpose of the 2012 AQMP is to set forth a comprehensive program that will lead the region into compliance with federal air quality standards for 8-hour ozone (O₃) and fine particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less (PM_{2.5}). The 2012 AQMP is designed to accommodate expected future population, housing, and employment growth and is based on the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG's) 2012 regional population, housing and employment projections contained in their 2012 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The State's criterion for regional significance is 500 dwelling units for residential uses. The proposed project entails the subdivision and construction of 139 buildings to be used as single-family residences and open space. The project will not violate any applicable federal or state air quality standard or projected air quality violation.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Project construction would generate temporary air pollutant emissions. These impacts are associated with fugitive dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and exhaust emissions from heavy construction vehicles and soil hauling trucks, in addition to ROG that would be released during the drying phase upon application of architectural coatings. Construction would generally consist of site preparation, grading, erection of the proposed buildings, paving, and architectural coating.

The site preparation phase would involve the greatest amount of heavy equipment and the greatest generation of fugitive dust. For the purposes of construction emissions modeling, it was assumed that the project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which identifies measures to reduce fugitive dust and is required to be implemented at all construction sites located within SCAB.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Sensitive receptors are adjacent to and within a 1/4 mile to approximately 3/4 mile of the property identified as playgrounds, schools, day care facilities and other residential neighborhoods. There would be a less than significant impact with code compliance. Construction of the project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (i.e., usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, exhaust emissions associated with construction of a project this size are typically below SCAQMD CEQA thresholds during construction and construction contractors would be required to implement measures to reduce or eliminate emissions by following SCAQMD standard construction practices. Therefore, sensitive receptors are not expected to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction, and potential short term impacts are considered less than significant. No further mitigation is required.

A Los Angeles County Department of Public Health memo dated December 15, 2010, recommends separation between residences and freeways; however, this is not an adopted policy for Regional Planning. A potentially significant impact could occur where the proposed project would contribute substantial pollutant concentrations near an existing sensitive use, and proximity to high volume vehicular routes, such as Sloan Canyon and Interstate 5, can result in unhealthful automobile exhaust exposure upon sensitive receptors and risk populations. Air quality impacts associated with proximity to the Interstate 5, which is more than one mile away, would be lessened with adherence to the Department of Public Health memo. Existing residences located within the area are greater than 500 feet from Interstate 5.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would involve residences, a park, and open space/trails. Diesel exhaust may be noticeable during some construction activities; however, the proposed project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and would be temporary in nature. Impacts would be less than significant.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Rincon Consultants, Inc. conducted a habitat assessment, vegetation mapping, and rare plant surveys in 2014 and 2015 to document general biological conditions of the project site, identify areas that could potentially support special-status plant resources, and determine presence/ absence of any special-status plants and/or vegetation communities. As discussed in the Rare Plant Survey Report, no special-status plant species were observed on-site during the focused rare plant surveys. Based on the results of the current and past rare plant surveys of the project site, no significant effects to special-status plants are anticipated. Nonetheless, the literature review and field surveys conducted for this report identified a moderate to high potential for six special-status plants to be present on-site; these include slender mariposa lily (*Calochortus clavatus* var. *gracilis*), Plummer’s mariposa lily (*Calochortus plummerae*), and club-haired mariposa lily (*Calochortus clavatus* var. *clavatus*), Peirson’s morning-glory (*Calyptegia peirsonii*), San Fernando Valley spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *fernandina*), Ojai navarretia (*Navarretia ojaiensis*). Since not all special-status plants are identifiable or in full bloom every year, small local populations that may exist as part of the seed bank may be present. Therefore, impacts to special-status plant species would be potentially significant and mitigation is required.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Detailed information regarding oak trees and an analysis of project impacts is available in the Oak Tree Report (see Appendix B). Within the Oak Tree Report study area, which includes the project’s disturbance footprint plus a 200 foot buffer area, a total of 41 qualifying individuals of coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) and four qualifying individuals of scrub oak (*Quercus berberidifolia*) were identified. Within the project’s disturbance footprint, 18 of the 45 qualifying oak tree trunks fall within the proposed project’s limits of grading, and are proposed for removal in their entirety during construction activities. Project activities will also encroach into the tree protection zone of an additional four. There are six oak trees proposed for removal by the Castaic

High School project that overlap with the proposed project's disturbance footprint. As discussed above, the Castaic Union School District has published its construction schedule and the construction of these road improvements is expected to be completed prior to the start of construction for the proposed project. These six oak trees would be mitigated by the Castaic High School project and it is not anticipated that the proposed project would impact these six oak trees. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts to 22 individual oak trees would be potentially significant and a County Oak Tree Permit and associated mitigation would be required. In addition, approximately 5.44 acres of these oak woodlands are located within the project's disturbance footprint and are proposed for removal. Of this total, 3.76 acre of these woodlands would be removed by the Castaic High School project. Therefore, approximately 1.68 acres of oak woodland is expected to be impacted by the proposed project.

The CDFW considers natural communities/alliances with a State Rank 1 to 3 (S1 to S3) or rarer as vulnerable and impacts to these communities/alliances may require mitigation by the County of Los Angeles. Two special-status plant communities, thick leaf yerba santa scrub (*Eriodictyon crassifolium* Provisional Shrubland Alliance; ID #10) and blue elderberry stands (*Sambucus nigra* Shrubland Alliance; ID #19) as recognized in the Manual of California Vegetation, both S3, were identified within the project disturbance footprint and fuel modification zones. Excluding vegetation communities/alliances within the Castaic High School project disturbance footprint, which would be expected to be mitigated by that project, the project would impact approximately 1.51 acres of thick leaf yerba santa scrub and approximately 0.36 acres of blue elderberry stands. Impacts to these communities/alliances would be potentially significant and mitigation would be required.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on
federally or state protected wetlands
(including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal
pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or
waters of the United States, as defined by §
404 of the federal Clean Water Act or
California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq.
through direct removal, filling, hydrological
interruption, or other means?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Rincon Consultants, Inc. prepared a wetland delineation for the project site in 2014 and confirmed the delineation findings with a supplemental site visit in 2015. According to the delineation report, the project site contains three potentially jurisdictional features (one with three upstream tributaries) within U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), CDFW, and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdiction.

Final determination regarding jurisdictional resources will be made by the resource agencies upon their review of the Jurisdictional Delineation Report and their concurrence with its findings. The impact analysis therein assumes that construction of Castaic High School – East Access Road Project, as discussed in the Final Supplemental EIR (FSEIR), would fully improve Sloan Canyon road prior to construction of the proposed project. As stated in the FSEIR, the Castaic High School – East Access Road Project is expected to include impacts to the jurisdictional areas along portions of drainages in the southern portion of the proposed project's Development Footprint. Specifically, impacts to biological resources associated with the construction of access to the Castaic High School would be mitigated by the School District in accordance with their land use permits as required by the lead planning agency. Impacts associated with drainages within the jurisdiction of the CDFW, USACE, or the Los Angeles RWQCB would occur and be mitigated per the Castaic High School-related regulatory agency permits.

No temporary project impacts are proposed. The proposed project as it is designed now, and excluding the Castaic High School proposed impacts would result in 0.12 acre (3,740 linear feet [lf]) permanent impacts to USACE non-wetland waters and 0.50 acre (8,515 lf) permanent impacts to RWQCB waters of the State and CDFW Streambed. Impacts to wetlands would be potentially significant and mitigation is required.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

The larger trees and shrubs within the project site provide potentially suitable nesting habitat for a variety of bird species that are afforded protection under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA – 16 United State Code Section 703-711) and California Fish and Game Code (CFG) Section 3503. The proposed project has the potential to impact migratory and other bird species if construction activities occur during the nesting season, which is typically February 1 through August 31. Construction-related disturbance could result in nest abandonment or premature fledging of the young. The proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to nesting birds unless sufficient mitigation is incorporated.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Coast live oak woodland is considered “apparently secure” on a state-wide basis (State Rank S4), and therefore, on a special-status vegetation basis, the loss of 1.68 acre of coast live oak woodland is not considered a significant impact. However, the County of Los Angeles, through the Oak Woodlands Conservation Management Plan, has established a goal of preserving and restoring oak woodlands such that no net loss of oak woodlands occurs. This plan develops a consistent policy for the management of oak woodlands by providing a voluntary conservation strategy to meet the requirements of the California Oak Woodlands Conservation Act (Assembly Bill 242). The Plan extends CEQA consideration of impacts to oak woodlands composed of oaks greater than 5 inches diameter at breast height (DBH) (as compared to the Oak Tree Ordinance, which protects oaks of 8 inches DBH) and recognizes that conservation of oak woodland habitat extends beyond the protection of individual trees.

As discussed above, approximately 1.68 acres of oak woodlands (coast live oak and scrub oak) are within the disturbance footprint and would be removed by the project. These woodlands are rated as “Moderately Degraded,” as they were isolated from a contiguous woodland corridor and were adjacent to an existing landscaped residential development. String-line trimmer damage was observed on some of the trees within the woodland as well as old cable and bracing that has now become included within bark tissue. Although the oak woodlands are in a moderately degraded state, they have retained some of their functionality and because

the entire woodland would be removed, impacts to oak woodlands at the project site are considered significant and mitigation is required under the County's Oak Woodlands Conservation Management Plan.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

In late 2013 and early 2014, Rincon prepared technical environmental documents for Vesting Tentative Tract Map 72680 (VTM 72680; dubbed "Vineyards at Sloan" at the time) and VTM 72619 (dubbed "Homestead at Sloan" at the time). Based on input from Los Angeles County and the resources present onsite, these two VTM projects were combined into one project in late 2014 and early 2015, to form one project, the Sloan Canyon Residential Project, an update to VTM 72680. This includes the addition of APNs 2865-023-019 and 2865-023-021 at the central portion of the southern end, north of Sloan Canyon Road, also known as the Preach Property. The combination and redesign of the project resulted in a significant reduction in potential impacts to rare plant species, oak trees and woodlands, and jurisdictional resources as compared to the original submittal.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

No Impact.

The project site is not included in any Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, Wildflower Reserve Areas, or Significant Ecological Areas (Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, GIS-NET3; Los Angeles County GIS Data Portal, 2013).

Mitigation Measures

MM4.1 Pre-construction Surveys and Avoidance. Prior to ground disturbance activities, pre-construction special-status plant surveys within the project disturbance footprint shall be conducted. If any special status species populations are observed, avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation shall be performed to reduce effects. If the population species cannot be fully avoided, then the Applicant shall draft a restoration/preservation plan to offset impacts to the species. Restoration/preservation plan may include onsite or offsite restoration with seed salvage, replanting, and preservation. The following methods may be implemented individually, or in conjunction with each other.

Onsite or Offsite Restoration Plan (Seed Salvage and Replanting). Restoration shall involve the collection of seed from within the development footprint or nearby areas, and replanting the seed in a suitable area outside the

development footprint but elsewhere on the project site that is set aside for preservation. If infeasible, an offsite location as close to the impact area as possible, but at least within the local watershed, may be used. An in-lieu fee to compensate for the loss of the population may be provided to a qualified agency or other entity acceptable to the County and applicable regulatory agencies. The in-lieu agreement shall be provided to the County for review prior to issuance of a building permit or grading permit, whichever occurs first. The Restoration Plan, prepared by a qualified plant ecologist satisfactory to the County, shall include, but not be limited to, the following to achieve a performance standard of a 2:1 replacement, or as dictated by a regulatory agency with permitting authority over the species:

- Location of the mitigation/restoration and map;
- Performance criteria (i.e., what is an acceptable success level of re-vegetation to mitigate impacts);
- Plant species, container sizes, and seeding rates;
- Planting schedule;
- Monitoring effort (i.e., who is to check on the success of the re-vegetation plan, and how frequently), including a monitoring methodology;
- Contingency planning (i.e., if the effort fails to reach the performance criteria, what remediation steps need to be taken);
- Irrigation method/schedule (i.e., how much water if needed, where and for how long);
- Means to control exotic vegetation; and
- Identification of the party responsible for meeting the success criteria and providing for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity;
- Method to maintain and monitor plants for a minimum of five years

The Applicant shall maintain and monitor the plants for a minimum of five years.

The Plan shall be implemented by one year after completion of the project, acceptable to the County. The applicant shall secure a bond for the cost of the mitigation effort. The bond shall be recorded released by the County upon satisfaction of the approved performance criteria after the monitoring period has expired.

Offsite Preservation Plan. Offsite preservation shall consist of locating a population of the impacted special status plant species containing at least two-times the number of individuals impacted by the project, and preserving the population in perpetuity via placement of a permanent conservation easement or purchase of the land and dedication to the County, or an approved conservation organization, or other entity acceptable to the County. The preserved population shall be located on an area of sufficient size to create a preserve core and be located, as feasible, at least 350 feet away from existing or proposed development, paved roads, v-ditches and irrigated areas. Additionally, the preserve population shall exhibit connectivity to other protected open space or hillside areas. The Preservation Plan shall at least identify the specific location of the preservation site and size; number of individuals preserved; ownership of the land; parties involved; and

the preservation methodology (i.e., permanent conservation easement or dedication to an approved conservation organization, etc.). The easement, dedication, or other legal mechanism to preserve the population shall be provided to the County for review and acceptance prior to County recordation. Proof of recordation shall be provided to the County prior to issuance of a grading permit or building permit, whichever occurs first.

MM4.2 Nesting Birds. If vegetation clearing and/or ground disturbance activities are scheduled to commence during the non-breeding season (September 1 to January 31), no pre-construction surveys or additional measures with regard to nesting birds and other raptors are required. If the nesting season cannot be avoided, a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys of all potential nesting habitats within the project site for project activities that are initiated during the breeding season (February 1 to August 31). Surveys shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to construction activities. Surveys need not be conducted for the entire project site at one time; they may be conducted in phases so that surveys occur no more than 14 days before any new portions of the site are disturbed. The surveying biologist must be qualified to determine the status and stage of nesting by migratory birds and all locally breeding raptor species without causing intrusive disturbance.

If active nests are found, a suitable buffer shall be established around active nests, and no construction within the buffer should be allowed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (i.e., the nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest). Encroachment into the buffer may occur at the discretion of a qualified biologist.

MM4.3 Special-Status Plant Communities. A restoration/preservation plan for thick leaf yerba santa scrub and blue elderberry stands shall be prepared by a qualified biologist/restoration ecologist. The plan shall include at a minimum: mitigation site location within the project site, native plant palette, planting plan, onsite seed and plant salvage, time of year planting will occur, irrigation plan, invasive species control program, success criteria, maintenance program, and monitoring program. Planting, maintenance, monitoring, and reporting shall be overseen by a restoration specialist or qualified horticulturalist familiar with the restoration of native habitats. Impacts to special-status vegetation communities shall be mitigated at a ratio of 1:1 (habitat restored for habitat lost) or other approved upon ratio. If mitigation cannot be conducted within the project site, the site shall be located in a dedicated open space area, or suitable adjacent off-site open space shall be obtained.

In addition to mitigation for tree removal, the permittee shall prepare a Habitat Mitigation Monitoring Plan to the satisfaction of the County forester, for protecting remaining oak trees during and after development. The HMMP shall be approved prior to issuance of a grading permit and include the following minimum requirements: description of the project/impact and mitigation sites, specific objectives, success criteria, plant palette, implementation plan, maintenance activities, monitoring plan, and contingency measures. Finally, the HMMP shall be reviewed by the staff biologist and the County forester.

MM4.4 Wetland Replacement. If impacts to jurisdictional features cannot be avoided, the Applicant shall consult with the CDFW, USACE, and the RWQCB and obtain applicable permits for the proposed impacts to jurisdictional waters, or obtain confirmation that permits are not needed. This includes a Pre-Construction Notification (PCN) and application for the Section 404

Nationwide General Permit for Residential Developments (NWP 29) from the USACE, a Section 401 water quality certification or Waste Discharge Requirements from the RWQCB, and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW. These permits typically require mitigation to reduce impacts to water quality and quantity, vegetation, and wildlife. The project Applicant shall demonstrate to the County of Los Angeles that the requirements of agencies with jurisdiction over waters onsite can be met prior to obtaining grading permits or building permits, whichever occurs first. This may include, but not be limited to, consultation with those agencies, securing the appropriate permits, waivers or agreements, and arrangements for re-vegetation mitigation as needed.

Areas of temporary disturbance shall be enhanced (weeds removed) and re-seeded or planted with a palette of native species at a 1:1 ratio for temporary impacts and 2:1 ratio for permanent impacts, or as required by the regulatory agencies having permitting jurisdiction over the resources, as appropriate within one (1) year of completion of drainage improvements. Revegetation for jurisdictional waters shall consist of appropriate willow scrub species and that of the ephemeral stream shall consist of annual grasses and forbs, unless otherwise specified by the regulatory agencies. All revegetation plant material must be sourced from a locally endemic genotype, as determined feasible by the County.

Re-vegetation shall occur as close to the impact area as possible, and in the same drainage to be disturbed, as feasible. If infeasible, another similar location may be acceptable, and shall be as close to the area disturbed as possible, and at least within the local watershed. An in-lieu fee to a conservation organization approved by the County (and acceptable to the regulatory agencies, as appropriate) to conduct the mitigation may be accepted if no other locations are feasible, as confirmed by the County. The project Applicant shall submit a re-vegetation plan prepared by a qualified restoration biologist for review and approval by the County, prior to issuance of a grading permit or building permit, whichever comes first. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following components:

- Location of the mitigation/re-vegetation and map;
- Performance criteria (i.e., what is an acceptable success level of re-vegetation to mitigate impacts);
- Plant species, container sizes, and seeding rates;
- Planting schedule;
- Monitoring effort (i.e., who is to check on the success of the re-vegetation plan, and how frequently);
- Contingency planning (i.e., if the effort fails to reach the performance criteria, what remediation steps need to be taken);
- Irrigation method/schedule (i.e., how much water if needed, where and for how long);
- Means to control exotic vegetation; and
- Identification of the party responsible for meeting the success criteria.

The revegetation shall be completed within one year of completion of the improvements affecting the drainages, acceptable to the County. The Applicant shall maintain and monitor the plants for a minimum of five years, or until the performance criteria are met.

With implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-5, potential impacts to rare plant species, nesting birds, special-status plant communities, and locally protected trees and oak woodlands would be less than significant.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact.

Rincon Consultants, Inc. prepared a Cultural Resources Study for the project site in 2015. The study reported no evidence of historic cultural resources on or around the project site. The site currently contains three residences, none of which qualify as historic sites. Therefore, no impact, would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

No evidence of prehistoric or historic cultural resources, including archaeological, paleontological or other cultural resources were found according to the Rincon Consultants, Inc report. An intensive pedestrian survey of the project site identified no previously unrecorded cultural resources within the project site. Rincon’s archaeologists attempted to relocate the three previously recorded cultural resources within the project site identified in the records search, but were only able to locate one (P-19-380H). Two of the three resources (P-19-350H and P-19-358H) qualify as archaeological sites. According the report and a 2005 report, Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Castaic 120 Project, by Roger D. Mason and Koral Ahmetone, none of these resources appear eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Based on the results of the records search, Native American scoping, and field survey, Rincon does not recommend further cultural resource studies for the project. However, one previously recorded Native American cultural resource is present within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site and no Native American cultural resources were observed during the pedestrian survey.

The proposed project would require ground disturbance that could have the potential to disturb previously unrecorded archaeological resources. Impacts could be potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. Implementation of the Mitigation Measure MM5.1 would avoid, reduce or minimize potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is vacant. There are no known human remains on-site and the presence of such remains is unlikely. However, ground disturbance would be required to construct the proposed project. If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the Los Angeles County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations during construction of the proposed project would reduce the potential impact to less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Mitigation Measure

MM5.1 Archaeological Resources. If significant subsurface prehistoric or historic archaeological or paleontological resources appear to be encountered during construction and/or earthmoving activities, the evaluation of any such resources shall proceed in accordance with the criteria outlined in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966, as amended), in accordance with CEQA guidelines (1970, as amended), and in accordance with the County of Los Angeles General Plan. Specifically, all work must be halted in the immediate vicinity of the cultural resource found until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the resource.

6. ENERGY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

The purpose of the Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31) is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact, or positive environmental impact, and encouraging sustainable construction practices in the following categories: planning and design, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material conservation and resource efficiency, and environmental air quality. As required of all development in the County, the proposed project would conform to applicable County of Los Angeles Title 31 Green Building Code standards. As stated in the *Project Description*, the project also includes green building techniques such as low flow faucets and showerheads, installation of LED light fixtures, and installation of water conserving landscaping. The proposed project would also be subject to the energy conservation requirements of the California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, *California’s Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings*), and the California Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations). The California Energy Code provides energy conservation standards for all new and renovated commercial and residential buildings constructed in California. The Code applies to the building envelope, space-conditioning systems, and water-heating and lighting systems of buildings and appliances.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see [Appendix F](#) of the CEQA Guidelines)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Code provides guidance on construction techniques to maximize energy conservation. Minimum efficiency standards are given for a variety of building elements, including appliances; water and space heating and cooling equipment; and insulation for doors, pipes, walls and ceilings. The Code emphasizes saving energy during peak periods and seasons, and improving the quality of installation of energy efficiency measures. The California Green Building Standards Code sets targets for energy efficiency; water consumption; dual plumbing systems for potable and recyclable water; diversion of construction waste from landfills, and use of environmentally sensitive materials in construction and design, including ecofriendly flooring, carpeting, paint, coatings, thermal insulation, and acoustical wall and ceiling panels. Adherence to Title 24 energy conservation requirements and the County’s green building standards would ensure that energy is not used in an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary manner.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

<p>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology’s Seismic Hazards Maps, although the project site is located in seismically active Southern California, it is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest active earthquake fault zone defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is the San Gabriel fault zone, which is located 3,000 feet northeast of the project site. A rupture of any of several faults in the area could be felt at the project site; however, no fault rupture at the site is expected.

<p>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact.

As with any new development in California, building design and construction for the project would be required to conform to the current seismic design provisions of the California Building Code (CBC). The 2013 CBC incorporates the latest seismic design standards for structural loads and materials, as well as provisions from the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, to mitigate losses from an earthquake and provide for the latest in earthquake safety. Therefore, the project would not cause or accelerate geologic hazards that would result in substantial damage to structures or infrastructure or expose people to substantial risk of injury impacts from strong seismic ground shaking. Impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant and no mitigation beyond implementation of CBC standards is required.

<p>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

Liquefaction occurs when the strength and stiffness of a soil is reduced by intense ground shaking typically associated with an earthquake in areas with a high groundwater table. According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology's Seismic Hazard Zone Map for the Val Verde Quadrangle (December 2002), the project site is located within a liquefaction zone. The Geotechnical Report prepared for the project site by Gold Coast Geoservices, Inc. in March 2016 indicates that, based on the analysis completed using the LiquefyPro model, there is a potential for liquefaction on the site. Impacts would be potentially significant and mitigation is required via implementation of the guidelines within the March 2016 report.

iv) Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to Geotechnical Report prepared by Gold Coast Geoservices, Inc., the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology's Seismic Hazard Zone Map for the Val Verde Quadrangle (December 2002), indicates that the project site is susceptible to earthquake-induced slope failures. The Geotechnical Report included a pseudo-static or seismic stability analysis for the natural hillside areas and for the proposed graded slope conditions, in order to determine the safety factors against seismically induced landslides. The report found that the project grading as proposed would eliminate the seismically-induced landslide hazard potential. Impacts related to landslides would therefore be less than significant.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Loose soils create conditions that can lead to erosion. The potential for erosion generally increases after soil has been disturbed by clearing and grading. As discussed in Section III, *Air Quality*, dust control measures would be implemented during construction as required by the SCAQMD Rule 403 to minimize fugitive dust emissions. Measures to minimize fugitive dust emissions include watering exposed surfaces and covering soil stockpiles. These measures are also effective for reducing soil erosion.

The proposed project would be required to comply with Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 issued by the LARWQCB. In accordance with this permit, the Applicant would prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the proposed project. The SWPPP would specify best management practices (BMPs) that would be implemented by the contractor during construction to minimize stormwater runoff and downstream impacts to water quality. BMPs include the use of hydroseeding, soil binders, silt fencing, and sandbag barriers.

The proposed project would also be required to comply with the water quality requirements of the current MS4 permit, which requires that the amount of runoff from the site must be the same before and after construction of a project. As discussed in the *Project Description*, the project would install desilting basins, concrete "V" swales, the onsite storm drain system, and water quality basins. These devices are discussed in detail in Section X, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, and in the Hydrology, SUSMP, and LID Report prepared by Civil Design and Drafting, Inc. Compliance with the MS4 permit would reduce on-site erosion from vegetated areas. As such, construction and operational impacts associated with sedimentation and erosion would be less than significant.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Subsidence is the sudden sinking or gradual downward settling of the earth's surface with little or no horizontal movement. Subsidence is caused by a variety of activities, which include, but are not limited to, withdrawal of groundwater, pumping of oil and gas from underground, the collapse of underground mines, liquefaction, and hydrocompaction. Ground subsidence and associated fissuring have occurred in different places in Los Angeles County, due to falling and rising groundwater tables. The proposed project is located in a liquefaction zone and the Geotechnical Report completed for the project found that the site could be subject to liquefaction; therefore the project could potentially be subject to significant subsidence-related impacts. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant with implementation of the report guidelines to reduce impacts from liquefaction risk to a less than significant level.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

According to the Geotechnical Report prepared by Gold Coast Geoservices, Inc., some of the bedrock soils of the Saugus Formation within the project site are potentially expansive. Compacted fill materials generated from the bedrock soils may also be potentially expansive. With implementation of standard design measures required in the CBC to address expansive soils and implementation of the required report guidelines, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact.

The proposed project would be required to connect to the existing sanitary sewer system. No onsite wastewater treatment systems would be required.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Los Angeles County Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) requires a conditional use permit in urban hillside management areas when properties contain any area with a natural slope of 25 percent or more and are proposed to be developed with residential uses at a density exceeding what is allowed in an adopted plan. The project site includes hillsides with natural slopes greater than 25 percent. Therefore, the project would be required to comply with the design and development guidelines included in the Hillside Management Area Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

Preparation of the site in accordance with the recommendations included in the project Geotechnical Report would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u>				

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 97, the Resources Agency adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions and analysis of the effects of GHG emissions. The adopted CEQA Guidelines provide regulatory guidance on the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions in CEQA documents, while giving lead agencies the discretion to set quantitative or qualitative thresholds for the assessment and mitigation of GHGs and climate change impacts. To date, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) have adopted significance thresholds for GHGs. The SCAQMD threshold, which was adopted in December 2008, considers emissions of over 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e)/year to be significant. However, the SCAQMD’s threshold applies only to stationary sources and is intended to apply only when the SCAQMD is the CEQA lead agency. Although not formally adopted, the SCAQMD has a recommended quantitative threshold for all land use types of 3,000 metric tons CDE/year (SCAQMD, September 2010).

The County of Los Angeles released its Final Community Climate Action Plan 2020 (CCAP) in August 2015. The Community Climate Action Plan 2020 set the County’s GHG emissions reduction target to at least 11% below 2010 levels by 2020. The majority of the CCAP’s actions to reduce emissions are voluntary, incentive-based programs. These include incentivizing solar installations and energy efficiency in new development and encouraging use of electric construction equipment and idling limits for heavy-duty construction equipment, where feasible. The CCAP does not include GHG emissions thresholds for development. Because no GHG emissions thresholds have been adopted in the County of Los Angeles, the proposed project is evaluated based on the SCAQMD’s recommended/preferred option threshold for all land use types of 3,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year (SCAQMD, “Proposed Tier 3 Quantitative Thresholds – Option 1”, September 2010).

Methodology

The analysis focuses on CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O because these make up 98.9% of all GHG emissions by volume (IPCC, 2007) and are the GHG emissions that the project would emit in the largest quantities. Fluorinated gases, such as HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆, were also considered for the analysis. However, emissions of fluorinated gases are primarily associated with industrial processes; because the project involves the development of single-family homes, the quantity of fluorinated gases would be minimal. Emissions of all GHGs are converted into their equivalent weight in CO₂ (CO₂e). Minimal amounts of other main GHGs (such as chlorofluorocarbons [CFCs]) would be emitted, and these other GHG emissions would not substantially add to the calculated CO₂e amounts. Calculations are based on the methodologies discussed in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) CEQA and Climate Change white paper (January 2008) and

included the use of the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) General Reporting Protocol (January 2009).

Construction Emissions

Construction of the proposed project would generate temporary GHG emissions, primarily due to the operation of construction equipment and truck trips. Emissions associated with the construction period were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) software, based on the projected maximum amount of equipment that would be used on-site at one time. Complete CalEEMod results and assumptions can be viewed in Appendix A.

Indirect Emissions

Operational emissions associated with energy use (electricity and natural gas use) were estimated using the CalEEMod model. The emission values on which the CalEEMod model are based include the California Energy Commission (CEC) sponsored California Commercial End Use Survey (CEUS) and Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS) studies. CalEEMod provides operational emissions of CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄. This methodology is considered reasonable and reliable for use, as it has been subjected to peer review by numerous public and private stakeholders, and in particular by the CEC. It is also recommended by CAPCOA (January 2008).

Emissions associated with area sources, including consumer products, landscape maintenance, and architectural coating were calculated in CalEEMod and utilize standard emission rates from California ARB, USEPA, and SCAQMD supplied emission factor values (SCAQMD, 2013).

Emissions from waste generation were also calculated in CalEEMod and are based on the IPCC's methods for quantifying GHG emissions from solid waste using the degradable organic content of waste (SCAQMD, 2013). Waste disposal rates by land use and overall composition of municipal solid waste in California was primarily based on data provided by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle).

Emissions from water and wastewater calculated in CalEEMod were based on the default electricity intensity from the CEC's 2006 Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California using the average values for Northern and Southern California.

Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion

Emissions of CO₂ and CH₄ from transportation sources for the project were quantified using CalEEMod. Because CalEEMod does not calculate N₂O emissions from mobile sources, N₂O emissions were quantified using the California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol (January 2009) direct emissions factors for mobile combustion. Total daily trips for the proposed project were based on the project traffic study prepared by Linscott Law & Greenspan, Engineers (October 2015) and were calculated and extrapolated to derive total annual mileage in CalEEMod. Emission rates for N₂O emissions were based on the vehicle mix output generated by CalEEMod and the emission factors found in the California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol.

One of the limitations to a quantitative analysis is that emission models such as CalEEMod evaluate aggregate emissions and do not demonstrate what proportion are "new" emissions, specifically attributable to the project in question. For most projects, the main contribution of GHG emissions is from motor vehicles and the total vehicle miles traveled (VMT), but the quantity of these emissions appropriately characterized as

“new” is uncertain. Traffic associated with a project may be relocated trips, and consequently, may result in either higher or lower net VMT. For the proposed project, it is likely that some of the GHG emissions associated with traffic and energy demand would be truly “new” emissions; however, most of the trips would be generated by staff and vendors already working in the area. Thus, although GHG emissions are associated with the project, it is not possible to discern how much diversion is occurring or what fraction of those emissions represents global increases. In the absence of information regarding the different types of trips (i.e., existing versus new), the VMT estimate generated by CalEEMod is used to provide a conservative estimate of the proposed project’s maximum annual emissions.

Construction Emissions

Based on CalEEMod results, construction activity for the project would generate an estimated 4,449 metric tons of CO₂e. The SCAQMD has recommended amortizing construction-related emissions over a 30-year period in conjunction with the proposed project’s operational emissions. Amortized over a 30-year period (the assumed life of the project), construction of the proposed project would generate approximately 148 metric tons of CO₂e per year.

Operational Indirect and Stationary Direct Emissions

Operational Emissions include area source, energy use, solid waste, water use, and transportation emissions. For the proposed project, the combined annual GHG emissions would total approximately 2,672 metric tons of CO₂e. The total amount of GHG emissions would be lower than the threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year. Thus, impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Senate Bill 375, signed in August 2008, requires the inclusion of sustainable communities’ strategies in regional transportation plans for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. In April 2012, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) adopted the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). SCAG’s RTP/SCS includes a commitment to reduce emissions from transportation sources by promoting compact and infill development and promoting alternative modes of transportation. A goal of the SCS is to “promote the development of better places to live and work through measures that encourage more compact development, varied housing options, bike and pedestrian improvements and efficient transportation infrastructure.”

The project includes a trail and a pedestrian walkway that would connect the existing development to the east with Castaic High School that is under construction. The project would encourage walkability in the area.

The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs and would be consistent with the objectives of the County of Los Angeles CCAP, RTP/SCS, AB 32, SB 97, and SB 375. Impacts would be less than significant.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would involve the construction of residential dwellings that typically do not use or store large quantities of hazardous materials. Potentially hazardous materials such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents would be used during construction of the project. However, the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction of the Project would be conducted in accordance with applicable state and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

Compliance with applicable laws and regulations during construction of the proposed project would reduce the potential impact associated with the routine transport, use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials to a less than significant level.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

Residences located east of the project site are the nearest sensitive land uses. No schools are located within 0.25 mile of the project site. Large quantities of hazardous materials would not be used on-site and the residences would not emit toxic air contaminants. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and,

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact.

Rincon Consultants, Inc. completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the project (Appendix E). The ESA found that the project site is not on any hazardous material site list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The following databases were checked for known hazardous materials contamination at the project site:

- GeoTracker (California State Water Resources Control Board): list of leaking underground storage tank sites
- EnviroStor (California Department of Toxic Substances Control): list of hazardous waste and substances sites
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) database
- Cortese list of Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites

The project site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. There are no listed sites within 1,000 feet of the project site. No impact would occur.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact.

The closest airport or airstrip to the project site is the Agua Dulce Airport. The project site is located approximately 18 miles east of the Agua Dulce Airport and is not within the airport influence area as defined by the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (2008). No impact would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact.

The project site is located approximately 18 miles east of the Agua Dulce Airport. No impact would occur.

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction activities may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic along Sloan Canyon Road; thus, the contractor would be required to implement traffic control measures to facilitate the passage of people and vehicles through/around any required lane closures, in accordance with County policy and permitting requirements. Project-specific measures would be developed as part of the pre-construction process and may include, but would not be limited to, use of flagmen, and coordination with Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) and County of Los Angeles Fire Department (LACoFD).

Access to the project site would be from Sloan Canyon Road on the south side of the site. During the operational phase of the project, on-site access would be required to comply with standards established by the County of Los Angeles Public Works Department. The size and location of fire suppression facilities (e.g., hydrants) and fire access routes would be required to conform to LACoFD standards. As required of all development in the County, the proposed project would conform to applicable County of Los Angeles Title 32 Fire Code standards. The submittal of plans would be subject to conditions of approval, which would be developed as part of the permitting process approved by the County in accordance with County standards. Proposed fire access driveways and Fire Department turnarounds for the project site were developed in consultation with LACoFD and comply with LACoFD standards. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and no mitigation is required. The project's potential impact to emergency response and evacuation routes would be less than significant.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) Zone 4 as designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire, 2007).

ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is adjacent to existing residential development and has adequate access.

iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would be required to comply with applicable County of Los Angeles Title 32 Fire Code standards pertaining to fire hazard severity zones, including submittal of an approved preliminary fuel modification plan, removal of all flammable vegetation or combustible growth within 30 feet of structures, confirmation of adequate fire-flow (no less than 2,000 gallons per minute), and installation of hydrants, if necessary (Section 4908 and Section 325.2.1, 903.2.11.7, 905.2.1.2 of the Fire Code). The submittal of such plans is a standard requirement and the project would be subject to conditions of

approval that would be developed as part of the permitting process approved by the County in accordance with County standards.

iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Adjacent land uses include residences and vacant land, which are not potentially dangerous fire hazards. With compliance with the above requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is a residential subdivision that would comply with applicable County of Los Angeles Title 32 Fire Code standards, as described above. The project would control flammable vegetation on the site and include installation of hydrants, as necessary. The proposed use does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. Impacts would be less than significant.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is within the region covered by the Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 issued by the LARWQCB. This permit governs non-point source discharges associated with storm water runoff. Regulations under the federal Clean Water Act require compliance with the NPDES storm water permit for projects disturbing more than one acre during construction. Per State regulations, the applicant would be required to file a Notice of Intent with the LARWQCB and prepare a SWPPP. The SWPPP would require the use of BMPs (such as gravel bags, silt fences, hay bales, check dams, hydro seed, mulch, and soil binders) during construction, which would prevent excessive storm water runoff pollution. The SWPPP must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

Potable water for the proposed development would be supplied by the Newhall County Water District (NCWD). Further analysis of water supplies that would serve the development on the project site is provided in Section XVIII, *Utilities and Service Systems*, of this Initial Study. The project site is currently bare ground with no pavement. The project would increase the amount of impervious surface on the project site; however, the project would be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Areawide MS4 permit, which compels that the amount of runoff from the site must be the same before and after construction. The technical reports completed for the project confirms that with incorporation of the proposed drainage system (including desilting basins, concrete “V” swales, the onsite storm drain system, and water quality basins), runoff would be equal or less than existing levels. Therefore the project would not interfere with groundwater recharge. Impacts associated with this issue would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river,

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not alter any watershed boundaries, impact a stream course or increase the quantity of water, erosion, or siltation in a stream or river. The project site currently drains through natural drainages. The project would be required to implement a drainage system that would ensure that any runoff would remain on site. The drainage system would include a series of desilting basins that would treat silt from offsite drainage courses, and would then feed into a storm drain system and connect to the main storm drain system in Sloan Canyon Road.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Onsite stormwater would also be collected and treated for water quality and then discharged back to the main storm drain system. Thus, while the project would add impervious surface to the site, it would not substantially affect runoff volumes or patterns on the site. In addition, as discussed above, LACFCD does not permit any increase in receiving water peak flows as a result of the project development, and the project would be required to comply with this restriction. As such, the project would not alter drainage patterns in a manner that would cause flooding, erosion, or siltation. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as the West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would include desilting and stormwater collection basins. However, the intention of these basins is to collect stormwater and allow it to percolate through the soil and into the underground stormdrain system. Any water in the basins would be temporary. Any pools proposed on residential lots would include a recirculating system and would not increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases, such as the West Nile virus, and thus would not result in increased pesticide use. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project developer would also be required to comply with the MS4 permit and Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance requirements, which requires the integration of post-construction BMPs into the site's overall drainage system, which would further reduce the potential for pollutants to enter the storm drain system. In addition, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) does not permit any increase in receiving water peak flows as a result of project development.

The project would be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Areawide MS4 permit, which requires that the amount of runoff from the site must be the same before and after construction of a project. Site drainage systems would be designed, installed, and maintained per County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works requirements.

g) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Per State regulations, the applicant would be required to file a Notice of Intent with the LARWQCB and prepare a SWPPP. The SWPPP would require the use of BMPs (such as gravel bags, silt fences, hay bales, check dams, hydro seed, mulch, and soil binders) during construction, which would prevent excessive storm water runoff pollution. The SWPPP must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit.

h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Los Angeles County LID Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52) requires that a project retain 100% of the Stormwater Quality Design Volume¹ on-site, through infiltration, evapotranspiration, rainfall harvest and use, or a combination. The project would be required to comply with the Ordinance and include source control measures described in the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Low Impact Development Standards Manual (February 2014). Structural source control measures that the project would be required to employ include storm drain messaging and signage, an outdoor trash storage and waste handling area, effective landscape irrigation practices, and building materials selection. Effective landscape irrigation practices include not allowing irrigation runoff from landscaped areas to drain directly to storm drain systems, minimizing the use of fertilizer and pesticides, designing the irrigation system

¹ "Stormwater Quality Design Volume" means the runoff generated by a water quality design storm event. "Water Quality Design Storm Event" means any of the volumetric or flow rate based design storm events for water quality Best Management Practices identified in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Municipal Stormwater Permit for the County of Los Angeles.

to only water areas that need water, and more. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the Los Angeles County LID Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

i) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Areawide MS4 permit, which requires that the amount of peak runoff from the site must be the same before and after construction of a project, and the Los Angeles County LID Ordinance, which requires that a project retain 100% of the Stormwater Quality Design Volume on-site, through infiltration, evapotranspiration, rainfall harvest and/or use. Thus, the project would not result in point or non-point source pollutant discharges into a State Water Resources Control Board-designated Area of Special Biological Significance. Impacts would be less than significant.

j) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

No Impact.

The project would be required to connect to the existing sanitary sewer system. No onsite wastewater treatment systems would be required.

k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Because the project would be required to include site drainage systems according to standards and provisions set forth by the County of Los Angeles, impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

l) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located in Zones D and X, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), Panel #06037C0800F. Zone X is outside the 500- and 100-year flood zone. Zone D is for areas where there are possible but undetermined flood hazards, as no analysis of flood hazards has been conducted.

m) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No structures are proposed to be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain.

n) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Hydrology, SUSMP, and LID Report completed for the project analyze flood conditions under a potential two year, five year, 10 year, 25 year, 50 year, and 24-hour storm event. The report found that the proposed drainage system, including desilting basins, concrete “V” swales, the onsite storm drain system, and water quality basins, would be sufficient to handle runoff flows resulting from these storms. The project would not affect flood patterns and would not put people or structures at risk from flooding.

o) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact.

A tsunami is a tidal wave produced by off-shore seismic activity; seiches are seismically-induced waves that occur in large bodies of water, such as lakes. The site is over 40 miles from the coast. Additionally, according to the California Department of Conservation, the project site is not located within a tsunami hazard zone (2012). Because the project site is not in proximity to a large body of water, seiches are not a significant concern. Therefore, no impact related to these hazards would occur.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact.

The project would be located on a vacant site adjacent to residential development and vacant land. The project does not include any features that would physically divide the adjacent community, such as construction of a new road, flood control channel, or other structure. The project involves the construction of a single family residential development. The site does not separate complementary uses, nor is it used as a point of ingress/egress for the existing neighborhood. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact.

The project site is currently designated Rural, Rural Land 1 (1 dwelling unit / 1 acre) (RL1), Rural Land 2 (1 dwelling unit / 2 acre) (RL2), and Rural Land 5 (1 dwelling unit/5 acres) (RL5) in the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (also called One Valley One Vision) and zoned Heavy Agriculture (A-2-1 and A-2-2). The Applicant is seeking a zone change from A-2-2 and A-2-1 to RPD (Residential Planned Development). Properties in the RPD zone may be used for any use permitted in the Single Family Residence (R-1) zone. The purpose of the RPD zone is to promote residential amenities beyond those expected under conventional development, achieve greater flexibility in design, encourage well-planned neighborhoods through creative and imaginative planning as a unit, and provide for appropriate use of land that is sufficiently unique in its physical characteristics or other circumstances to warrant special methods of development.

c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No Impact.

The proposed RPD zone requires at least 30 percent of the site be dedicated open space. Hillside management design guidelines required at least 70 percent open space. The project proposal includes approximately 75 percent open space which is achieved by clustering the residences in the valley areas and along Sloan Canyon Road. In addition to the zone change, the project is seeking approval of a vesting tract map, a ridgeline variance, a grading conditional use permit, and an Oak Tree Permit.

For land divisions requests containing more than 50 lots, the Castaic Area CSD requires, to the greatest extent possible, a neighborhood park sufficient to provide that 90 percent of all residential lots within the land division are within one-half mile of a minimum two acre park. No park is proposed and an existing park is located within one mile of the project site.

With approval of the requested zone change and additional entitlements, the project would be consistent with the general plan and zoning designations for the site and no impact would occur.

d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is not located within a Significant Ecological Area or an area that is subject to an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community plan, or similar plan (Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, GIS-NET3; Los Angeles County, GIS Data Portal). The project is located within a Hillside Management Area. Any plans submitted for the project would be reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.217; refer to Section VII, *Geology and Soils*). Approval of proposed plans require codified best management practices and compliance with development standards and guidelines.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact.

Figure CO-2, Mineral Resources, on page 275 of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (2012) identifies no mineral resources worthy of preservation on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, no impact to mineral resources would occur as a result of the project.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact.

Figure CO-2, Mineral Resources, on page 275 of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (2012) identifies no mineral resources worthy of preservation on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, no impact to mineral resources would occur as a result of the project.

13. NOISE

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>		
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08 sets exterior noise standards, interior noise standards, and restrictions on mobile and stationary construction equipment. Exterior noise standards for non-transportation sources of noise range from 45 dBA Leq [30] (i.e. 45 dBA may not be exceeded for more than a total of 30 minutes in any hour) to 65 dBA Lmax (i.e. 65 dBA may not be exceeded for any period of time) at nighttime and 50 dBA Leq [30] to 70 dBA Lmax during the day for residential receptors. Section 12.07.11.2 of the Los Angeles County Code states that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 dBA in any habitable rooms (Ldn or CNEL). Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440 prohibits construction between the hours of 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM of any day, and any time on Sundays or holidays, if it will create a noise disturbance across a residential or commercial property line. Maximum daytime noise levels for mobile construction equipment is restricted to 75 dBA at residential receptors, while maximum daytime noise levels for stationary construction equipment is restricted to 60 dBA at residential receptors. Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440 also requires that all mobile or stationary internal-combustion-engine powered equipment or machinery be equipped with suitable exhaust and air-intake silencers.

Mitigation Measures

N-1 Construction Equipment. If electrical service is available within 150 feet, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools. Internal combustion engines shall be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. No internal combustion engine shall be operated on the project site without the manufacturer-recommended muffler. All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers. Mufflers generally provide at least a 5 dBA insertion loss.

All stationary equipment shall be placed at least 175 feet from nearby residential receptors. For all mobile construction equipment operating within 70 feet of nearby residential receptors and for all stationary construction equipment operating 175 feet from nearby residences, additional noise attenuation techniques shall be employed to ensure that noise remains within levels allowed by the County of Los Angeles noise standards. Such techniques may include, but are not limited to, the use of sound blankets on noise generating equipment and the construction of temporary sound barriers between construction sites and affected uses. Temporary noise barriers used during construction activity shall be made of noise-resistant material sufficient to achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of STC 25 or greater. Such a barrier may provide as much as a 10 dBA insertion loss, provided that it is positioned as close as possible to the noise source or to the

receptors. To be effective, the barrier must be long and tall enough to completely block the line-of-sight between the noise source and the receptors. The gaps between adjacent panels must be filled-in to avoid having noise penetrate directly through the barrier.

N-2 Neighbor Notification. The Applicant shall notify residential occupants adjacent to the project site at least 24 hours prior to initiation of construction activities that could significantly affect outdoor or indoor living areas. This notification shall include the anticipated hours and duration of construction and a description of noise reduction measures. The notification shall include a telephone number for local residents to call to submit complaints associated with construction noise. The notification shall be posted on Sloan Canyon Road adjacent to the project site and shall be easily viewed from adjacent public areas.

Implementation of mitigation measures N-1 and N-2 would reduce, avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts to sensitive receptors.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Vibration is a unique form of noise because its energy is carried through buildings, structures, and the ground, whereas noise is simply carried through the air. Thus, vibration is generally felt rather than heard. The ground motion caused by vibration is measured as particle velocity in inches per second and is referenced as vibration decibels (VdB) in the U.S. Los Angeles County has not adopted any thresholds or regulations addressing vibration.

The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. The vibration thresholds established by the FHWA are 65 VdB for buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operations (such as hospitals and recording studios), 72 VdB for residences and buildings where people normally sleep, including hotels, and 75 VdB for institutional land uses with primary daytime use (such as churches and schools). The threshold for the proposed project is 72 VdB for residences during hours when people normally sleep, as these are the only sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. In terms of ground-borne vibration impacts to structures, ground-borne vibration levels in excess of 100 VdB would damage fragile buildings and levels in excess of 95 VdB would damage extremely fragile historic buildings.

Operation of the proposed project would not perceptibly increase groundborne vibration or groundborne noise on the project site above existing conditions, due to the proposed residential nature of the proposed project. Construction of the proposed project could potentially increase groundborne vibration on and near the project site, but construction effects would be temporary. The sensitive receptor nearest to the project site is a residence located 70 feet east of the eastern project site boundary. Based on the information presented in Table 14, during construction, these residences would be exposed to maximum vibration levels of up to about 77 VdB.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would generate vehicle trips to and from the site, which would generate noise. Project traffic would predominately be distributed to Sloan Canyon Road and Parker Road. Hourly exterior noise levels at existing sensitive receptors closest to Sloan Canyon Road and Parker Road were modeled using the FHWA's Traffic Noise Model (TNM), version 2.5. The location of noise measurement locations and sensitive receptors are shown on Figure 5. TNM 2.5 calculates the average noise level at specific locations based on traffic volumes, average speeds, roadway geometry, and site environmental conditions. Traffic volumes for peak hours (7 AM to 9 PM and 4 PM to 6 PM) were derived from the prepared traffic impact analysis with the following scenarios modeled:

- Existing traffic volumes;
- Existing plus project traffic volumes;
- Future cumulative traffic volumes;
- Future cumulative plus project traffic volumes;

Traffic associated with the proposed project would increase noise levels by an estimated 0.5 to 0.7 dBA under existing plus project conditions and would increase levels by an estimated 0.4 to 0.6 dBA under cumulative plus project conditions. The project would not increase roadway noise by 1 dBA; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.

Operational Noise

Operation of the project may result in noise generated from trash trucks and HVAC equipment, but trash trucks would operate only periodically while HVAC systems would be required to comply with applicable noise restrictions of the Los Angeles County Code, as described above. Noise from these onsite sources would not create substantial increases in noise. Therefore, the project would not generate a permanent significant increase in noise.

The project site is in a rural area and the ambient noise level on the project was measured at less than 42 dBA. Based on this ambient noise condition, the proposed residences would not be exposed to interior or exterior noise levels in excess of standards established in the Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08. Impacts would be less than significant.

Construction Noise

Temporary noise impacts associated with construction could intermittently generate high noise levels on and adjacent to the project site, which may temporarily affect nearby residences. The main sources of noise during construction activities would be heavy machinery used in grading. Typical peak noise levels accompanying various types of heavy construction equipment associated with the use of individual pieces of stationary heavy equipment can range from about 67 to 82 dBA at 70 feet from the source and mobile heavy equipment can range from about 71 to 86 dBA at 70 feet. Peak noise levels associated with construction would potentially

expose the nearby residence (adjacent to the project site boundary) to noise levels that exceed the County's standard for mobile construction equipment (75 dBA) and for stationary construction equipment (60 dBA).

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact.

The airport nearest to the project site is Agua Dulce Airport in Santa Clarita, nearly 18 miles east of the project site. Therefore, the project would not expose future residents to significant levels of aircraft noise.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact.

The airport nearest to the project site is Agua Dulce Airport in Santa Clarita, nearly 18 miles east of the project site. Therefore, the project would not expose future residents to significant levels of aircraft noise.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would include 139 residential lots. Three residences currently exist within the project site. The Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan reported 3.09 persons per household in the plan area in 2010. According to data provided by the California Department of Finance (DOF), the current number of persons per household in the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County is 3.51. To provide a more conservative estimate, it is assumed that the residential lots would generate the more recent estimate of 3.51 persons per residential lot. Based on this average, the project would add approximately 477 new residents for a total population of 1,052,349 in the unincorporated area of the County.² Therefore, development of the project would not add population beyond that anticipated in SCAG's 2020 (1,159,100 persons) or 2035 (1,399,500 persons) growth forecast.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site currently includes three residences and are not known to be part of affordable housing stock.

The project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would displace two of these residences due to construction of the project; however, they would be replaced by the 139 residences for a net increase of 137 residences.

² 139 proposed residential lots minus three existing residences equals 136 residential lots. 136 residential lots multiplied by 3.51 persons per household equals 477 persons.

d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The addition of 477 new residents to the unincorporated area of the County would equal 0.4% of the total projected cumulative population growth through 2020.

The level of population growth associated with the project was anticipated in SCAG's long-term population forecasts and would not cumulatively exceed official regional population projections. Impacts would be less than significant.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>	<i>Potentially Significant</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>
	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?
Less Than Significant Impact.

The One Valley One Vision Final Program EIR for the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan describes the fire protection services within the Plan Area (2012). Fire protection within the Santa Clarita Valley is supplied by LACoFD with six stations currently located in the County’s Planning Area. The closest station to the site is Station 149, located at 31770 Ridge Route Road in Castaic, approximately 1.5 miles to the east. The project would not extend service to an area without service, as existing residences on the project site are currently being served by LACoFD. The LACoFD has several standards to maintain to adequately meet the fire protection needs of the residents of the Plan Area. The current standards for response times are five minutes or less for urban areas, eight minutes or less for suburban areas, and 12 minutes or less for rural areas. The 2008 median response time for the Plan Area was five minutes and 42 seconds. The project would not require new or expanded Fire Department facilities or personnel to serve the area (L. Bagwell, personal communication, March 24, 2016). Nonetheless, the applicant would be responsible for paying all impact fees associated with the project, such as a fire protection facilities mitigation fee, which in part are intended to ensure adequate funding is available for personnel and equipment needed to provide proper service (Los Angeles County Code Chapter 22.74). Impacts would be less than significant.

Sheriff protection?
Less Than Significant Impact.

The One Valley One Vision Final Program EIR for the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan describes the police protection services within the Plan Area (2012). Law enforcement in the Plan Area is served by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department with the California Highway Patrol maintaining jurisdiction over the state highways. The Sheriff’s Department, which operates one station in Valencia and a storefront station in Newhall, has a standard of one officer per 1,000 residents to maintain effective police protection. The Newhall storefront station is approximately six miles south of the project site at 28648 The Old Road in Valencia. The Santa Clarita Valley Sherriff Station is approximately seven miles south of the project site at 23740 W. Magic Mountain Parkway in Valencia. The stations’ service area includes 22 cities and unincorporated areas, including Castaic, City of Santa Clarita, Valencia, and Westridge. The project would not extend service to an area without service, as existing residences on the project site are currently being served by the Los Angeles County Sherriff’s Department. In 2012, the number of sworn officers within the County’s Planning Area was 171, which provides one officer per 439 residents (within a total service population of approximately 75,069).

As discussed in *Population/Housing*, the project would add approximately 477 new residents to the service area, which would increase the existing service population by 0.6 percent and incrementally change the existing service ratio to one officer per 442 residents. The project would not require new or expanded Sherriff Department facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives because the project would increase the service population by 0.6 percent and the existing residences on the site are already served by Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department. Nonetheless, the applicant would be responsible for paying all impact fees associated with the project, such as a law enforcement facilities mitigation fee, which in part are intended to ensure adequate funding is available for personnel and equipment needed to provide proper service (Los Angeles County Code Chapter 22.74). Impacts would be less than significant.

Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Castaic Union School District provides primary education services to the project site. Castaic Union School District includes Castaic Elementary School, Live Oak Elementary, Northlake Hills Elementary, and Castaic Middle School. Elementary school students would attend Live Oak Elementary and middle school students would attend Castaic Middle. Castaic High School is currently under construction and is expected to open in Fall 2018. Until Castaic High School opens, Valencia High School in the William S. Hart School District accommodates high school students in the Castaic Union School District area. Castaic High School is planned to open prior to completion of the proposed project. The project would increase school enrollment and could result in exceedances of capacity at local schools. Table 15 shows the enrollment at the elementary and middle schools for the 2014-2015 school year and the number of students expected to be generated by the project. As shown in Table 15, students from the project would represent approximately five percent of the enrollment at the Live Oak Elementary and Castaic Middles combined.

As of January 1987, State law allows school districts to levy three different levels of development fees directly on new residential, commercial, and industrial development (Government Code Section 65995). Districts set their own fees within this limit based on a nexus study establishing their funding requirements. Since Proposition 1A was passed by the voters and Government Code Section 65995(h) was adopted by the State Legislature in 1996, school fees generated by new development are deemed legally-sufficient mitigation of any impacts based on generation of students on school facilities. Thus, the project would not require new or expanded schools to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. Impacts would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The One Valley One Vision Final Program EIR for the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan describes recreational facilities within the Plan Area (2012). The Plan Area currently has 1,355 acres of parkland through a combination of neighborhood, community, and regional parks. Additionally, the Plan Area has 6,395 acres of open space. The One Valley One Vision Final Program EIR found that the amount of parkland would total 6.39 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents at buildout of the Plan Area. The project would incrementally increase demand on local and regional parks. The Los Angeles County Code requires the subdivider of a residential subdivision to provide local park space to serve the subdivision, pay a fee in lieu of the provision of such park land in accordance with the provisions of County Code Section 21.28.140, provide local park space containing less than the required obligation but developed with amenities equal in value to the park fee, or do a combination of the above. Because the project is a residential subdivision, the applicant would be required to adhere to this provision.

Libraries?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The One Valley One Vision Final Program EIR for the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan describes library services within the Plan Area (2012). The County of Los Angeles Public Library system’s service level guidelines consist of 2.75 items per 1,000 residents and 0.5 square foot per 1,000 residents. As of 2012, there were 595,314 available library items and 48,605 square feet of library space for the five libraries located within the Plan Area. Based on the service level guidelines, in 2012 there was a surplus of 389,064 library items and a surplus of 11,105 square feet of library space. The Castaic Library was renovated and expanded in 2015. The project would incrementally increase demand for library services. Based on the surplus that existed in 2012 and the expanded library facilities in Castaic, it is not expected that the project would cause library services to decrease below service level guidelines. The applicant would be responsible for paying all impact fees associated with the project, such as a library facilities mitigation fee, which in part are intended to ensure adequate funding is available for personnel, materials and equipment needed to provide proper service (Los Angeles County Code Chapter 22.72). However, additional library facilities would not be needed. Impacts would be less than significant.

Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impacts to other public facilities (e.g., sewer, storm drains, and roadways) are discussed in Section XVII, *Transportation/Traffic*, and Section XVIII, *Utilities and Public Services*, of this Initial Study.

16. RECREATION

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) **Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would include 141 acres of open space for recreation, including two private recreation parks totaling approximately one acre, and a multi-use trail for hiking, equestrian and mountain biking uses, adjacent to Sloan Canyon Road.

The currently existing neighborhood park would be impacted by the additional residents of the 137 new single-family residence lots in addition to being used by the current residents. With payment of in-lieu fees, impacts would be less than significant.

b) **Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would incrementally increase demand on local and regional parks. As discussed above, in accordance with Los Angeles County Code, the project would include 141 acres of open space, including a multi-use trail for hiking, equestrian and mountain biking uses, adjacent to Sloan Canyon Road. The project's open space area would include undisturbed natural areas, open space for private, passive recreation, and secondary open space including graded slopes restored to natural vegetation communities, and would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The open space area would preserve natural areas on the project site and would not adversely affect the environment. Development of multi-use trails for hiking, equestrian and mountain biking uses would be within the disturbance area of improving Sloan Canyon Road and would not create additional adverse physical effects on the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) **Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

Exhibit CO-8, Recreation and Open Space, on page 281 of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan does not identify recreational or open space on the project site. Wilson Canyon Ranch is a 240-acre open space area north of

the project site. The project would include open space immediately adjacent to Wilson Canyon Ranch and concentrate residential development along the southern boundary of the project site, adjacent to existing residential development. Impacts would be less than significant.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>Would the project:</p> <p>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Linscott Law & Greenspan, Engineers prepared a traffic impact study (TIS) for the proposed project (October 2015). The trip generation assessment was developed utilizing trip generation rates and equations from *Trip Generation, 9th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012). The proposed project would generate approximately 1,323 daily vehicle trips.

According to the TIS, the traffic generated by the project will have a significant transportation impact to the Interstate 5 Freeway Southbound on-ramp at Parker Road intersection based on the County's Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines.

Mitigation Measure

MM17.1 Interstate 5 Freeway Southbound On-Ramp at Parker Road. West Approach Mitigation: Widen roadway to add one eastbound exclusive right-turn lane. The project shall be responsible for one of the following:

1. Enter into an agreement with the Caltrans for the sole implementation of the intersection improvements prior to final map recordation or on a date acceptable to Caltrans. Detailed signing and striping plans for the improvements shall be approved by Public Works prior to final map clearance.
2. Provide a letter from Caltrans that the total mitigation for this intersection has been satisfied prior to final map recordation.

<p>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) is a state-mandated program that was enacted by the California State Legislature with the passage of Proposition 111 in 1990. The program is intended to address the impact of local growth on the regional transportation system. As required by the 2010 CMP for Los Angeles County, potential impacts to designated monitoring locations on the CMP highway system were analyzed. The analysis was prepared in accordance with procedures outlined in the 2010 CMP (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 2010).

The CMP Traffic Impact Assessment guidelines require that intersection monitoring locations must be examined if the proposed project will add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours. The proposed project would not add 50 or more trips during the AM or PM peak hours to any intersections.

According to the TIS, the cumulative traffic generated by the project and other related projects will have a significant transportation impact at the two intersections listed below based on the County's Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines:

- Interstate 5 Freeway Southbound on-ramp at Parker Road
- Interstate 5 Freeway Northbound off-ramp at Parker Road/Ridge Route Road

Mitigation Measures

MM17.2 Interstate 5 Freeway Southbound On-Ramp at Parker Road.

Construct Interstate 5 Freeway Southbound on-ramp at Parker Road to the planned buildout as described in the Castaic Bridge and Major Thoroughfare District.

The project shall be responsible for one of the following:

1. Enter into an agreement with the Caltrans for the sole implementation of the intersection improvements prior to final map recordation or on a date acceptable to Caltrans. Detailed traffic signal plans and signing and striping plans for the improvements shall be approved by Public Works prior to final map clearance.
2. Provide a letter from Caltrans that the total mitigation for this intersection has been satisfied prior to final map recordation.

MM17.3 Interstate 5 Freeway Southbound On-Ramp at Parker Road.

Construct Interstate 5 Freeway Northbound off-ramp at Parker Road/Ridge Route Road to the planned buildout as described in the Castaic Bridge and Major Thoroughfare District.

The project shall be responsible for one of the following:

1. Enter into an agreement with the Caltrans for the sole implementation of the intersection improvements prior to final map recordation or on a date acceptable to Caltrans. Detailed traffic signal plans and signing and striping plans for the improvements shall be approved by Public Works prior to final map clearance.
2. Provide a letter from Caltrans that the total mitigation for this intersection has been satisfied prior to final map recordation.

MM17.4 Site Access Requirements.

The following on-site intersections shall provide stop controls on the following minor side streets:

- Sloan Canyon Road at Oak Horn Avenue
- Sloan Canyon Road at “A” Street
- Sloan Canyon Road at “B” Court

MM17.5 Monitoring and Collecting Traffic Information.

The project shall be solely responsible for monitoring and collecting traffic data for a period of five years after project build-out for the two intersections below:

- Interstate 5 Freeway Southbound on-ramp at Parker Road
- Interstate 5 Freeway Northbound off-ramp at Parker Road/Ridge Route Road

Additionally, the project shall submit a report containing the traffic count data and traffic signal warrant analyses prepared in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices every years for five years to Public Works for review and approval.

MM17.6 Consult with other jurisdictions.

The applicant shall consult with the City of Santa Clarita and Caltrans to obtain concurrence with any potential California Environmental Quality Act impacts within its jurisdiction prior to final map recordation to the satisfaction of County Public Works.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact.

The project site is located approximately 18 miles from the nearest airport (Agua Dulce Airport), the project would not present any impediments to air traffic, and would not affect air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not introduce any design features such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses to the project site or surrounding road network that would increase hazards. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not affect emergency access. Ingress/egress would be provided by Sloan Canyon Road and site circulation would be designed to meet the County of Los Angeles Fire Department requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact.

As required by the 2010 CMP, Linscott Law & Greenspan, Engineers reviewed potential impacts of the project on transit service in the traffic impact study (October 2015). The project site is served by the City of Santa Clarita Transit, Route 1. The nearest bus stop is 0.5 mile away at the intersection of Parker Road and Sloan Canyon Road.

The project trip generation was adjusted by values set forth in the CMP (i.e., person trips equal 1.4 times vehicle trips, and transit trips equal 3.5% of the total person trips) to estimate transit trip generation. Pursuant to the CMP guidelines, the proposed project is forecast to generate demand for 6 transit trips during the AM peak hour and 7 transit trips during the PM peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, the proposed project is forecast to generate demand for 65 daily transit trips.

As described above, one bus transit lines and routes are provided adjacent to or in close proximity to the project site. The current service provides two buses per hour (one eastbound and one westbound) during the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, based on the above calculated AM and PM peak hour trips, this would correspond to three additional transit riders per bus. It is anticipated that the existing transit service in the project area will adequately accommodate the increase of project-generated transit trips. Given the number of project generated transit trips per bus, no project impacts on existing or future transit services in the project area are expected to occur as a result of the project. The project would not affect or conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. The project would have a less than significant impact with respect to alternative transportation.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>		
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site was not found to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources. As discussed above, no cultural resources are known to be present on-site and project has the potential to disturb undiscovered resources during grading. A mitigation measure has been recommended to avoid potentially significant adverse environmental impacts. The project would not cause a substantial change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that has been made known to staff.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Less Than Significant Impact.

The closest Native American cultural resource is present within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. No Native American cultural resources were observed during the pedestrian survey. No resources have been identified or shown to be significant.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would require connection to existing sewer infrastructure and would result in an increase in the amount of wastewater produced on the site. Wastewater from the project site would be conveyed by the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District (District). The District operates two water reclamation plants (WRPs), the Saugus WRP and the Valencia WRP which provide wastewater treatment in the Santa Clarita Valley. These facilities have a combined design capacity of 28.1 million gallons per day (mgd) and currently process an average flow of 19.1 mgd. Based upon the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County's published wastewater generation rates, each residence would generate approximately 260 gallons of wastewater per day. Therefore, the 139 proposed residences would generate a total of 36,140 gallons of wastewater per day. This is 0.4% of the remaining capacity of two WRPs. Thus, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements, exceed the capacity of the local wastewater system, or require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities.

b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

Civil Design and Drafting, Inc. prepared a sewer study for the project in January 2016. The study analyzed the capacity of sanitary sewer lines from the project site to the main trunk line using the LADPW Sewer Manual S-C4 chart. Maximum density capacity for sewer lines is 50% full. The cumulative flow from the proposed project and existing land uses would exceed capacity for some of the specific sewer segments. These segments would be required to be upgraded to handle the flow that would result from the cumulative scenario. Therefore, implementation of the required improvement will make the project impact less than significant.

c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact.

As discussed above, the project site currently mostly consists of pervious surfaces. The project would increase the amount of impervious surface on the site. Stormwater drainage in the County is provided by a network of regional drainage channels and local drainage facilities. Surface water is deposited into regional channels, which are owned and maintained by the County. The proposed project would be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Areawide MS4 permit, which requires that the amount of runoff from the site must be the same before and after construction of a project, and the Los Angeles County LID Ordinance, which requires that a project retain 100% of the Stormwater Quality Design Volume on-site, through infiltration, evapotranspiration, rainfall harvest and/or use. The project would install desilting basins, concrete “V” swales, the onsite storm drain system, and water quality basins to accommodate project site drainage.

Thus, the proposed project would not increase runoff into the storm drain system. The on-site storm drain system would be designed, installed, and maintained per County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works standards. Because the project would be required to include site drainage systems according to standards and provisions set forth by the County of Los Angeles, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Newhall County Water District and Los Angeles County Waterworks District 36 would provide water services to the project site. The four retail water purveyors in the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) (Santa Clarita Water Division of CLWA, Newhall County Water District, Valencia Water Company, and Los Angeles County Waterworks District 36) prepare a joint Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). According to the CLWA’s 2015 UWMP, overall service area demand for 2010 was 69,973 acre-feet. This is projected to increase by 43,752 acre-feet (or 63%) to 113,725 acre-feet in 2035 (without conservation). This increase in demand is calculated based on projected increases in population for the service area. Water demand associated with the project would be approximately 0.04% of the water demand forecast within the service area. Adequate water supplies and network capacity are identified in the CLWA to meet future demand. The proposed project is not expected to require new sources of water supply.

In response to statewide drought conditions, the CLWA and associated retail purveyors have adopted water conservation measures, which would be incorporated into the proposed project (CLWA, 2011). These include requirements for irrigation practices (such as daytime hour restrictions) and for fountains (recirculating systems required). With implementation of these and other water conservation practices as necessary, it is anticipated that water supplies would continue to be adequate to serve the project.

e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Southern California Edison (SCE) would provide electricity services to the project site. SCE provides 14 million people with electricity across a service territory of approximately 50,000 square miles (SCE website, N.D.). The proposed project would add approximately 477 residents to SCE's service area; this would increase SCE's service population by less than 0.00002%. Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) would provide natural gas services to the project site. SoCalGas provides natural gas to 20.9 million people across a service territory of approximately 20,000 square miles (SoCalGas website, N.D.). The proposed project would increase SoCalGas' service population by less than 0.00002%. The proposed project would not create energy utility system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. In addition, the proposed project would be designed with energy efficient construction materials and appliances, energy-efficient LED lighting will used throughout the proposed development, as well as water conserving low flow toilet fixtures, Energy Star appliances, and charging stations for electric vehicles in order to further reduce energy consumption. This would be less a less than significant impact.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located approximately four miles from the Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill. The Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of 6,000 tons per day and average daily peak disposal tonnage, as of February 2016, is 3,400 tons per day (Los Angeles County, 2012; CalRecycle, 2016); therefore, the landfill has an average 2,600 tons per day available daily capacity. Solid waste generation for the project was estimated based on the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide's solid waste generation rate (2006) of 12.23 pounds per day of solid waste per residence. Based on this rate, the proposed 139 residences would generate a total of about 1,700 pounds of solid waste per day. This is 28% of the daily capacity at the Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill. In addition, the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) mandated that local jurisdictions meet a solid waste diversion goal of 50% by 2000. In 2011, unincorporated Los Angeles County met the 50% diversion goal by not exceeding its per capita disposal rate targets of 7.4 pounds per person per day (ppd) based on population size and 41.5 ppd based on annual average number of employees by jurisdiction (2012 and 2013 diversion progress reports are currently being reviewed for unincorporated Los Angeles County). In 2011, unincorporated Los Angeles County's per capita disposal rate was 4.6 ppd based on population and 27.9 ppd based on employees. Therefore, the estimate of 1,700 pounds, or 0.85 tons, per day is a conservative estimate and the actual disposal amount would likely be lower. The project would account for approximately 0.3 percent of the landfill's available daily capacity (2,600 tons per day). Development of the proposed project would not significantly affect current operations or the expected lifetime of this landfill.

On-site uses would be required to comply with the County and State waste reduction and recycling standards. For these reasons, potential impacts associated with landfill capacity would be reduced to a less than significant level and no mitigation is required. Therefore, potential impacts to landfill capacity would be less than significant.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The County, applicant and project contractor would comply with all local, state, and federal requirements for integrated waste management (e.g., recycling, green waste) and solid waste disposal as required by the California Integrated Waste Management Act (CIWMA) of 1989. This would be a less than significant impact.

20. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

The project would have a potentially significant impact to rare plants, nesting birds, oak woodlands and individual oak trees, and wetland features. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-6 would reduce potential impacts to rare plants, nesting bird species, protected oak woodlands and individual oak trees, and wetland features to a less than significant level.

Although no archaeological resources are known to be present on-site, project construction has the potential to disturb undiscovered archaeological resources during grading. However, impacts would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure MM5.1. Consequently, impacts to plants, animals and major periods of California history or prehistory would be less than significant with mitigation.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

Mitigation measures have been recommended to minimize or avoid potentially significant adverse environmental impacts. Thus, the proposed project would achieve short-term environmental goals while avoiding all long-term adverse environmental impacts. With mitigation measures implemented, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

No significant cumulative impacts have been identified. With implementation of recommended mitigation measures, cumulative project impacts would be less than significant.

d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impacts to human beings are generally associated with air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise impacts. The South Coast Air Basin is currently designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Development of the proposed project would contribute to air pollutant emissions on a short-term basis. As a result, the project would be required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. The purpose of SCAQMD Rule 403 is to reduce the amount of particulate matter in the atmosphere resulting from man-made fugitive dust sources. Compliance with applicable rules and regulations would ensure potential impacts on human beings would be less than significant.