

May 20, 2003

Syn. No. 36
3/25/03

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NUMBER 94-087-(5)
FIFTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT / THREE-VOTE MATTER**

On March 25, 2003, your Board conducted its hearing on the above-entitled permit which is sought in connection with the Newhall Ranch project in the Newhall Zoned District. Your Board closed the hearing, adopted a motion with amendments regarding proposed measures that you wished to have included in any potential approval of the project, and instructed us to prepare proposed findings and conditions consistent with your adopted motion. Enclosed are proposed findings and conditions for your consideration and possible use in the event you decide to approve the project.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD W. PELLMAN
County Counsel

By
RICHARD D. WEISS
Principal Deputy County Counsel

APPROVED AND RELEASED:

LLOYD W. PELLMAN
County Counsel

RDW/
Enclosures

**FINDINGS OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AND ORDER
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 94-087-(5)**

1. On March 23, 1999, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (the "Board") certified the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP") (SCH No. 95011015) and approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP. The project approvals included: (i) General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments No. 94-087-(5), which amended the Land Use Policy Maps and other General Plan Policy Maps of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan; (ii) Adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan; (iii) Zone Change Case No. 94-087-(5); (iv) Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 94-087-(5), which allowed development within Significant Ecological Areas ("SEA"), SEA 20 and SEA 23, portions of which overlie the Specific Plan site; and (v) Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 24500-(5), which allowed division of the subject property into 30 large lots for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing only (collectively, the "project approvals"). In conjunction with the project approvals, the Board adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations, dated February 1999; approved the Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, attached as Exhibit "A" to the CEQA Findings; and adopted findings, orders, and conditions of approval for CUP No. 94-087-(5) and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 24500-(5).
2. After project approval, various parties challenged the County's certification of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR and approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant in a consolidated action in Kern County Superior Court, entitled *United Water Conservation District v. County of Los Angeles, et al.* Case No. 239324 RDR ("the Newhall Ranch litigation"). The Court upheld Final EIR certification in connection with approval of the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant with respect to many of the issues raised in the Newhall Ranch litigation. However, the Court ordered the County to void its certification of the Final EIR with respect to the specific issues listed below and to conduct an additional analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") in order to:
 - (a) Extend the traffic impact analysis that was used in the EIR to evaluate Los Angeles County traffic impacts to the project's impacts on Ventura County arterial roadways exiting State routes 23 and 126 until the one percent impact standard is reached;

- (b) Determine the effect on the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek wildlife corridor caused by the shifting of wildlife into the Salt Creek corridor;
- (c) Address the Specific Plan's impacts on biological resources in the Santa Clara River corridor associated with channelization and bank hardening;
- (d) Demonstrate that adequate water sources will be available for build-out of the Specific Plan, which may be achieved by securing other water sources consistent with CEQA and/or by developing a factual basis providing substantial evidence from which the County can adequately assess environmental impacts of the Aquifer Storage and Recovery ("ASR") alternative and its ability to meet water needs; and
- (e) Address the alternative of siting the Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant off-river, including an analysis of the biological impacts of that siting.

The Court also ordered the County to set aside the project approvals, but only as those approvals relate to SEA 23 and the County's Development Monitoring System ("DMS") as it applies to water supplies, and to take action to:

- (a) Ensure consistency of the Specific Plan with the County General Plan policies requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23; and
- (b) Ensure consistency of the Specific Plan with the County's General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies.

Consequently, the Court set aside approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, and Final EIR certification, but only with respect to the issues identified above.

3. After the Court's decision, the Board approved a resolution identifying the action to be taken by the County in order to respond to the Court's decision and writ in the Newhall Ranch litigation. The resolution instructed County staff to prepare an additional environmental analysis under CEQA ("Additional Analysis"). The Additional Analysis was to address each of the specific issues described in the Court's decision and writ.
4. In response to the Board's resolution, the County caused to be prepared the Draft Additional Analysis ("DAA"), Volumes I-III, dated April 2001, to the Final

EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant. The DAA addressed the specific issues identified in the Court's decision and writ. On November 13, 2000, County staff distributed the Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of the DAA to various public agencies, and other interested groups, and received responses to the NOP. On April 19, 2001, County staff caused to be prepared and circulated the Notice of Availability of the DAA. The public review and comment period on the DAA was to occur for a 60-day period, commencing on April 20, 2001, to June 19, 2001 (15 days longer than required by CEQA). The Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") held three public hearings on Newhall Ranch and the DAA on June 20, 2001; July 16, 2001; and August 27, 2001. During the second public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period on the DAA through August 27, 2001 (for a total public review period of 130 days).

5. In October 2001, the Commission considered the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis ("FAA"), Volumes I and II, dated October 2001, which included public comment letters, revisions to the text of the DAA, and the County's written responses to the public comments. After considering the FAA and related project approvals, the Commission recommended that the Board certify the FAA as adequate under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.
6. In November 2002, due to the existence of new information regarding water resources and the San Fernando Valley Spineflower, the County caused to be prepared the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft Additional Analysis ("RDAA"), Volumes I-II, dated November 2002. The RDAA was circulated for public review for a 70-day comment period. Public comments were received and reviewed in response to the RDAA.
7. As a result, County staff prepared the proposed Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, Volumes III - IV, dated March 2003, which included additional public comments, additional revisions to the DAA and RDAA text, and the County's written responses to the public comments. On March 25, 2003, the Board held a noticed public hearing to consider the Newhall Ranch environmental documentation and related project approvals. At that hearing, the Board took public testimony regarding the Newhall Ranch environmental documentation. After completion of the public testimony, the Board closed the public hearing, instructed staff to complete preparation of the proposed final environmental documentation, as well as proposed resolutions, ordinance, findings, and conditions for the Newhall Ranch project approvals, along with the additional revisions noted in the Board's motions. In this regard, County staff was also directed to prepare final written responses to the written and oral comments received prior to, or at, the March 25, 2003, public hearing for the Board's review.

The Board then continued the matter to its May 27, 2003, public meeting for consideration and possible action.

8. Based on the Court's decision in the Newhall Ranch litigation, as stated above, the Board set aside its approval of CUP No. 94-087-(5) but only as it relates to SEA 23 and DMS as it applies to water supplies. The Board's prior approval of this CUP as it relates to SEA 20 remained adopted and valid in all respects. In compliance with the Court's decision and writ, the Board hereby reconsiders CUP No. 94-087-(5) as it relates to SEA 23, and approves CUP No. 94-087-(5) in accordance with the findings set forth in this permit. In doing so, as explained below, the Board's findings also address refinements to the boundaries of SEA 20. These refinements were made to enhance the Specific Plan's compatibility with existing SEA 23 resources and are addressed in further detail below.
9. The following findings, order, and conditions constitute the Board's approval of CUP No. 94-087-(5) and necessarily include all prior findings and conditions relating to SEA 20 and the Specific Plan's compatibility with the biotic resources present within SEA 20. As stated in paragraph 8, above, this permit already has been approved and adopted by the Board as it relates to SEA 20. Therefore, in making these findings, the Board is not readopting this CUP as it relates to SEA 20 but, rather, is acknowledging and reiterating the Board's previously adopted SEA 20 findings, as modified below to account for additional refinements made to existing SEA 23 boundaries, which minimize impacts and further enhance the Specific Plan's compatibility with the existing SEA resources within the Specific Plan site.
10. The applicant proposes the development of a large-scale mixed-use project, commonly referred to as Newhall Ranch, on portions of the subject property located in the northwestern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The proposed Specific Plan would include a broad range of residential, mixed-use, and non-residential land uses within five villages. As revised by the Board, the Specific Plan allows for up to 20,885 dwelling units; 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of business park land uses; 37 acres of visitor-serving uses; 1,014 acres of open space, including 181 acres of community parks and 833 acres in other open spaces; 5,157 acres in special management areas; 55 acres in 10 neighborhood parks; a 15-acre lake; a public trail system; an 18-hole golf course; 2 fire stations; a public library; an electrical station; reservation of 5 elementary school sites, one junior high school site, and one high school site; a 6.8-million-gallon per day water reclamation plant; and other associated community facilities. The Specific Plan is projected to be constructed over a 25- to 30-year period.

11. The subject property is an 11,963-acre irregularly shaped site located in the northwestern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County in the Santa Clara River Valley. The property is within the County's Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area. Specifically, the property is one-half mile west of the Golden State Freeway (I-5) and largely southwest of the junction of I-5 and State Route 126 ("SR-126"), located between the Magic Mountain Theme Park on the east and the Los Angeles County/Ventura County boundary line on the west. The City of Santa Clarita is located east of the subject property. SR-126 and the Santa Clara River transect the property from east to west, with a majority of the property south of SR-126 and the Santa Clara River.
12. General Plan Amendment and Sub-Plan Amendments No. 94-087-(5) have been concurrently approved for this project by the Board to amend the Land Use Policy maps and other General Plan Policy maps of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan. The Board has concurrently adopted the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which provides detailed development policies and standards for the development of all aspects of the proposed project. The Board's findings as contained in its resolution relating to the adoption of the General and Sub-Plan amendments are incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full.
13. Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 24500 ("VTPM No. 24500") was previously approved for this project by the Board in March 1999. VTPM No. 24500 allowed the division of the subject property into 30 large lots for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing only. The previously adopted findings of the Board with respect to VTPM No. 24500 are incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full.
14. The applicant proposes adjustments in the current boundaries of SEA 20 (Santa Susana Mountains) and SEA 23 (Santa Clara River). Portions of SEA 20 and SEA 23 are located within the subject property.
15. The proposed SEA boundary adjustments are intended, in part, to more accurately reflect the location of the sensitive biological resources currently located within existing SEA boundaries. The proposed SEA boundary adjustments are also intended to be consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which proposes to establish a Specific Plan designation of "Special Management Area" ("SMA") over the adjusted SEA boundaries. The SMA is to implement the provisions contained in the "Resource Management Plan" section of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Although the adjusted area is referred to as an SMA in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the underlying, existing SEA designations would remain in effect.

16. Section 22.56.215 of Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance) requires that a conditional use permit be obtained for a proposed subdivision of land or proposed development within an SEA to ensure compliance with specific design compatibility criteria. This conditional use permit is being granted for the purpose of allowing limited development within existing SEA 23 boundaries, based on the consistency findings presented below.
17. The pre-existing zoning on the entire subject property is A-2-2 (Heavy Agriculture – 2-acre-minimum lot size), A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture – 5-acre-minimum lot size), and M-1-5 (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing). The Board has concurrently approved a change of zone on the property to "Specific Plan."
18. The subject property is within the Santa Clara River basin and contains ten drainage areas, all of which drain into the Santa Clara River. The Santa Clara River transects the northern portion of the subject property from east to west. Salt Creek, Potrero Canyon, Chiquito Creek, Long Canyon, San Martinez Grande, and other unnamed drainage courses also either originate on or flow through the site.
19. As previously indicated, two Significant Ecological Areas overlie portions of the Specific Plan site, SEA 20 and SEA 23. SEA 20 is primarily noted for its diverse oak woodland habitat and its facilitation of species movement between the San Gabriel and Santa Monica mountains via the Simi Hills. The Santa Clara River SEA ("SEA 23") is noted for its wetlands and habitat for the unarmored threespine stickleback fish. Approximately 5,237 acres (43.8 percent) of the property are currently within these existing Significant Ecological Areas. With regard to SEA 23, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan proposes development within the boundaries of the existing SEA, including Low-Medium and Medium-Density residential housing, Mixed-Use and Business Park uses, bank stabilization, bridges, utility crossings, and the Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant.
20. The "Significant Ecological Area" designation is one of several land use classifications set forth in the Land Use Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan. The SEA classification generally identifies lands having important biological resources. The classification includes habitats of rare and endangered species, sites with critical fish and wildlife values, relatively undisturbed areas of typical natural habitat, and regionally scarce biotic resources. The intent of the General Plan is to preserve and enhance SEAs, to the extent possible, for the benefit of present and future County residents.
21. The purpose underlying the SEA land use classification is to preserve SEA resources in an ecologically viable state. Several General Plan policies reflect that intent. For example, Policy 15, in the "Environmental Protection" section,

entitled "General Goals and Policies," requires protection of "areas that have significant natural resources and scenic values, including significant ecological areas."

22. Other factors governing implementation of the General Plan's SEA goals and objectives include the County's ability to accurately identify areas of SEA resource value, the availability of financial and other resources necessary to support preservation, restoration and enhancement efforts, and the competing priorities between resource preservation and other critical public needs. Because the original SEA selection process was based on limited field verification of SEA resources, the General Plan acknowledges that future additions or deletions to identified SEAs may be appropriate, based on more detailed and updated biological surveys. The County's Zoning Ordinance further acknowledges that it is not the purpose of the SEA designation to preclude development within SEAs but, rather, to ensure, to the extent possible, that such development maintains and, where possible, enhances the SEA biotic resources while allowing limited controlled development within SEAs.
23. Recognizing the resource values at stake and the constraints imposed by competing priorities and objectives, the General Plan seeks to provide a process for reconciling specific conflicts between proposed land uses and the preservation of identified SEAs. The General Plan does not, however, suggest that this can be accomplished by applying a single set of regulatory standards to all SEAs. Instead, the General Plan recognizes that measures necessary to preserve and enhance SEAs will vary depending upon the nature of the resource values present and the degree of threat implied by potential incompatible development. Within this context, the General Plan sets forth SEA-compatible land uses and identifies SEA design compatibility criteria to guide specific land use decisions.
24. As stated above, the General Plan identifies certain uses, which are compatible with SEAs, by definition and certain uses that may be compatible. However, the General Plan notes that it "has not attempted to identify, in other than the most general terms, appropriate use types and intensities within significant ecological areas." Therefore, in order to determine whether a development proposal, in fact, is compatible with a particular SEA, the General Plan requires that the proposal be reviewed for compliance with certain "design compatibility criteria." The design criteria are as follows:
 - (a) That the requested development is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas;

- (b) That the requested development is designed to maintain water bodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state;
 - (c) That the requested development is designed so that wildlife movement corridors (migratory paths) are left in an undisturbed and natural state;
 - (d) That the requested development retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resource areas from said requested development;
 - (e) That, where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas from development; and
 - (f) That roads and utilities serving the proposed development are located and designed so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas, or migratory paths.
25. The General Plan requirement that development proposed within an SEA comply with the foregoing "design compatibility criteria" is implemented through provisions of the Los Angeles County Code. Pursuant to Section 22.56.215(A)(1) of the Los Angeles County Code, an applicant must obtain a conditional use permit "prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, approval of a minor land division or subdivision, or the commencement of any construction or enlargement of any building or structure on a lot or parcel, which is in or partly in an area designated in the County General Plan and related maps as a significant ecological area."
26. The Board has reviewed the SEA General Plan Consistency analysis contained in the Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001), including *revised* Section 2.4 of the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis (May 2003). As it relates to SEA 20, the Board previously determined that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan, since it is in substantial compliance with the general conditions for development in Significant Ecological Areas and that the applicant has satisfied the requirements of Section 22.56.215 of the Zoning Ordinance. In making these findings, the Board also notes that certain revisions were made to the boundaries of SEA 20 in response to refinements made to the existing SEA 23 boundary. These revisions were made because, as explained below, certain acres of sensitive habitat that would have been redesignated from SEA 23 to SEA 20 will now remain within the existing SEA 23 boundary. As discussed below, the Board finds that this change is consistent with the General Plan compatibility findings for SEAs, in that the sensitive habitat will remain protected by the existing SEA designation and no development will occur within that sensitive habitat.

27. The Board previously determined that the proposed development within existing SEA 20 is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas. This determination was based upon the Board's following findings, which were previously adopted and remain valid as applied to SEA 20, as revised below:
- (a) The proposed SEA 20 boundary adjustment results in an area that is approximately 237 acres larger than the original SEA 20 on the Specific Plan site. The original SEA 20 within the Specific Plan area was approximately 3,947 acres in size, while the adjusted existing SEA 20 area would be approximately 4,184 acres. The boundary adjustment would provide a beneficial impact by creating an SEA/High Country SMA that contains larger amounts of higher quality habitat when compared to the original, existing SEA 20 boundary;
 - (b) The adjustment in boundaries increases the net acreage of sensitive habitats by 195 acres, which includes an additional 166.1 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat and 28.9 acres of live oak woodland. The Habitat Value Ranking analysis described in Section 4.6 of the Final EIR for the Specific Plan provides a second measure of the impact of the boundary modification. This analysis indicates that the amount of land in the lower value habitats (1 and 2) would be increased by 31.3 acres, while the land in the higher value habitats (3 and 4) would be increased by 206.5 acres;
 - (c) The boundary change would not substantially increase the contact between Specific Plan land uses and the SEA 20/High Country SMA and the wildlife corridor, and nearly all of the interface is separated by steep slopes, which reduce potential access and impacts created by people and pets. The general effect of the boundary change would be to add approximately 237 acres at the northeast edge of the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA boundary. The Specific Plan land uses would be separated by high, steep slopes from the canyon, which form the wildlife corridor and thus a sufficient buffer is provided between the corridor and the Specific Plan uses. This edge of development is shown on Exhibit 2.6-7 of the Resources Management Plan (Chapter 2.6 of the Specific Plan). The separating slopes would prevent direct access by residents to the wildlife corridor and would greatly reduce access by pets. In addition, Specific Plan land uses have been modified so that Estate Residential and Open Area land use categories now adjoin nearly the entire northern boundary of the SEA 20/High Country SMA boundary, buffering it from more urban

uses within the Specific Plan. In response to the Board's motion, the applicant has also agreed to permanently dedicate to the public, in fee and/or by conservation easement, approximately 1,500 acres of land in the Salt Canyon watershed in Ventura County, adjacent to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. This land will enhance the compatibility of the Specific Plan with the biotic resources present in the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA. The Board has imposed this requirement as an agreed-upon off-site project condition; it is not intended to be part of the Specific Plan. This specific condition is found in the Board's Conditions of Approval to this CUP, which are attached and incorporated herein by this reference, as if set forth in full;

- (d) Upon approval of the Specific Plan, the provisions of the Resource Management Plan ("RMP") become effective. The RMP requires that a conservation agreement be established over SEA 20/High Country SMA and that a detailed program be developed for its long-term management and ownership. The 1,500 acres of land in Ventura County indicated in paragraph (c), above, would be subject to the same requirements. As a result, the SEA 20/High Country SMA and the adjacent 1,500 acres in Ventura County would be preserved in perpetuity and would be managed and maintained;
- (e) The land uses shown on the Land Use Plan and Specific Plan within SEA 20/High Country SMA consist of unimproved hiking/equestrian trails. In addition, the Permitted Uses Matrix of the Specific Plan permits a range of low-intensity land uses, which could be proposed in the future. See Chapter 3, Table 3.4-2, Permitted Uses Matrix;
- (f) With the exception of the unimproved hiking/equestrian trail, it is not currently known which of the uses described immediately above may be proposed in the future or whether any will be proposed. However, the Permitted Uses Matrix provides that each of the uses permitted in SEA 20/High Country SMA be reviewed under the County General Plan SEA criteria and Section 22.56.215 of the Los Angeles County Zoning Code, which implements the County General Plan provisions regarding SEAs. This section requires a CUP for any use that is the subject of a building permit, grading permit, or a minor land division or subdivision within a SEA. Under Section 22.56.215, a review to determine the need for such a CUP would have to be undertaken for all the permitted uses with the exception of the unimproved hiking and equestrian trails and existing uses. Under Section 22.56.215, a CUP would also be required for the uses shown on the Land Use Plan, because such

uses would require, or would be part of a development which requires, a subdivision, a grading permit, or building permits. At the Specific Plan level, it would be speculative to evaluate the compatibility of future unknown details of potential permitted land uses; however, the Specific Plan does impose sufficient controls so as to ensure future review and compatibility determinations for these uses under the County General Plan SEA criteria and under Section 22.56.215;

- (g) The description of SEA 20 in the General Plan states that medium-intensity recreational uses, which include overnight camping and daytime equestrian use, are compatible with the SEA. The Specific Plan limits public recreational access in the High Country SMA to day use by hikers and equestrians. Trail bikes and motorized dirt bikes would be prohibited. Therefore, the intensity of recreational uses would not exceed that described in the General Plan. The proposed management and maintenance of SEA 20/High Country SMA would also help to prevent deterioration of SEA resources, which might result from public recreational use; and
- (h) SEA 20/High Country SMA and the adjacent 1,500 acres of land in the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County are required to be dedicated to a joint powers authority consisting of the County, the City of Santa Clarita, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and will be managed by the Center for Natural Lands Management, a non-profit conservancy, which will also own and manage the SEA 23/River Corridor SMA. Recreation and conservation activities will be funded through an open space financing district and an endowment by the applicant and, therefore, will be at no cost to the general public.

28. The Board previously determined that the proposed development within the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA is designed to maintain water bodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state. This determination was based upon the Board's following finding, which was previously adopted and remains valid as applied to SEA 20, as revised below:

All drainage courses within the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA would be retained in a natural state. However, culverts may be provided where needed to protect the access roads or trails. In addition, inlet devices are proposed in certain locations in the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA, as shown on Specific Plan Exhibit 2.5-1, Conceptual Backbone Drainage Plan. The inlets would be required in order to develop property outside of the existing SEA 20/High Country

SMA. As that development would require a subdivision, among other permits, the associated inlets would be reviewed under the County General Plan SEA criteria and Section 22.56.215 of the Zoning Ordinance, as discussed above. Furthermore, all impacts to drainage courses in the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA would be fully mitigated under the RMP, which requires restoration and/or enhancement as mitigation of impacts to riparian vegetation.

29. The Board previously determined that the proposed development within existing SEA 20 is designed so that wildlife movement corridors within that area are left in a natural and undisturbed state. This determination was based upon the Board's following finding, which was previously adopted and remains valid as applied to SEA 20, as revised below:

Retention of the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA in a largely natural and undisturbed state would preserve the major wildlife movement corridors and migratory paths, which currently exist in the SMA. Access for wildlife between the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA and the Santa Clara River would continue to be available through the Salt Canyon wildlife corridor, which is the most significant wildlife corridor on the property. The value of this corridor is high due to its relative remoteness, the quality of habitats present, and the fact that it is an integral part of the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA. The connection of the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA to the River through the Salt Creek corridor would provide a regional open area system and remain in a natural and undisturbed state. The Salt Creek wildlife corridor drainage joins the Santa Clara River off-site in Ventura County. The applicant, which is the owner of the property in Ventura County, has indicated no plans for development of this property. As a condition of approval, the applicant has agreed to permanently dedicate to the public in fee and/or by conservation easement the approximately 1,500 acres of land encompassing the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County, adjacent to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. This additional land will be dedicated to the joint powers authority responsible for overall recreation and conservation of the High Country SMA, and shall be managed in conjunction with, and in the same manner as, the High Country SMA. The Board has imposed this requirement as an agreed-upon off-site project condition; it is not intended to be part of the Specific Plan. As stated above, this specific condition is found in the Board's Conditions of Approval to this CUP.

30. The Board previously determined that the proposed development within existing SEA 20 retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resource areas based upon the Board's following finding, which was previously approved and remains valid as applied to SEA 20, as revised below:

Virtually all of the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA is being retained in a natural state. Vegetative cover within the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA will be naturally enhanced by the withdrawal of grazing, with the exception of grazing for management purposes, as provided in the Newhall Ranch RMP. The existing SEA 20/High Country SMA is identified as a primary location for oak resource planting to mitigate impacts, which might occur within the development areas of the Specific Plan. As indicated in the Biotic Section of the Final Environmental Impact Report, as many as 633 oak trees may be impacted by development, and these would be replaced on at least a 2:1 ratio, as governed by the County Oak Tree Ordinance. The RMP further requires restoration and/or enhancement to mitigate any riparian vegetation or oak resources, which are disturbed during development of uses within the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA. The vertical elevation of the adjacent development and the transition from higher intensity land uses to very low-intensity uses adjacent to the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA also provide buffers to the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA resources. Additionally, steep slopes will provide buffers between the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA and residential uses in the northwest area of the SMA. The Specific Plan, Section 2.6.2.b.(3)(b), Transition/Fuel Modification Areas, institutes protections of the interface between the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA and adjacent residential development. The Board also finds that the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA is further enhanced through the off-site project condition requiring the 1,500-acre dedication of land in the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County, adjacent to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

31. The Board previously determined that, where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas within the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA from development, based upon the Board's following finding, which was approved and remains valid as applied to SEA 20, as revised below:

In virtually all areas where the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA adjoins residential areas to be developed under the Specific Plan, the interface between development and natural area is composed of steep

slopes, which will minimize or eliminate access to the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA by people and pets. The interface would be controlled by the standards of the Wildfire Fuel Modification Zones, which would include a plant palette compatible with the adjoining natural vegetation of the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA and Section 2.6.2.b.(3)(b), Transition/Fuel Modification Areas, as discussed above. Specific Plan Exhibit 2.6-7, Salt Creek Wildlife Corridor Perspective, shows the vertical separation between the Salt Creek wildlife corridor and nearby homes. Walls or view fences are typically provided at the rear or sides of residential land uses, and these would separate residents from the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA, although the steep slopes between the lots and the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA make fences and walls unnecessary for buffering purposes. Habitat areas are further protected by the provisions of Section 2.6.2.b.(3)(b), which restrict construction of buildings and other structures to developed pads within Planning Areas OV-04, OV-10, PV-02, and PV-28 and prohibits construction on southerly slopes facing the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA and in the area between the original SEA 20 boundary and the High Country boundary. Recreational access to the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA would occur primarily through the Visitor Serving land use designation, which is shown on the Land Use Plan in a location immediately adjacent to the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA. It is intended that this area be the control point for residents and visitors to access hiking and equestrian trails in the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA. The Newhall Ranch RMP (Section 2.6 of the Specific Plan) requires graded areas adjacent to and within SEAs to be clearly marked, thereby buffering and avoiding important habitat areas from impacts from development. Furthermore, the Specific Plan, Chapter 4 (Design Guideline), requires shielded lighting fixtures to minimize glare and "direct rays" impacts upon adjacent areas, resulting in additional protection of the habitat areas.

32. The Board previously determined that roads and utilities serving the proposed development are located and designed so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas, or migratory paths within the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA. This determination was based upon the Board's following finding, which was approved and remains valid as applied to SEA 20, as revised below:

At the Specific Plan level it is not possible to accurately assess the impacts that future road and/or utility construction would have because the Specific Plan does not propose any such projects within

the existing SEA 20/High Country SMA. However, under Section 22.56.215 of the Zoning Ordinance, an SEA conditional use permit would be required for any such construction or subdivision, and this would require an evaluation of the project's conformity with the General Plan Design Compatibility Criteria for SEAs. Environmental review would also be required and define the anticipated impacts and necessary mitigation.

33. As discussed above, the Court in the Newhall Ranch litigation found that the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR did not adequately address the Specific Plan's impacts on sensitive habitat in the existing SEA 23 boundaries within the Specific Plan site. In the Specific Plan, the existing SEA 23 area is also described as the "River Corridor Special Management Area" or the "River Corridor SMA." The Court also found that the County's findings regarding the deletion of sensitive habitat from the existing SEA boundaries (at that time, determined to be 103 acres) were not supported by substantial evidence. Finally, the Court found that there was not substantial evidence to justify the County's findings that development *within* the existing SEA 23 boundaries, including bridge crossings and utilities, was located and designed so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas, or migratory paths within SEA 23.

In response to the Court's direction, the County prepared the Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001). In the Draft Additional Analysis, Section 2.4, SEA General Plan Consistency, assessed the three issues raised by the Court in the Newhall Ranch litigation. The three issues were: (1) the Specific Plan's impacts on sensitive habitat within the existing SEA 23; (2) the need to further substantiate the Specific Plan's proposal to remove acreage from the existing SEA 23 for development purposes; and (3) the need to further substantiate the Specific Plan's proposal for limited development within the existing SEA 23.

After extensive public comments and responses to those comments, County staff has recommended that additional refinements be made to the Specific Plan as it pertains to the existing SEA 23. These additional refinements were recommended by County staff to minimize impacts and further enhance the Specific Plan compatibility with existing SEA 23 resources. These additional refinements are reflected in both the revised Specific Plan (May 2003) and the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis (May 2003), specifically, revised Section 2.4, SEA General Plan Consistency.

In summary, the original Final EIR (March 1999) stated that 103 acres of sensitive habitat were redesignated from SEA 23 to other designations. Further

study in the Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001) indicated that 28 acres of sensitive riparian habitat in SEA 23 would be redesignated from SEA 23 to residential and non-residential land uses (and not the previously designated 103 acres). In response to comments, refinements have been made to the existing SEA 23 boundary to further minimize impacts and enhance the Specific Plan's compatibility with existing SEA 23 resources. The most noteworthy of the recommendations results in the elimination of proposed residential and non-residential land uses from 27 of the 28 acres of sensitive riparian habitat in SEA 23, leaving just one acre of sensitive riparian habitat redesignated to non-residential and infrastructure-related land uses. The 14 acres of sensitive riparian habitat that was not in the original, existing SEA 23 would still be added to the existing SEA 23, as previously proposed in the Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001).

Other recommendations result in the following changes to the existing SEA 23: (1) 70 acres of sensitive riparian habitat that was to be redesignated from SEA 23 to Open Area would be changed, so that 66 acres would remain in existing SEA 23; with the other 4 acres still redesignated to Open Area; and (2) 19 acres that was to be redesignated from SEA 23 to SEA 20 would remain in existing SEA 23. As a result of these changes, the total amount of sensitive riparian habitat found within the existing SEA 23 boundary would increase by a net of 5 acres, from 380 acres to 385 acres. In addition, the proposed size of SEA 23 on the Specific Plan site would increase by 156 acres, from 819 acres to 975 acres.

Based on the analysis presented, the Board's existing SEA 23 consistency findings are discussed further in the following three subsections: (1) Description of Changes to Existing SEA 23 (paragraph 34, below); (2) SEA Boundary Adjustments (paragraph 35, below); and (3) Specific Plan Development Within Existing SEA 23 (paragraph 36, below).

34. Presently, approximately 1,290 acres of land is located within the existing SEA 23 boundaries on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan proposes changes to SEA 23 resulting in a reduction of land area to 975 acres, or a net reduction of 315 acres, within SEA 23. Approximately 23 acres of the total redesignated area involves sensitive habitat (14 acres added, 8 acres redesignated to Open Area, and one acre redesignated for development). However, the proposed changes to the SEA area must be understood in context.

In this case, only a very small amount of sensitive habitat area (*i.e.*, one acre, or 0.08 percent of the existing SEA) is being removed from the existing SEA 23 boundary due to development. In fact, the existing amount of sensitive riparian

habitat that would occur in SEA 23 would actually increase under the Specific Plan by 5 acres (instead of the 103-acre decrease, which was shown in the original Final EIR); 14 acres of sensitive riparian habitat would be added to the SEA, one acre would be redesignated for development of non-residential land uses, and 8 acres would be redesignated from SEA 23 to the Open Area designation, because it is not riparian in nature or represents relatively small fragments of sensitive habitat isolated from the riparian resources of the river.

The 315-acre reduction of land area in existing SEA 23 indicated above was calculated as follows: 355 acres was removed for development, plus 22 acres removed and preserved elsewhere in the Specific Plan, for a total of 377 acres, less 62 acres of land that is added to SEA 23, for a net reduction in SEA 23 of 315 acres. The redesignations were made with consideration to the type and quality of the habitat and the purpose of the SEA 23 (preservation of riparian habitats and associated species). A detailed description of the disposition of land removed from the existing SEA 23 is provided in the table below for each habitat category.

Table Proposed Changes to Existing SEA 23						
Existing SEA 23		Removed and Preserved Elsewhere in Specific Plan	Added to SEA 23	Removed for Development	Percent of Total Existing SEA 23 Removed	Revised SEA 23
Habitat	Acreage					
Sensitive^a	380	-8	+14	-1	0.08	385
Non-Sensitive^b	444	-6	+14	-19	1.5	433
Ag/Disturbed^c	466	-8	+34	-335	26.1	157
Total^d	1,290	-22	+62	-355	28	975
<p>^aNote: As shown above, the sensitive habitat within the existing SEA 23 totals 380 acres. After refinements to the existing SEA, the sensitive habitat in the SEA was increased by a net of 5 acres (380 + 5 = 385 acres).</p> <p>^bNote: As shown above, the non-sensitive habitat within the existing SEA 23 totals 444 acres. The reduction in non-sensitive habitat was calculated as follows: 444 acres <i>minus</i> 6 acres, <i>plus</i> 14 acres, <i>minus</i> 19 acres, <i>equals</i> 433 acres. This results in the removal of a net of 11 acres of non-sensitive habitat from existing SEA 23 (444 acres - 433 acres = 11 acres).</p> <p>^cNote: As shown above, the agricultural/disturbed land within the existing SEA 23 totals 466 acres. The reduction in agricultural/disturbed land from the SEA was calculated as follows: 466 acres, <i>minus</i> 8 acres removed/preserved elsewhere in the Specific Plan, <i>plus</i> 34 acres added to the SEA, <i>minus</i> 335 acres removed for development, <i>equals</i> 309 net acres of agricultural/disturbed land removed from the SEA.</p> <p>^dNote: The 315-acre reduction of land area in existing SEA 23 was calculated as follows: 355 acres removed for development, 22 acres removed and preserved elsewhere in the Specific Plan (for a total of 377 acres removed from SEA 23), and 62 acres added to the SEA. This results in a net amount of land to be removed from existing SEA 23 of 315 acres (377 acres – 62 acres = 315 net acres to be removed).</p>						

35. The Board finds that the proposed adjustments to the existing boundaries of SEA 23 are consistent with General Plan policies requiring the protection of natural resources within SEAs. As discussed in the Final Additional Analysis, the Specific Plan has been designed to avoid sensitive resources within the existing SEA 23 boundaries to the greatest extent possible.

The existing SEA 23 boundary on the Specific Plan site is approximately 1,290 acres in size. Under the Specific Plan, the size of SEA 23 would be reduced to 975 acres, or a net reduction of 315 acres. As shown below, the 315-acre net reduction in SEA 23 acreage consists of the following:

- 11 acres	Non-Sensitive Habitat Removed
-309 acres	Agricultural/Other Disturbed Land Removed
+ 5 acres	Sensitive Habitat Added to the Existing SEA 23
<hr/>	
-315 net acres	Total Land Removed from Existing SEA 23 Boundary

As shown, the vast majority of land redesignated from SEA 23 to other Specific Plan land use designations consists of existing agricultural or other types of disturbed lands. Development on land already disturbed poses no direct impacts to the sensitive biological resources found within the existing SEA 23.

Regarding the sensitive riparian habitat, the amount removed for development from the existing SEA 23 boundary under the Specific Plan would be approximately one acre. In addition, 8 acres of sensitive riparian habitat would be redesignated from the existing SEA 23 to the Specific Plan's Open Area designation. Finally, 14 acres of sensitive habitat, which is not within existing SEA 23 boundaries, would be added to the existing SEA 23 boundary under the Specific Plan. Accordingly, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in a net increase of 5 acres in the amount of sensitive riparian habitat contained in the existing SEA 23 boundary. This net increase in sensitive riparian habitat acreage is calculated as follows:

+14 acres	Sensitive habitat added to the existing SEA 23
- 1 acre	Redesignated from SEA 23 to non-residential/ infrastructure-related land use designations
- 8 acres	Redesignated to Open Area
<hr/>	
5 net acres	Sensitive habitat added to the existing SEA 23 boundary

For the reasons discussed below, the proposed boundary adjustments affecting sensitive resources in existing SEA 23 (one acre for development and 8 acres redesignated to Open Area) are considered consistent with the General Plan's policies as they relate to resources within existing SEAs. First, as to the 8 acres redesignated from SEA 23 to the Open Area designation, the Open Area designation provides resource protection, which is comparable to that provided by the SEA designation. For example, the Open Area and SEA designations both allow agricultural uses, grazing, recreational uses, greenhouses, trails, golf courses, oil and natural gas operations, and sand and gravel extraction activities, subject, in some instances, to a conditional use permit. However, certain uses (e.g., residential uses, commercial uses, animal hospitals, and campgrounds) are conditionally permitted in SEAs, but are not permitted within the Open Area designation under any circumstances. Consequently, the acreage within the existing SEA 23 proposed to be transferred to the Open Area designation (8 acres) will receive a degree of protection which is comparable to that provided by the County's SEA designation.

In addition, some of the sensitive habitat to be redesignated to the Open Area designation has been redesignated because it is not the type of habitat intended for protection within SEA 23 (*i.e.*, riparian habitat necessary for the unarmored threespine stickleback fish), and because much of the acreage would receive adequate protection under the Open Area designation. Specifically, the Santa Clara River SEA was designated predominantly because of the presence of habitat for the unarmored threespine stickleback. (See, Los Angeles County General Plan Background Report, p. OS-A30 to OS-A31.) Therefore, SEA habitat that does not contribute to the stickleback's survival may be removed from the SEA designation, particularly where, as here, the acreage is being redesignated to another preserve classification (Open Area). With regard to the 8 acres of habitat redesignated to Open Area, some of that acreage exists on bluffs above the River, and the remainder is generally fragmented and isolated. The County has further determined that the limited amount of habitat to be redesignated Open Area (8 acres) does not contribute significantly to the survival of the stickleback and, therefore, may be removed from SEA 23 as part of the boundary adjustments associated with the revised Specific Plan.

Second, as to both the one acre redesignated from SEA 23 for development (and not otherwise protected) and the 8-acre redesignation from SEA 23 to Open Area, the Land Use Element of the General Plan states that: "It is the intent of the General Plan policy to preserve the County's significant ecological resources and habitat areas in viable and natural conditions." (See, Los Angeles County General Plan, p. LU-A12.) The redesignation of one acre of sensitive habitat for development and the 8-acre redesignation to Open Area will not affect the County's ability to preserve the existing SEA 23 in a viable and natural condition. After redesignation of the one acre, the existing SEA 23 area will contain approximately 385 acres of sensitive riparian habitat, which is 5 more acres of sensitive riparian habitat than presently exists in the SEA. Moreover, the one acre proposed to be redesignated for development consists of small patches of fragmented and disconnected habitat distributed throughout the Specific Plan area, and the acreage is required for public roads, utilities, and development. Such small, isolated habitat patches are considered to have a lower biological value than large areas of contiguous sensitive habitat. Consequently, redesignation of the one acre from existing SEA 23 does not pose a legitimate threat to the continued viability of the sensitive resources with the existing SEA 23 boundary. As to the 8-acre redesignation, as stated above, the Open Area designation would provide resource protection comparable to that provided by the SEA designation.

In addition to overall habitat values, the acreage within the existing SEA 23 boundary would remain in a viable and natural condition in terms of other important ecological functions, even with implementation of the Specific Plan. The acreage within the existing SEA 23 boundary would continue to function as an east/west wildlife movement corridor and as habitat for the unarmored threespine stickleback, because the Specific Plan retains both the riparian vegetation in the Santa Clara River and the natural flow of the water without the need for periodic vegetation clearing. In addition, the Specific Plan would result in an increase in the amount of river bottom available to the unarmored threespine stickleback. The Specific Plan also establishes transitions, or "buffer" areas, to separate sensitive habitat within the existing SEA 23 boundary from the proposed urban land uses. In addition, the tributaries to the Santa Clara River within SEA 23 (Castaic, San Martinez, and Chiquito Canyon creeks) would be maintained and preserved in a largely natural state with soft bottoms.

The Specific Plan is consistent with General Plan policies regarding the balancing of SEA policies against other competing public needs. In its discussion of SEA policies, the General Plan states: "Major factors influencing the realization of Plan [SEA] objectives . . . include . . . the competing priorities between resource preservation and other critical public needs." (See, Los Angeles County General Plan, p. LU-A12.) Adjustment of the existing

SEA 23 boundary, including redesignation of one acre of sensitive habitat, will serve other critical public needs. For example, the Specific Plan will provide a broad spectrum of housing, including affordable housing that will help meet the County's long-term housing needs. The size and single ownership of the Newhall Ranch site provide opportunities to develop a comprehensive master-plan community in which land uses, infrastructure, and public services are properly planned and sited. The Specific Plan's Business Park, Commercial, and Mixed-Use Land Use designations will provide approximately 18,700 permanent jobs that will help the County achieve its economic goals. The Specific Plan's bridge crossings implement portions of the County's Master Plan of Highways and are considered essential to the development of a local and regional transportation system. In addition, the Specific Plan's RMP includes an extensive mitigation and habitat management program for the existing SEA 23/River Corridor SMA. The RMP is considered a significant benefit to the River Corridor. The River Corridor SMA would also be dedicated to the public and managed, neither of which occur in SEAs (lands under the County's SEA designation remain under private control and are not typically managed for resource protection).

36. The Specific Plan also proposes to develop within the boundaries of the existing SEA 23. As discussed above, Section 22.56.215(A)(1) of the County Code requires that a conditional use permit be obtained prior to commencing such activities, and Section 22.56.215(F) requires the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed development conforms to the SEA "design compatibility criteria." The Final Additional Analysis, including revised Section 2.4, contains the factual analysis necessary to address whether the proposed Specific Plan development is consistent with the County's SEA "design compatibility criteria" as it relates to existing SEA 23. The Board's findings with regard to the SEA design compatibility criteria are presented below.

Design Compatibility Criterion No. 1. The proposed development is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas. The Board has determined that the development proposed in the Specific Plan is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present in the existing SEA 23, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas. This determination is based upon the following findings:

- (a) At the inception of the planning process for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, detailed site investigation studies were performed for purposes of analyzing development constraints and opportunities. The development constraints included identification of the existing boundaries of SEA 23 within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

(See, Specific Plan, Ch. 2, Ex. 2.2-1, Ex. 2.2-2, and Ex. 2.2-3.) The constraints analysis also identified sensitive vegetation/habitat zones within the existing boundaries of SEA 23. (See, Specific Plan, Ch. 2, Ex. 2.2-1.) Based on the constraints analysis, and other relevant information, the Specific Plan identified important objectives to be implemented in conjunction with the Specific Plan. Those objectives included, among other things: (a) preserving the Santa Clara River Corridor and adjacent wetlands containing significant natural resources for their resource value; and (b) identifying and protecting significant resources within SEA 23. (See, Specific Plan, Ch. 2, pp. 2-1, 2-4.) During the planning process, it was also acknowledged that adjustments to SEA boundaries were possible with detailed study of the existing SEA areas. (See, Specific Plan, Ch. 2, p. 2-9);

- (b) In addition, the following objectives were developed in order to balance the environmental and flood control issues presented by the Santa Clara River, as required by the General Plan. The objectives were used to determine the general boundaries of the proposed SEA 23, which would be set aside as the River Corridor SMA under the Specific Plan. These objectives are noted below:
 - (i) The flood corridor must allow for the passage of Los Angeles County Capital Flood flows without the permanent removal of natural river vegetation (except at bridge crossings);
 - (ii) The banks of the river will generally be established outside of the "waters of the United States" as defined by federal laws and regulations, and as determined by the delineation completed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers ("ACOE") in August 1993;
 - (iii) Where the ACOE delineation width is insufficient to contain the Capital Flood flow, the flood corridor will be widened by an amount sufficient to carry the Capital Flood flow without the necessity of permanently removing vegetation or significantly increasing velocity;
 - (iv) Where development is proposed within the existing Los Angeles County 50-Year Capital Flood Plain, the land where development is to occur will be elevated in accordance with Los Angeles County policies to remove it from the flood plain; and
 - (v) Bank stabilization will occur only where necessary to protect against erosion. The proposed adjustment in the existing

SEA 23 boundaries would reduce the overall acreage of SEA 23 from 1,290 acres to 975 acres, which is a reduction in land area of 315 acres. Approximately 23 acres of the total area redesignated involves sensitive habitat. However, the proposed changes to the SEA area must be understood in context. In this case, only a very small amount of sensitive habitat area (*i.e.*, one acre, or 0.08 percent of the existing SEA) is being redesignated from the existing boundaries of SEA 23 due to proposed development. In fact, the existing amount of sensitive riparian habitat that would occur in SEA 23 would actually increase under the Specific Plan by 5 acres, instead of the 103-acre decrease, which was proposed in the original Final EIR; 14 acres of sensitive riparian habitat would be added to the SEA, one acre would be redesignated for development, and 8 acres would be redesignated from SEA 23 to Open Area, because it is not riparian in nature, or it represents relatively small fragments of sensitive habitat isolated from the riparian resources of the river. In addition, a total of 62 acres of land is proposed to be added to SEA 23 (377 total acres proposed for redesignation from the existing SEA to residential and non residential land uses, while 62 acres are proposed for addition for a net reduction in existing SEA acreage of 315 acres). The redesignations were made with consideration to the type and quality of the habitat and the purpose of the SEA 23 (preservation of riparian habitats and associated species). A description of the disposition of land redesignated from SEA 23 is provided in the table above;

- (c) The Specific Plan also addresses the one acre of sensitive habitat proposed to be redesignated from SEA 23 to non-residential land uses. The Specific Plan states that all riparian vegetation and all oak resources will be restored in the most suitable areas of the SEA 23/River Corridor SMA, as identified and required under the Specific Plan RMP, or under regulations of the ACOE and CDFG;
- (d) The Specific Plan RMP contains numerous mitigation measures designed to offset the loss of habitat due to the Specific Plan. For example, Mitigation Measure 4.6-63 requires 100 percent replacement/restoration of all riparian resources impacted by implementation of the Specific Plan. Several other measures (*e.g.*, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-16) outline requirements for mitigation of impacts to riparian habitat through habitat restoration and enhancement plans.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 requires that habitat restoration/enhancement efforts "be conducted only on sites where soils, hydrology, and microclimate conditions are suitable for riparian habitat." Such sites necessarily occur *within* the Santa Clara River Corridor. Figure 2.4-8, which graphically depicts the Specific Plan's candidate riparian restoration/enhancement areas, shows that nearly all such sites occur within the current boundaries of SEA 23. Moreover, a comparison of Figure 2.4-8 and Figure 2.4-5 demonstrates that the candidate areas are comprised almost entirely of disturbed areas; therefore, after restoration, the sites can be considered "new" sensitive habitat within SEA 23.

This discussion demonstrates that 309 acres of agricultural/disturbed areas and 11 acres of non-sensitive habitat types that are appropriately placed outside the SEA boundary after a more detailed mapping of the SEA would be redesignated from existing SEA 23 to residential and non-residential land uses, while 5 net acres of sensitive habitat would be added to the existing SEA 23. The net result is a 315-acre reduction in the size of the existing SEA 23. The 5 net acres of added sensitive riparian habitat is calculated as follows: Eight acres will be redesignated to the Open Area designation, and one acre redesignated for non-residential land uses will be replaced through restoration or enhancement of appropriate areas within the boundaries of the existing SEA 23 or the proposed SEA 23/River Corridor SMA. Finally, pursuant to the Specific Plan, 14 acres of sensitive habitat would be *added* to the existing SEA 23. Consequently, the proposed development would result in a net increase in protected sensitive riparian habitat of approximately 5 acres within SEA 23.

- (e) Moreover, in areas adjoining the SEA on the south side of the river, the Specific Plan designates 444 acres of Open Area, of which approximately 415 acres will remain in a natural state. The balance will provide active recreational opportunities to residents within the Specific Plan. This Open Area includes the steep, oak-filled canyons, which contain blueline streams/tributaries to the river, the river bluffs, and ridges contiguous with the River Corridor. This Open Area preserves over approximately 197 acres of sensitive habitats, including 149 acres of coastal sage scrub, 4 acres of Cottonwood/Oak Woodland, 39 acres of Coast Live Oak Woodland/Mainland Cherry, 5 acres of Elderberry Scrub, and 0.01 acre of mesic meadow. As a part of the Specific Plan, this Open Area would be offered to the County for dedication or placed under

long-term management by another organization. After combining the land preserved in the revised SEA (975 acres) with the preserved Open Area immediately adjacent to the revised SEA (415 acres), a total of 1,390 acres of undisturbed land would be preserved as part of the Specific Plan, including 577 acres of sensitive habitat. Existing SEA 23 consists of 380 acres of sensitive habitats. Due to Specific Plan implementation, 197 additional acres of sensitive habitats within and adjacent to the SEA 23/River Corridor SMA will be permanently preserved when compared with the amount of restricted land within the existing SEA 23.

Upon approval of the Specific Plan, the provisions of the RMP would be effective. As discussed above, the RMP provides standards for the mitigation of impacts to the riparian and oak resources in the proposed SEA 23/River Corridor SMA through restoration and enhancement activities. The RMP would also require that a conservation easement be established over the proposed SEA 23/River Corridor SMA after development of areas adjoining the river are complete, and includes the eventual removal of cattle grazing. Furthermore, the RMP requires that a plan be prepared and approved by Los Angeles County for the permanent ownership and management of the proposed SEA 23/River Corridor SMA as a "significant ecological area."

In summary, the Specific Plan is considered highly compatible with the biotic resources present within the existing boundaries of SEA 23 for the following reasons: (a) the Specific Plan proposes to set aside appropriate and sufficient undisturbed sensitive habitat areas within the existing boundaries of SEA 23; (b) the Specific Plan proposes to retain SEA 23 in a largely natural state; (c) only a relatively small amount of sensitive habitat (*i.e.*, one acre, or 0.08 percent of the existing SEA) is being redesignated for non-residential land uses; (d) the impacted area would be fully mitigated; (e) the River Corridor would still be sufficiently wide (and in certain locations widened) to accommodate the County's Capital Flood and still retain the sensitive riparian vegetation; (f) winter storm runoff would still continue to open its own channels through the river vegetation, flowing in a natural, non-invasive manner and preserve the meandering characteristics of the streambed; (g) the tributary canyons and bluffs on the south side of the river would still be preserved and provide an additional 444 acres (including 415 acres of undisturbed land), which would be dedicated to Open Area adjacent to the river; and (h) due to implementation of the Specific

Plan, the amount of sensitive riparian habitat found in the existing SEA 23 would increase by approximately 5 acres and an additional 192 acres of additional sensitive habitat areas adjacent to the SEA 23/River Corridor SMA would be permanently preserved; and

- (f) A chapter addressing potential impacts due to channelization and bank hardening is provided in the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis. As indicated in that chapter, no significant increases in velocity, erosion or sedimentation would occur in the river; therefore, biotic resources present within the existing boundaries of SEA 23 would not be significantly impacted.

Design Compatibility Criterion No. 2. The requested development is designed to maintain water bodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state. The Board's determination in this regard is based on the following additional findings:

- (a) As discussed above, implementation of the Specific Plan would maintain the Santa Clara River in a largely natural state. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.2 (Flood) of the Final EIR, in a 50-Year Capital Storm, total storm flows subsequent to development would be decreased by approximately 12 percent, and total debris volume would be reduced by approximately 30 percent from their pre-development levels. Because development of the Specific Plan does not increase site runoff during a Capital Storm, it would not result in upstream or downstream flooding of the river. During smaller two-year storms (rather than the 50-Year Capital Flood design event), the depth of flow in the Santa Clara River at the County line would change from approximately 2.34 feet under pre-development conditions to approximately 2.5 feet under post-development conditions, which represents an increase of 1.6 inches in depth. A separate chapter in this Additional Analysis addresses potential impacts due to channelization and bank hardening and indicates that no significant increases in velocity, erosion, or sedimentation would occur in the river. Consequently, existing biotic resources would not be significantly impacted by implementation of the Specific Plan. The velocity of flow would increase no more than 4 percent at the County line due to development of the Specific Plan and, in all cases, the post-development velocity for the two-year storm would be approximately 5.2 feet per second. This would not result in a substantial increase in erosiveness; therefore, existing biotic resources would not be significantly impacted;

- (b) The Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP") would be developed to serve the Specific Plan land uses. A recycled water distribution system would be designed to use tertiary treated wastewater from the WRP to irrigate land uses within the Specific Plan that can accept non-potable water. Even without the project revisions reflected in the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis (Topical Response 13), the EIR Wastewater Section anticipates that there would be approximately 286 to 1,025 acre-feet of the recycled water, which may not be needed during the winter months, and which could be discharged to the river. This results in an approximately 6 percent increase in the annual flow volume in the river at the County line. The discharge would be 319 acre-feet per month in the highest months of December and January. This translates to a flow rate of approximately 5.2 cubic feet per second ("cfs"). During a year of average rainfall, the WRP discharge of 5.2 cfs would increase the river flow of 56 cfs by about 9.3 percent. Although it is possible that the 5.2 cfs discharge could increase the river flow of 17 cfs by about 30 percent in a drought year, it is highly unlikely since irrigation requirements for landscaping in a drought year would increase and the actual discharge would be significantly reduced, if not eliminated. The average annual and peak WRP discharges of recycled water do not significantly increase the river flow, either annually or monthly;
- (c) Potential indirect impacts to the SEA 23 due to sedimentation and debris transport during construction and subsequent to development would be controlled by the installation of desilting and debris basins, drainage swales, slope drains, storm drain inlet/outlet protection, and sediment traps, all of which would be designed as part of the final drainage plans prepared for each subdivision map. Section 2.5 (Public Services and Facilities Plan) of the Specific Plan provides conceptual drainage and flood control improvements, which include National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") water quality basins; requires that all tributaries with flows greater than 2,000 cfs would require open drainage systems; and requires that all additional NPDES requirements be met;
- (d) The confluence of the Santa Clara River tributaries (Castaic, San Martinez, and Chiquito Canyon creeks) with the river are all within the SEA 23 boundary and are preserved in a largely natural state pursuant to the Section 2.5 (Public Services and Facilities Plan) and Section 2.6 (Resource Management Plan) of the Specific Plan; and

- (e) In summary, the Specific Plan has been designed to maintain water bodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state. As indicated above, no significant increases in velocity, erosion, or sedimentation would occur in the river because of the Specific Plan. During most storm events, the velocity and depth of the river would remain unchanged from current conditions, since the course of the river is able to meander without being constrained by bridge abutments or bank protection. It is only in the infrequent 50- to 100-year event where small increases in depth or velocity will occur at certain locations along the river. Please refer to the Floodplain Chapter for detailed analysis of Specific Plan impacts to the depth and velocity of flow water in the Santa Clara River. As indicated, these increases do not significantly affect the water flow in the river.

Design Compatibility Criterion No. 3. The requested development is designed so that wildlife movement corridors are left in an undisturbed and natural state. The Board's determination in this regard is based on the following additional findings:

- (a) Under the Specific Plan, SEA 23 would continue to function as a wildlife movement corridor because the plan retains both the riparian vegetation in the river and the natural flow of the water without the need for periodic vegetation clearing; the Specific Plan now shows a substantially reduced level of impact to sensitive riparian habitat along the Santa Clara River (the originally proposed 103 acres of impact has been reduced to approximately one acre); the Specific Plan results in an increase of five acres in the amount of sensitive riparian habitat along the river; the plan also establishes transition areas to separate SEA 23 from the urban uses identified in the Land Use Plan, as discussed below; the three bridges over the river would be sufficiently high as to allow the continued use of the river by animals for movement east to west along and within the river route; and lighting controls are required to ensure that the SEA 23 would continue to function as a wildlife movement corridor. Section 2.5 (Public Services and Facilities Plan) and Section 2.6 (Resources Management Plan) of the Specific Plan provide objectives and conceptual plans for preserving the river and Salt Canyon in a natural and undisturbed state. The EIR addresses impacts and imposes mitigation measures for any impacts that would occur. As a condition of approval, the applicant is also conserving in perpetuity approximately 1,500 acres of the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura

County, adjacent to the Specific Plan site, which will enhance the Specific Plan's compatibility with animal movement in the region;

- (b) The tributaries (Castaic, San Martinez, and Chiquito Canyon creeks) to the Santa Clara River within SEA 23 are all maintained and are preserved in a largely natural state with soft bottoms pursuant to Section 2.5 (Public Services and Facilities Plan) and Section 2.6 (Resources Management Plan) of the Specific Plan. Furthermore, the remainder of these tributaries outside SEA 23, but within the Specific Plan, are designated Open Area and are preserved in a largely natural state;
- (c) The Salt Canyon area of the Specific Plan serves as a wildlife movement corridor. The limited development proposed within SEA 23 would not have any impact upon this wildlife movement area and, as indicated above, approximately 1,500 acres of the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County, adjacent to the Specific Plan site, would be conserved in perpetuity, thereby enhancing the Specific Plan's compatibility with animal movement in the region; and
- (d) Caltrans has completed the widening of SR-126 from Fillmore in Ventura County to the I-5 freeway in Los Angeles County. As part of that widening project, major north/south animal movement undercrossings were installed under SR-126 at three locations. In addition, three additional larger undercrossings exist along SR-126 within the Specific Plan area at locations where bridges and culverts were constructed over secondary tributary stream courses. Because the Ventura County undercrossings were designed to facilitate north/south wildlife movement, and because the three undercrossings within the Specific Plan site are of sufficient size to accommodate north/south wildlife movement, the County is of the opinion that north/south connectivity across the Santa Clara River will not be significantly impacted. For further information regarding Salt Canyon, please refer to Section 2.2 of the Additional Analysis.

Design Compatibility Criterion No. 4. The requested development retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resources from said requested development. The Board's determination in this regard is based on the following additional findings:

- (a) Species that utilize the Santa Clara River Corridor are typically found in the riverbed itself or within the riparian habitats found adjacent to the river course. As discussed under the first

compatibility criterion above, after combining the land preserved in the revised SEA (975 acres) with the preserved Open Area immediately adjacent to the revised SEA (415 acres), a total of 1,390 acres of undisturbed land would be preserved as part of the Specific Plan, including 577 acres of sensitive habitat. The existing SEA 23 consists of 380 acres of sensitive habitats. Due to Specific Plan implementation, the amount of sensitive riparian habitat in SEA 23 would actually increase by approximately five acres when compared with the amount of sensitive habitat within the existing SEA 23. This additional amount of land would provide sufficient habitat and open areas to buffer the sensitive resources from the one acre of sensitive habitat redesignated for non-residential land uses within existing SEA 23;

- (b) In addition to the amount of land that will be permanently preserved for use by sensitive species, the Specific Plan requires a setback between the river and proposed land uses of 75 to 100 feet in width. This area will be planted with native species to buffer sensitive species from potential impact. The Specific Plan also provides transition areas between the riparian resources of the proposed SEA 23/River Corridor SMA and proposed urban development;
- (c) In general, the transition areas would be trails; open areas, including natural or revegetated slopes and other planted areas; and bank protection areas, which would consist of buried bank stabilization. Approximately 34,000 lineal feet of bank hardening is necessary to protect development within the Specific Plan. Where protection is required on the north side of the river, approximately 73 percent of the required stabilization will consist of buried bank protection. On the south side of the river, buried bank protection represents 72 percent of the bank protection required along the river. Buried bank protection areas would be restored to a natural condition through the planting of native species over the stabilized areas, thereby enabling their use by sensitive animal species.

The regional river trail would extend along the northern edge for the entire five mile length of the Specific Plan. The regional river trail would be built on land, which is elevated and provided with buried bank protection where necessary in order to eliminate flooding and bank erosion. Where bank protection does not exist, the trail would be located on a natural shelf above the elevation of the river.

The Specific Plan also includes 415 acres of Open Area, including oak-filled canyons, river bluffs, and a community park that would

separate riparian habitats from urban development on the south side of the river. The Specific Plan contains a number of measures that are intended to promote compatibility between developed uses and preserved Open Area. For example, the RMP (Section 2.6) contains standards covering recreation and access, location and nature of bank protection, and grading. The RMP requires graded areas adjacent to and within SEAs to be clearly marked, thereby buffering and avoiding important habitat areas from impacts from development. Furthermore, Chapter 4 (Design Guidelines) of the Specific Plan requires shielded lighting fixtures to minimize glare and direct rays impacts to adjacent areas, resulting in additional protection of the habitat areas.

The tributaries (Castaic, San Martinez, and Chiquito Canyon creeks) to the Santa Clara River are all maintained with SEA 23 and are preserved in a largely natural state pursuant to Section 2.5 (Public Services and Facilities Plan) and Section 2.6 (Resource Management Plan) of the Specific Plan. Furthermore, the remainder of these tributaries within the Specific Plan are designated Open Area and are preserved in a largely natural state.

The Board previously evaluated the adequacy of the width of the proposed buffer area along the Santa Clara River when the Specific Plan was originally approved in March 1999. Prior to final approval, the Board required that the Specific Plan design be revised to incorporate an additional 100-foot buffer between development and riparian resources to protect riparian habitat and sensitive species within SEA 23 boundaries. This finding was arrived at after evaluating the potential impacts of proposed land uses along the entire length of the river, coupled with the existing habitat protection and enhancement provisions contained in the Specific Plan RMP and Design Guidelines.

Exhibits depicting the Newhall Ranch River Corridor riparian habitat buffers along the entire course of the Santa Clara River within the Specific Plan boundaries were presented to the Commission in a Staff Report, dated August 27, 2001. The exhibits show the width of the buffer between the riparian resource river as originally approved by the Board. (Note that the exhibits do not reflect changes to the Potrero Bridge, the WRP site, and the other areas no longer proposed for development, which increase the acreage of riparian habitat and buffer area.)

As shown on the exhibits, the width of the riparian habitat corridor varies from a minimum of 300 feet to 2,205 feet (0.4 miles) at its

widest point. The total buffer area (478 acres) varies in width from a minimum of 135 feet to more than 800 feet and is three-quarters the size of the riparian habitat area itself. The average buffer width is approximately 400 feet. As shown on the exhibits, the buffer widths are greatest where the existing riparian habitat corridor is the narrowest; in some cases two to three times greater.

The buffer area is comprised of several different components:

(a) the Salt Creek wildlife corridor connection and the High Country half-mile-wide buffer at the west end of the Specific Plan on the south side of the river; (b) native upland habitats in the Open Area along the south side of the river; (c) disturbed areas within the River Corridor that will be restored or enhanced as riparian habitat; (d) buried bank stabilization that will be revegetated with native riparian and upland plant species; and (e) landscaped open space areas, such as community parks, the Regional River Trail, and community trails. In addition, these Specific Plan buffer areas will be enhanced by the condition requiring the applicant to conserve approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County, adjacent to the Specific Plan site;

- (d) The Specific Plan, Chapter 2.6, Resource Management Plan, provides standards by which biological resources will be managed during construction and thereafter for the life of the community. It contains: (i) provisions for restoration and enhancement of disturbed areas such as agricultural fields; (ii) restrictions on pedestrian and vehicular access to the river corridor; (iii) design standards for transition areas between development and the river; (iv) conveyance of conservation easements; and (v) preparation of a financial plan for the long-term management of the riparian resources by the Center for Natural Lands Management. In addition, the Specific Plan, Chapter 4, Design Guidelines, contains provisions restricting the manner in which developed areas relate to the River Corridor, including site planning, fencing, landscape design, grading, and lighting. These measures satisfy the General Plan SEA design compatibility criteria as means to protect sensitive habitat and species, including the unarmored three-spine stickleback ("UTS") and least Bell's vireo; and
- (e) In summary, the Specific Plan retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and open space to buffer critical resources found in SEA 23 from the proposed development shown in the Specific Plan. Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in the direct preservation of 1,390 acres of land along the Santa Clara River Corridor within the boundaries of the plan area. The Specific Plan

also incorporates an extensive buffer area to protect critical resources within SEA 23.

Design Compatibility Criterion No. 5. Where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas from development. The Board's determination in this regard is based on the following additional findings:

- (a) The discussion of compatibility criterion 4, above, describes how the Specific Plan incorporates vegetative cover and open space to buffer critical resources from proposed uses. In addition to these features, the Specific Plan also buffers habitat from proposed uses through development regulations and design guidelines. As indicated in Chapter 4 of the Specific Plan, future residential subdivisions and commercial development constructed within the Specific Plan area must include fences or walls that will preclude access to sensitive resources within SEA 23. As each tract or parcel map is submitted to the County of Los Angeles, it will be reviewed to determine whether proposed uses substantially comply with the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan, including those pertaining to fencing and walls to ensure that they buffer important SEA 23 habitat areas from development; and
- (b) As a condition to this permit, the applicant shall work with the County's biologists to enhance and increase the effectiveness of animal movement protections within the Salt Creek Wildlife Corridor, including the possible use of fencing.

Design Compatibility Criterion No. 6. Roads and utilities serving the requested development are located and designed so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas, or migratory paths. The Board's determination in this regard is based on the following additional findings:

- (a) The Specific Plan proposes the construction of three bridges and several utility lines across the Santa Clara River, within the existing SEA 23. Utilities serving the proposed Specific Plan, where feasible, would be incorporated with the river bridges. However, the Specific Plan also proposes two utility crossings as shown on Figure 2.4-6. Both would contain wastewater lines, and possibly water lines, natural gas piping, and electrical power lines. Both crossings would be buried beneath the river and its banks. The construction disturbance zone is estimated at 85 feet wide but will vary dependent upon the design of the facility and construction methods employed. Specific information would be provided to permitting authorities at the time of project design. The

construction zone would be revegetated with native species upon completion of construction activities consistent with the Specific Plan and federal and state resource permit requirements. As a result, potential impacts would be minimized and movement paths of animals would be unimpeded;

- (b) The Specific Plan also proposes three elevated highway bridge crossings over the Santa Clara River. The number and general location of the bridge crossings were established in order to minimize impacts on SEA 23 and other sensitive resources and to minimize major access points to SR-126. Each of the bridge crossings is an extension of an existing road, creating a functional regional circulation system;
- (c) Construction of bridges would involve various equipment, such as excavators, bulldozers, cranes, backhoes, haul trucks, and concrete trucks. Temporary impacts would occur during installation of support columns in the riverbed as well as construction of bridge abutments. Excavations will be designed to minimize riverbed disturbance while satisfying the structural requirements of construction. The construction disturbance zone is estimated at 100 feet wide on each side of the bridge, but the actual distance will vary dependent upon the design of the facility and construction methods employed. Specific information would be provided at the time of bridge design. As with utility crossings, disturbed federal and state resource permit requirements;
- (d) The bridge crossings would have support columns in the riverbed, but the crossings are elevated structures so as to reduce impacts on river vegetation and sensitive species and to allow species that move along the river course to continue to use existing resources. The elevated bridge crossings replace the existing at-grade agriculture crossings, which would reduce the amount of direct disturbance to the riverbed and its environs;
- (e) The three proposed bridges would connect the development areas south of the Santa Clara River to SR-126. SR-126 is a major east-west arterial along the north bank of the river serving local and regional traffic that is proposed for widening to six lanes from Potrero Canyon eastward through the Specific Plan boundary. These bridge routes also connect to, and are a continuation of, existing arterial roads north of SR-126; namely, Commerce Center Drive, Chiquito Canyon Road, and San Martinez Grande Road. Each of the three bridges is an essential feature of the overall Specific Plan circulation system, and each plays an essential role in

providing the necessary traffic accessibility and capacity for the Specific Plan. As described below in the subsection entitled "The Need for the Three Proposed Bridges and Their Designs," consistent with the County's General Plan, the bridge locations and designs were selected in such a way as to minimize impacts to sensitive biotic resources in and adjacent to the river while, at the same time, balancing the topographical constraints of the site and engineering requirements of the structures and adjoining roadways;

- (f) The Santa Clara River, which flows westerly, parallels the southerly side of SR-126 and, in some areas, is immediately adjacent to this four-lane highway. The existing ground between the north side of the river and SR-126 is fairly level, while the southerly side of the river has bluffs several hundred feet high with some major drainages cutting the bluffs into segments. The basic design concept is to provide safe, four-way connections with existing roadways from the north, then extend southerly across SR-126 and the Santa Clara River, preserving as much as possible the biotic resources by spanning the river with bridges. After crossing the Santa Clara River, the design goal is to minimize grading of the bluffs by laying roads between bluff segments, along the sides of incised drainages;
- (g) The Potrero Bridge was scrutinized further to determine if increasing the span (length) of the bridge would reduce environmental impacts to the river within SEA 23. The proximity of development on the north side of the river adjacent to the Potrero Bridge was an issue previously reviewed by the Commission during the original approval process in 1996 and 1997. As a result of those concerns, the original Specific Plan was specifically revised in this area to reduce the direct and indirect impacts to the river and to reduce the risk of bank erosion. The significant changes made at that time included: (a) 5.6 acres of development area was eliminated and converted to River Corridor; (b) the Commercial and Medium Residential designations were reclassified to Mixed-Use to reduce the potential for more intrusive land uses; and (c) 190 residential units were eliminated;
- (h) By way of background, the Potrero Valley Road is a secondary highway in both the Specific Plan and the County Master Plan of Highways. The Potrero Bridge is the longest bridge in the Specific Plan with a total length of approximately 1,300 feet and a width of 84 feet (see, FAA, Section 2.4.7.4 and 2.4.7.5). At Commission hearings, discussions took place regarding the lengthening of this bridge span, and an exhibit was presented in the Commission's

August 27, 2001, Staff Report (Exhibit 2), depicting the bridge with an increased span. As shown on that exhibit, the southerly abutment is located as close to the mouth of Potrero Valley as practicable to preserve the large sensitive cottonwood riparian habitat south of the active Santa Clara River channel;

- (i) Potential impacts from the Potrero Bridge (without any increase in its span) included loss of habitat from construction due to piers and the bridge "shadow effect" (2.5 acres) and changes in velocity, scouring, or water depth due to narrowing of the watercourse. By extending the length of the bridge by an additional two spans (for a total length of 1,500 feet), the bridge "shadow effect" would increase by 0.4 acre, but no sensitive riparian habitat would be impacted, only existing farm field. The location of bank stabilization would also need to be modified if the bridge abutment is moved north. However, by lengthening the bridge by two spans (for a total of 1,500 feet), an additional 2.9 acres of farm field could potentially become part of the river bottom to offset the shadow effect. Based on the Final Additional Analysis, this would have a beneficial impact by reducing river velocities 18 percent and by increasing the amount of habitat available to the UTS. The width of the post-project floodplain would be increased in this area, allowing floodwaters to slow down and thereby reduce scour. This would have a beneficial impact and minimize the change in flows in the river system; and
- (j) A report, entitled "Newhall Ranch Engineering Design Summary and Report for Bridge Crossings of the Santa Clara River," is attached as Appendix 2.4(a) to the Final Additional Analysis. The report is supplemental to the document, entitled "Traffic Study for the Newhall Ranch Bridge Crossings of the Santa Clara River," prepared by Austin-Foust Associates. This design summary addresses selection of the location and span of the three proposed bridge crossings of the Santa Clara River in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. It is intended to summarize the physical constraints, required design criteria, and provisions adopted to satisfy those requirements.

37. The Board finds that the proposed bridge crossings conform to other policies of the County's General Plan related to development within SEAs. For example, the Board considered General Plan Circulation Element Policy 22, which calls for "avoidance" of the "construction of transportation facilities within significant ecological areas unless found essential following a detailed analysis of alternatives, including a "no project" alternative. Even if the transportation facility

is still found to be necessary after the alternatives analysis, this policy requires that the facility be constructed "in the most environmentally sensitive manner."

- (a) Both the Commission and Board have considered a variety of alternative locations and configurations for each bridge crossing, as well as alternative spans for each bridge, taking into account natural constraints, such as geography and sensitive habitat, as well as safety and engineering constraints, such as intersection angles, minimum curve radii, super-elevation, design speed, and sight distance. Both the Commission and Board considered a no project alternative but rejected the alternative as infeasible because many of the basic objectives of the Specific Plan would not be attained and many of the benefits associated with the Specific Plan would not be realized. Both the Commission and Board also considered the fact that the bridge crossings would serve Specific Plan and regional transportation needs, provide necessary connections in the County's Master Plan of Arterial Highways, provide access between the Specific Plan site and the commercial centers north of SR-126, and provide emergency access route alternatives. Based on its consideration of alternative bridge locations and spans, and geographical, design, and safety constraints, both the Commission and Board have concluded that the three bridge crossings, at the proposed locations, are essential for the safe and adequate circulation of traffic for the Specific Plan and the region and will be constructed in the most environmentally sensitive manner;
- (b) In addition, both the Commission and Board have determined that the bridge crossings would advance many other General Plan goals related to transportation, land use, noise control, safety, energy conservation, and air quality. This determination is based on the discussion of these goals and how the proposed bridge crossings contribute to attaining these other General Plan goals, which is found in the Final Additional Analysis, revised Section 2.4; and
- (c) Recognizing the resource values within existing SEA 23 and the constraints imposed by competing priorities and objectives, on balance, the Board finds that the road and utility crossings do not conflict with critical resources, habitat areas, or migratory paths in the existing SEA 23 boundary, particularly when considered in the context of the SEA design compatibility criteria (discussed above) and the other relevant General Plan policies (discussed above).

38. Oil and natural gas operations, agricultural operations, and grazing operations currently exist and will continue to exist in both of the aforementioned SEAs as permitted uses. Although these uses predate the SEA designation and will be "grandfathered" as existing uses in the Specific Plan, they are considered consistent with the SEA General Plan compatibility criteria for a number of reasons. First, existing uses were not designated as incompatible when the SEAs were created. Existing agricultural, grazing, and oil and gas uses were considered compatible with the resource values present in the SEAs, since there was no indication that the County intended to regulate those existing uses under either the SEA General Plan provisions or Zoning Ordinance at the time of their adoption. Second, these uses have been operating since (and were operating prior to) the formation of the SEAs. Third, the County General Plan indicates that there is no intent under the SEA procedure to preclude "reasonable use of privately held lands." In addition, the General Plan recognizes the need to balance competing priorities between resource preservation and other critical public needs. Rather than unreasonably restrict such uses, the General Plan seeks to provide a process for reconciling conflicts between proposed land uses and the preservation of identified SEAs. The continuing operation of agricultural, grazing, and oil and natural gas operations indicates the absence of such conflicts. In addition, grazing will be subject to the provisions of the RMP (Chapter 2.6 of the Specific Plan), which provides a set of standards by which biological and cultural resources will be managed to avoid impacts to sensitive areas, including the SEA. Oil and natural gas operations will be operated in accordance with all state and federal laws and abandoned oil-related sites must be remediated to the satisfaction of all state and County requirements.
39. In conjunction with its prior adoption of this CUP, the Board found that the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR (SCH No. 95011015) had been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code section 21000 *et seq.*) and the state and County Guidelines relating thereto. The Board found that the Final EIR contained a description of the project, documented the project's potential impacts, and identified mitigation measures, which will be implemented as part of the project. The Board stated that it had independently reviewed the information contained in the Final EIR.
40. The Board further found that implementation of the Specific Plan will result in specifically identified significant effects upon the environment. However, except for adverse effects upon agricultural resources (conversion of prime agricultural land), visual qualities, air quality, biological resources, and solid waste disposal, which could not be found to be completely mitigated, the Board found that such specifically identified significant adverse effects could be reduced to acceptable levels with the mitigation measures identified in the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR and the adopted Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

41. With respect to the adverse effects upon agricultural resources (conversion of prime agricultural land), visual qualities, air quality, biological resources, and solid waste disposal, which could not be adequately mitigated, the Board determined that the substantial benefits resulting from implementation of the project outweighed the potential unavoidable adverse effects and were acceptable based on the overriding considerations set forth in the Board's prior CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Specific Plan. The Board's prior CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, which were concurrently adopted by the Board, are incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full.
42. The Board further found that the mitigation measures in the Final EIR were incorporated into the conditions of approval for this conditional use permit and related parcel map (VTPM No. 24500). The Board also found that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan contained in the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, and attached as an exhibit to the Board's prior CEQA Findings, identified the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential adverse impacts to the environment is ensured.
43. The proposed Specific Plan and this conditional use permit are consistent with the economic portion (Urban Services Analysis) of the Development Monitoring System, since there will be adequate water service, sewer discharge capacity, schools, and fire service with implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the previously certified Final EIR and the Final Additional Analysis.

As it relates to water supplies for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors' above finding is also made to respond to the Court's decision in the Newhall Ranch litigation directing the County to take action to ensure that the Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies.

Based on the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.5, Water Resources, and the record, the Board finds that an adequate supply of water is available to meet the demands of the Specific Plan, without creating significant environmental impacts, and consistent with the County's DMS water supply requirements.

As stated in the Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.5, the applicant has responded to the Court's direction to demonstrate availability of identified water supplies by now relying on its own primary sources of water supply. The first source is the applicant's historical alluvial groundwater produced in the County of Los Angeles that is presently committed to agriculture uses. The second source is the applicant's purchase of water from Nickel Family LLC in Kern County (the

"Nickel Water"). Because these two independent primary water sources meet the potable water needs of the Specific Plan, no potable water would be needed from State Water Project ("SWP") and Castaic Lake Water Agency ("CLWA") supplies, except as a source for supplemental water supplies, if needed.

Furthermore, as stated, the applicant has undertaken several major steps to identify supplemental water supplies to enhance the overall reliability of the water supply for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Specifically, the applicant has accomplished the following:

- Secured 7,648 acre feet per year ("AFY") of additional SWP water entitlement from landowners who are served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency.
- Purchased 55,000 acre feet ("AF") of groundwater banking storage capacity, which includes the ability to use up to 4,950 AF of water during dry years as a water supply from the Semitropic Water Storage District.
- Determined through comprehensive groundwater testing that the local Saugus aquifer can be successfully used for groundwater banking through an ASR program.
- Along with members of the "Downstream Water Users," including the United Water Conservation District, forwarded a unanimously supported request to the State Department of Water Resources ("DWR") to amend the 1978 Castaic Creek Flood Flow agreement, thereby making these flows available for use in groundwater banking and for other appropriate beneficial water uses. This step improves the potential to use Castaic Creek flood flows.
- Determined that CLWA could provide the applicant with supplemental water supplies, if needed.

The relationships between Newhall Ranch water demand and supply in normal/average and dry years are provided in the Final Additional Analysis, at Tables ES-1 and ES-2, and are illustrated in Chart ES-1.

Based on the data presented in the Final Additional Analysis and record, the Board of Supervisors further finds that the Specific Plan is consistent with the County's DMS policies as they relate to water supplies. The Final Additional Analysis and record contain an analysis determining that sufficient water supplies will be available for the Specific Plan under the County's General Plan DMS requirements. As revised by the Final Additional Analysis, Topical Response 13, the projected total water demand for the Specific Plan, as revised, is 17,395

acre-feet per year in average years and 19,134 acre-feet per year dry years. The analysis addressed water supply requirements resulting from buildout of all pending, recorded, and approved projects listed in the County's DMS, plus the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Under the DMS analysis, there will be sufficient water supplies for the entire demand of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and all pending, approved and recorded projects in DMS. Because two independent primary water sources have been secured to meet the potable water needs of the Specific Plan, no additional potable water would be needed from SWP and the CLWA supplies, except as a source for supplemental water supplies, if needed. In fact, as revised, a surplus of approximately 16,851 to 44,388 AFY would occur in average years and a surplus of approximately 16,866 to 88,403 AFY would occur in dry years.

The analysis also shows that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site is located immediately adjacent to existing development and the retail water service area of the Valencia Water Company. The site is also within the wholesale service area of CLWA. The Specific Plan site is located approximately one eighth of one mile from the Magic Mountain Theme Park, Castaic Junction, and the Valencia Commerce Center, and approximately three quarters of a mile from the Valencia Industrial Park. All of these existing development areas are served by County or other public services, and provide commercial services and job opportunities. As indicated above, more than enough water supplies are available to the Specific Plan to meet its projected demand, as shown in the Final Additional Analysis, Subsection 2.5.5.4(a)(1) entitled "DMS General Plan Consistency," and other portions of the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings.

44. The proposed Specific Plan and this conditional use permit are consistent with the social portion of the Development Monitoring System, since there is adequate road service and commercial and employment facilities are located in close proximity to the Specific Plan. The road service was evaluated as part of the environmental analysis in the Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis, and the proximity to commercial and employment facilities was evaluated as part of the field investigation and general plan/specific plan evaluation.
45. The Specific Plan and this conditional use permit are consistent with the environmental portion of the Development Monitoring System, since there are no significant unmitigated geotechnical, flood hazard, or fire impacts, and the Specific Plan does not affect publicly held or privately dedicated open space, as shown in the County General Plan. The Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis evaluated numerous environmental topics as part of the assessment of the Specific Plan. Mitigation measures and alternatives were evaluated as part of the environmental analysis in the Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis.

46. The Board makes the following findings with respect to the Final Additional Analysis:
- (a) The Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015) has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the Court's decision and writ;
 - (b) The Board has independently reviewed the information contained in the Final Additional Analysis, in conjunction with its review of the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR;
 - (c) When certifying the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR, the Board previously acknowledged that the Specific Plan could potentially have significant environmental impacts. To minimize those impacts, the Board required the adoption of numerous mitigation measures, which were contained in the adopted Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and the Water Reclamation Plant. Even after mitigation, the Specific Plan still posed certain unavoidable significant environmental impacts. As permitted under CEQA, the Board approved the Specific Plan despite its unavoidable impacts, finding in its CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations that the substantial benefits resulting from implementation of the Specific Plan outweighed those impacts;
 - (d) The Final Additional Analysis does not identify any significant environmental impacts not fully addressed in the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR and adopted Mitigation Monitoring Plans. Nonetheless, the Final Additional Analysis identifies additional and revised mitigation measures that further minimize the Specific Plan's impacts. Those measures are presented in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, attached as exhibits to the "Additional CEQA Findings." Both the Additional CEQA Findings and revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans are incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full; and
 - (e) The mitigation measures in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant are also incorporated into the conditions of approval for this permit. The revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans, attached as exhibits to the "Additional CEQA Findings," identify the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential adverse impacts to the environment is ensured.

BASED UPON THE FOREGOING FINDINGS, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONCLUDES:

1. The proposed development will be consistent with the adopted General Plan for the area.
2. The Specific Plan adjusts the existing SEA 23 boundaries by removing a limited amount of acreage for development from the existing SEA; the existing SEA will nevertheless remain in a viable and largely natural condition, particularly when taking into account major factors influencing the realization of General Plan objectives in this regard, including competing priorities between resource preservation and other General Plan policies and objectives.
3. The proposed development conforms with the General Plan's SEA "design compatibility criteria," in that:
 - (a) The proposed development is designed to be highly compatible with biotic resources present in the existing SEA 23, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas;
 - (b) The proposed development is designed to maintain water bodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state within the existing SEA 23;
 - (c) The proposed development is designed so that wildlife movement corridors are left in a natural and undisturbed state within the existing SEA 23;
 - (d) The proposed development retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resources within the existing SEA 23 from the proposed development;
 - (e) The proposed development provides fences or walls where necessary to buffer important habitat within the existing SEA 23 from proposed development; and
 - (f) The proposed development locates and designs roads and utilities serving the development so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas, or migratory paths within the existing SEA 23.
4. The Specific Plan is sensitive to, and compatible with, the biotic resources of the existing SEA 23;
5. The proposed development at the locations proposed will not:

- (a) Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area; or
 - (b) Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or
 - (c) Jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.
- 6. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping, other development features prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance, or as otherwise required in order to integrate said uses with the uses in the surrounding areas.
- 7. The site is adequately served:
 - (a) By highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate; and
 - (b) By other public or private service facilities as are required.

THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

- 1. Certifies that the Final Additional Analysis has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and the Court's decision and writ in the prior Newhall Ranch litigation; and that the Final Additional Analysis reflects the independent judgment of the Board;
- 2. Certifies that the Board has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015), in conjunction with its review of the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR prior to its approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5);
- 3. Determines that the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the previously certified Final EIR and the Final Additional Analysis are the only mitigation measures for the Specific Plan, which are feasible, and that the unavoidable significant effects of the Specific Plan, after adoption of the conditions and mitigation measures, are as described in the Final EIR, Final Additional Analysis, and the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant;

4. Determines that the remaining, unavoidable significant effects of the Specific Plan, as described in the Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis, have been either reduced to an acceptable level or are outweighed by the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations of the Specific Plan, as stated in the previously approved CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations (February 1999), as well as the Additional CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations (May 2003);
5. Adopts the attached Additional CEQA Findings for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, including the determination that the Water Reclamation Plant On Site Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts), as described in subsection 3.5.4 of the Final Additional Analysis, is the environmentally superior Water Reclamation Plant site alternative, and the revised Statement of Overriding Considerations, which are part of the Additional CEQA Findings.
6. Approves and adopts the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, incorporated in the Final Additional Analysis, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, finds that the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans, which are incorporated herein by this reference, are adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during Specific Plan implementation; and
7. Approves Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5), subject to the attached conditions.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 94-087-(5)

1. These conditions apply to both Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") 20 and SEA 23. Portions of SEA 20 and SEA 23 are located within the subject property, commonly known as "Newhall Ranch." The conditions identified below under the heading, "SEA 20 Conditions of Approval," were previously adopted by the Board of Supervisors ("Board") on March 23, 1999, remain valid in all respects and are repeated here for completeness.
2. The conditions adopted by the Board on March 23, 1999, as they relate to SEA 23, were set aside in response to the Court's decision issued in the Newhall Ranch litigation. After reconsidering the Newhall Ranch project approvals, the Board hereby adopts the following conditions of approval for both SEA 20 and SEA 23.

SEA 20 Conditions of Approval

The following general conditions apply throughout the entire project unless otherwise specified.

3. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.
4. This grant shall not be effective until:
 - (a) The permittee and the owner of the property involved (if other than the permittee) have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning ("Department") their affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant; and
 - (b) An ordinance changing the zoning of the property from A-2-2, A-2-5, and M-1.5 to "Specific Plan," as recommended in Zone Change No. 94-087-(5), has been adopted by the Board and has become effective.
5. It is declared and made a condition of this permit that if any condition hereof is violated, or if any law, statute, or ordinance is violated, the permit shall be suspended, and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse; provided, that the permittee has been given written notice to cease such violation and has failed to do so for a period of 30 days.

6. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or a hearing officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or hearing officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety, or so as to be a nuisance.
7. The subject property shall be developed, maintained, and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant, with all requirements of Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 24500, and with existing laws, statutes, ordinances, or other regulations applicable to any vesting development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance with the above shall be a violation of these conditions.
8. If any future inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse the Department for all additional enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance.

The following conditions relate to the environmental mitigation measures established for this project.

9. The environmental mitigation measures set forth in the revised "Mitigation Monitoring Plans" for both the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and the Water Reclamation Plant are hereby incorporated by this reference, as if set forth in full, and are made conditions of this conditional use permit. The Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant are contained in Section 4.0 of the Newhall Ranch Revised Additional Analysis (May 2003), Vol. VIII, and are exhibits to the "Additional CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations (May 2003)," which have been adopted by the Board in connection with its certification of the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis to the previously certified Final EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant (SCH No. 95011015). The revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant are on file at the Department.
10. Monitoring Report Requirements: As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures and conditions of approval set forth in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, the permittee shall submit mitigation monitoring reports to the Department. The reports shall describe the status of compliance with the mitigation measures and conditions of approval adopted as conditions of this grant.

The reports shall be submitted and approved in the following sequence:

- (a) Prior to, or concurrent with, a submittal to be approved by the Department, and prior to issuance of grading permits by the Department of Public Works; and
 - (b) Additional reports as deemed necessary by the Department.
- 11. An Environmental Documentation Deposit Account shall be established and maintained pursuant to Section 12.040.020 of the Los Angeles County Code to defray the costs of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the reports required by Condition No. 10 hereof.
 - 12. All mitigation measures and conditions of approval listed in the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, the previously certified Final EIR (SCH No. 95011015), and the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant shall be implemented in a timely manner and in accordance with the monitoring actions contained in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans.

The following conditions relate to graffiti removal.

- 13. All structures, walls, and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings, or signage that do not provide pertinent information about the premises.
- 14. In the event of such extraneous markings occurring, the permittee shall remove or cover the markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours following such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint used in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.

The following conditions relate to the permittee's obligations in the event of a legal challenge.

- 15. The permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County of Los Angeles, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code section 65009, or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall promptly notify the permittee of

any claim, action, or proceeding, and the County shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding, or if the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the permittee shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the County.

16. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay the Department an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the Department's cooperation in the defense, including, but not limited to, depositions, court testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:
 - (a) If, during the litigation process, actual costs incurred by the Department reach 80 percent of the amount of deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation; and
 - (b) At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents shall be paid by the permittee according to Section 2.170.010 of the Los Angeles County Code.

17. It is hereby declared that if any provision of this permit is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void, and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.

SEA 23 Conditions of Approval

The following general conditions apply throughout the entire project unless otherwise specified.

18. General Condition Nos. 3 through 9, above, are incorporated herein by this reference, as if set forth in full, and are adopted as applied to SEA 23.

The following conditions relate to the environmental mitigation measures established for this project.

19. The environmental mitigation measures set forth in the revised "Mitigation Monitoring Plans" for both the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and the Water Reclamation Plant are hereby incorporated by this reference, as if set forth in full, and are made conditions of this conditional use permit. The Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant are contained in Section 4.0 of the Newhall Ranch Revised Additional Analysis (May 2003), Vol. VIII, and are exhibits to the "Additional CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations (May 2003)," which have been adopted by the Board in connection with its certification of the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis to the previously certified Final EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant (SCH No. 95011015). The revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant are on file at the Department.
20. Monitoring Report Requirements: As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures and conditions of approval set forth in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, the permittee shall submit mitigation monitoring reports to the Department. The reports shall describe the status of compliance with the mitigation measures and conditions of approval adopted as conditions of this grant.

The reports shall be submitted and approved in the following sequence:

 - (a) Prior to, or concurrent with, a submittal to be approved by the Department, and prior to issuance of grading permits by the Department of Public Works; and
 - (b) Additional reports as deemed necessary by the Department.
21. An Environmental Documentation Deposit Account shall be established and maintained pursuant to Section 12.040.020 of the Los Angeles County Code to defray the costs of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the reports required by Condition No. 8 hereof.
22. All mitigation measures and conditions of approval listed in the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, the previously certified Final EIR (SCH No. 95011015), and the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant shall be implemented in a timely manner and in

accordance with the monitoring actions contained in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans.

The following conditions relate to graffiti removal.

23. General Condition Nos. 13 and 14, above, are incorporated herein by reference, as if set forth in full, and are adopted as applied to SEA 23.

The following conditions relate to the permittee obligations in the event of a legal challenge.

24. General Condition Nos. 15, 16, and 17, above, are incorporated herein by reference, as if set forth in full, and are adopted as applied to SEA 23.

The following new conditions were added by the Regional Planning Commission and relate to SEA 23 and other areas within the project boundaries. The Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the following conditions previously approved by the Commission:

25. The length of the proposed Potrero Bridge shall be extended by an additional two spans for a total length of 1,500 feet to further minimize intrusion into the floodplain in conjunction with the future bridge design, subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works.
26. The On Site Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts) for the Water Reclamation Plant site, as described in subsection 3.5.4 of the Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015) and as depicted in Figure 3.0-7 of that document, shall be implemented.
27. The permittee shall work with the County's biologist to enhance and increase the effectiveness of animal movement protections within the Salt Creek wildlife corridor, including the possible use of fencing.

The following new conditions were added by the Board of Supervisors, since the Regional Planning Commission hearings, and relate to SEA 23 and other areas within the project boundaries:

28. The permittee shall contact its consultants to advise them that specific existing provisions in the consultant contracts allow consultants to disclose to the County all environmental-related information associated with the Specific Plan and related actions. The permittee shall further amend its contracts to either eliminate such confidentiality provisions or make clear that consultants are not

precluded from disclosing and, in fact, are required to disclose environmental-related information regarding Newhall Ranch to the County.

29. The permittee shall obtain disclosure statements, signed under penalty of perjury, from its consultants certifying that the consultants' reports, studies, or other environmental-related information required for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan EIR and additional analyses have been fully disclosed in that environmental documentation.
30. The permittee shall provide the County with the same "property access" and "document access" provisions as those contained in the settlement reached with the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG").
31. The permittee shall amend its existing consultant contracts to ensure that the "document access" provisions in the Newhall/CDFG settlement are made part of Newhall's consultant contracts.
32. The permittee shall revise its current mitigation relating to ongoing agricultural activities (Mitigation Measure 4.6-79) to ensure that the applicant's ongoing agricultural activities will not significantly impact the spineflower.
33. The permittee shall be required to submit a signed statement, filed concurrently with the filing of any departmental development application, obligating the permittee to disclose to the Department the existence of any endangered or threatened species that are known or suspected to exist on the subject property.
34. The permittee shall be required to report to the Department the results of all on-site biological surveys within 30 days after completion of the survey work.
35. The permittee shall schedule a consultation meeting between its representatives, the Department, the applicant, and the applicable environmental consultant(s) to discuss the results of the survey work, and to ensure public disclosure of the survey results in the required environmental documentation for the proposed project.
36. Clean sediment, periodically removed from debris basins within or outside the Specific Plan, may be placed into the Santa Clara River area as approved by the Department of Public Works and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by the Department of Public Works.
37. Prior to approval of the first subdivision map, which permits construction, a report will be provided by the applicant, which evaluates methods to recharge the

Saugus Aquifer within the Specific Plan, including the identification of appropriate candidate land areas for recharge. The report shall be subject to approval by the Department of Public Works and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by the Department of Public Works.

38. All purchasers of homes within any subdivision in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are to be provided with a disclosure statement in the purchase/sales documentation making the purchaser(s) aware that the parking and storage of recreational vehicles on the purchased home/lot must satisfy the standards established by the County of Los Angeles and/or as contained in the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions ("CC&Rs"), whichever is more restrictive.
39. The Board's motion on March 25, 2003, directed that changes be made to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Land Use Plan to further protect the spineflower from possible future development impacts. Those changes include elimination of future development and transferable development potential from the 64 acres of spineflower preserves/buffers dedicated by conservation easement to the CDFG. This change results in the elimination of 730 dwelling units and 131,647 square feet of commercial development from the Specific Plan. These changes occur in the portions of the Specific Plan site, which are generally known as Grapevine Mesa and Airport Mesa, the two locations where the CDFG conservation easement areas are located.
40. To further reduce the potential for significant impacts to the San Fernando Valley spineflower found in the San Martinez area of Newhall Ranch, the Board has required that additional Mitigation Measure 4.6-80 be added to the EIR spineflower mitigation program. This new mitigation measure is contained in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and is incorporated herein by reference, as if set forth in full.
41. The Board has required that the Specific Plan mitigation measures be amended to preclude roadways or road rights-of-way from being constructed in all spineflower preserve and buffer locations, unless constructing a road in such locations is found to be the environmentally superior alternative. In response to the Board's direction, existing EIR Mitigation Measures 4.6-67 and 4.6-70 have been amended, consistent with the Board's direction. The amended mitigation measures are contained in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and are incorporated herein by reference, as if set forth in full.
42. Upon approval of the first tract map adjacent to Ventura County in the Oak Valley Village of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the permittee has agreed to grant to the public in perpetuity 1,517 acres of land encompassing the Salt Creek

watershed in Ventura County. The permittee, or its designee, shall satisfy this condition by dedicating said land in fee and/or by conservation easement, as determined by the County in its sole discretion, to the joint powers authority, which is responsible for overall recreation and conservation of the Newhall Ranch High County Special Management Area ("SMA"). Said land shall be managed in conjunction with and in the same manner as the High Country SMA.

43. Upon approval of the Specific Plan and in connection with the submittal of additional environmental documentation for the Newhall Ranch project, each consultant preparing, or participating in a study or investigation for, that additional documentation, shall provide a disclosure statement to the Director of Planning, signed under penalty of perjury, stating that it has disclosed to County staff all relevant environmental information and data obtained during its work, including, but not limited to, all information regarding the presence of any endangered, threatened, or candidate species.
44. Upon approval of the Specific Plan, the permittee is directed to provide sufficient funding on an annual basis in the reasonable discretion of the Director of Planning, to allow the Department to retain a consultant(s), or to compensate its own consultant(s), for purposes of conducting a peer review, as determined necessary by the Department, of all additional environmental documentation submitted for further environmental review by the applicant's consultant(s) or sub-consultant(s).
45. To ensure that an adequate supply of water is available for the Specific Plan over the long term, the Board has required that existing mitigation be amended to address the term of the Nickel Water agreement. In response to the Board's direction, existing EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11-20 has been revised to address issues concerning the term of the Nickel Water agreement. The revised mitigation measure is contained in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and is incorporated herein by reference, as if set forth in full.
46. The permittee or its designee shall provide the Department with an annual status report throughout the construction phases stating the number of residential units constructed; the square footage of all commercial and industrial buildings completed; the dates of dedication or completion for all required infrastructure and community amenities; the status of all tentative and approved subdivision maps and discretionary zoning applications, including associated CEQA environmental reviews filed with the County; and, the status of all discretionary applications from government agencies other than the County, identified as either an Enforcement Agency or Monitoring Agency in the Revised Mitigation

Monitoring Plan for the Specific Plan. This reporting requirement shall be contained in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and the Specific Plan Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

47. The Specific Plan shall contain a residential setback provision requiring that if the County's general setback standards in place at the time building permits are obtained for the Newhall Ranch project phases are more stringent than the existing standards contained in the Specific Plan, then the more stringent setback standards shall be applied.

May 20, 2003

Syn. No. 36
3/25/03

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 94-087-(5)
SUB-PLAN AMENDMENT NUMBER 94-087-(5)
FIFTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT / THREE-VOTE MATTER**

On March 25, 2003, your Board conducted its hearing on the recommendation of the Planning Commission to approve amendments to the Countywide General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan relating to the adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

Your Board closed the hearing, adopted a motion with amendments regarding proposed measures that you wished to have included in any potential approval of the project, and instructed us to prepare a proposed resolution and exhibits for the above-referenced general and sub-plan amendments. Enclosed are the proposed plan amendment resolution and exhibits for your consideration and possible use in the event you decide to approve the project.

The Department of Regional Planning will transmit the proposed Newhall Ranch Specific Plan with appropriate revisions directly to your Board for your consideration and possible approval.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD W. PELLMAN
County Counsel

By
RICHARD D. WEISS
Principal Deputy County Counsel

APPROVED AND RELEASED:

LLOYD W. PELLMAN
County Counsel

RDW/
Enclosures

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
RELATING TO ADOPTION OF
LOS ANGELES COUNTY GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 94-087-(5)
SANTA CLARITA VALLEY AREAWIDE PLAN AMENDMENT 94-087-(5)
(SUB-PLAN AMENDMENT)
NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN**

WHEREAS, Article 6 of Chapter 3 of Division I of Title 7 of the Government Code of the State of California (commencing with section 65350) provides for adoption of amendments to county general plans; and

WHEREAS, Article 8 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code of the State of California (commencing with section 65450) provides for the adoption of specific plans by resolution; and

WHEREAS, on June 30, 1994, and thereafter, The Newhall Land and Farming Company ("Newhall") submitted applications to the Department of Regional Planning of the County of Los Angeles for General Plan and Sub-Plan amendments 94-087-(5), the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Zone Change 94-087-(5), Conditional Use Permit 94-087-(5), and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 24500-(5) for the project entitled the "Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant"; and

WHEREAS, the subject property, Newhall Ranch, is an 11,963-acre site located in the northwestern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County and within the County's Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area; and

WHEREAS, the Newhall Ranch project approvals, as described below, would allow for both the adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), relating to proposed large-scale, mixed-use planned development, and construction of a Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"), as a part of the proposed Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with preparation of the Newhall Ranch project approvals, as described below, and in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 *et seq.*) ("CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15000 *et seq.*) ("the Guidelines"), the County caused to be prepared the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant Final Environmental Impact Report ("Newhall Ranch Final EIR") (SCH No. 95011015); and

WHEREAS, after preparation and public circulation of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR, the Commission of the County of Los Angeles ("Commission") conducted

concurrent public hearings regarding the Specific Plan, WRP, related project approvals, as described below, and the Newhall Ranch Final EIR on October 9, 1996; November 4, 1996 (field trip/public testimony); November 6, 1996; November 26, 1996; January 16, 1997; February 18, 1997; April 23, 1997; June 11, 1997; and December 17, 1997; and

WHEREAS, on December 17, 1997, the Commission unanimously: (a) certified the Newhall Ranch Final EIR; (b) adopted the Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Specific Plan and WRP; (c) adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations; (d) recommended approval of the proposed General Plan and Sub-Plan amendments, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, and Zone Change; and (e) approved the Conditional Use Permit and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") conducted concurrent public hearings regarding the Newhall Ranch Final EIR and the General Plan and Sub-Plan amendments, Zone Change, Specific Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map on March 24, 1998; July 28, 1998; November 24, 1998; and March 23, 1999; and

WHEREAS, the Board duly considered the decisions and recommendations of the Commission, the public testimony for and against the Newhall Ranch project, the recommendations and testimony of both the Department of Regional Planning and Department of Public Works, and the Newhall Ranch Final EIR and related documents, including the documentation within the files of both departments; and

WHEREAS, on March 23, 1999, the Board unanimously: (a) certified the Newhall Ranch Final EIR; (b) adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations; (c) approved the Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Specific Plan and WRP; and (d) approved the Newhall Ranch General Plan and Sub-Plan amendments, Zone Change, Specific Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (collectively, the "Project Approvals"); and

WHEREAS, on or about April 21, 1999, the County of Ventura, *et al.*; the United Water Conservation District; the Sierra Club, *et al.*; and Maria Vega, *et al.*, filed petitions for writ of mandate challenging the County's approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Project Approvals and its certification of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR ("the Newhall Ranch litigation"); and

WHEREAS, on May 31, 2000, after a two-day hearing before the Honorable Roger D. Randall of the Kern County Superior Court, the Court issued a Ruling, followed by a Statement of Decision, Peremptory Writ of Mandate ("Court's writ"), and Judgment on August 1, 2000, in connection with the Newhall Ranch litigation; and

WHEREAS, the Court's writ directed the County and the Board to do the following:

- a. Void certification of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR (SCH No. 95011015), but only with respect to the specific issues described in paragraphs 2(a) through (e) of the Court's writ;
- b. Suspend any and all specific project activity or activities that could result in an adverse change or alteration to the physical environment, unless and until the County and the Board have taken the actions specified in the Court's writ to bring those actions into compliance with CEQA in accord with the Court's Statement of Decision with regard to the specific issues identified in the Court's writ;
- c. Set aside approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, General Plan and Santa Clarita Areawide Plan amendments 94-087-(5), Zone Change 94-087-(5), and Conditional Use Permit 94-087-(5), but only as those approvals relate to Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") 23 and to Los Angeles County's Development Monitoring System ("DMS") as it applies to water supplies;
- d. Take action to ensure that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan policies of the County requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23 and the General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies; and
- e. File a return to the Court's writ within 90 days after completing the actions taken to comply with the requirements of the Court's writ; and

WHEREAS, in response to the Court's writ, the Board adopted a resolution which, among other things:

- a. Voided the Board's certification of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR, but only with respect to the specific issues described in paragraphs 2(a) through (e) of the Court's writ;
- b. Suspended any and all specific project activity or activities that could result in an adverse change or alteration to the physical environment, unless and until the County and the Board have taken the actions specified in the Court's writ to bring those actions into compliance with CEQA and the Court's Statement of Decision, with regard to the specific issues in the Court's writ;
- c. Set aside approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, General Plan and Areawide Plan amendments 94-087-(5), Zone Change 94-087-(5), and Conditional Use

Permit 94-087-(5), but only as those approvals relate to SEA 23 and Los Angeles County's DMS policies regarding water supplies (the Board's March 23, 1999, approval of Vesting Tentative Parcel Map 24500 remained valid in its entirety, because the Court's writ did not set aside any portion of that approval);

d. Directed that actions be taken to ensure that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan policies of the County requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23 and the General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies; and

e. Directed County staff to prepare, or cause to be prepared, an additional environmental analysis under CEQA that would address each of the specific issues described in the Court's writ and Statement of Decision; and

WHEREAS, in response to the Board's resolution, County staff caused to be prepared the Draft Additional Analysis to the Newhall Ranch Final EIR ("Draft Additional Analysis"), which addressed the specific issues identified in the Court's writ and Statement of Decision. On November 13, 2000, County staff distributed the Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of the Draft Additional Analysis to various public agencies and other interested groups, and received responses to the NOP. On April 19, 2001, County staff caused to be prepared and circulated the Notice of Availability of the Draft Additional Analysis and caused the Draft Additional Analysis, Volumes I through III, in conjunction with the Newhall Ranch Final EIR, to be circulated for public review; and

WHEREAS, the public review and comment period on the Draft Additional Analysis was to occur for a 60-day period, commencing on April 20, 2001, to June 19, 2001 (15 days longer than required by CEQA). The Commission held public hearings on Newhall Ranch and the Draft Additional Analysis on June 16, 2001 (field trip); June 20, 2001; July 16, 2001; and August 27, 2001. During the public hearing on July 16, 2001, the Commission extended the public comment period on the Draft Additional Analysis through August 27, 2001 (for a total public review period of 130 days); and

WHEREAS, the Commission reviewed and considered the Draft Additional Analysis, Volumes I through III, including public comments, and written responses to those comments, all of which were presented in the Final Additional Analysis to the Newhall Ranch Final EIR ("Final Additional Analysis"). The Commission also reviewed the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, in conjunction with the additional analysis performed in response to the Court's writ; and

WHEREAS, on October 24, 2001, the Commission unanimously adopted a resolution and related actions, which included recommendations that the Board hold a

public hearing, certify the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, and approve the Project Approvals; and

WHEREAS, following the Commission action, a noticed public hearing was set before the Board for November 27, 2001, which was continued until January 29, 2002, and, prior to that date, on January 10, 2002, the appellate court in another action issued a ruling setting aside an Environmental Impact Report prepared by Castaic Lake Water Agency relating to the purchase of 41,000 acre-feet per year of State Water Project ("SWP") water entitlement by that agency, whose water was, in part, relied on as a source of water supply for Newhall Ranch ("CLWA Action"); and

WHEREAS, on January 22, 2002, the Board continued its public hearing to April 23, 2002, stating that, "[s]ince water availability is a critical issue in the Santa Clarita Valley and for this project, ...the hearing on this project should be continued until staff can fully analyze the ramifications of the [CLWA] appellate court ruling and its effect on Newhall Ranch." (Board Motion, January 22, 2002); and

WHEREAS, on April 16, 2002, the Board again continued its public hearing to August 27, 2002, stating that the appellate court in the CLWA Action had not set aside or invalidated CLWA's agreement for the purchase of the 41,000 acre-feet per year of water entitlement; however, CLWA had not yet sought clarification from the trial court regarding the appropriate remedy to be issued. (Board Motion, April 16, 2002) In continuing the public hearing, the Board stated that water availability is a critical issue in the Santa Clarita Valley and for this project, and that the project hearing should be further continued until the applicant could demonstrate water sources for Newhall Ranch; and

WHEREAS, on August 6, 2002, the Board again continued its public hearing to January 28, 2003, stating that the Department of Regional Planning, with the concurrence of County Counsel, had determined that there was "new information affecting the proposed Newhall Ranch development," including the recent discovery of additional San Fernando Valley spineflower, an endangered plant, and the need to identify a reliable water supply source for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The Board's motion also directed that the new information be presented to the public and other agencies and circulated in accordance with CEQA, the state CEQA Guidelines and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines. Consistent with the Board's motion, staff directed preparation of the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft Additional Analysis (November 2002) to describe and analyze the changes to the sources of water to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, and to assess the Specific Plan's impacts on the spineflower, along with an analysis of additional mitigation measures and project alternatives; and

WHEREAS, on October 25, 2002, the trial court in the CLWA Action issued its writ and decision, clarifying that CLWA was not prohibited from using the 41,000 acre-feet of water to which claimed entitlement, and the court's writ and other documents were circulated for public review as part of the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft Additional Analysis (November 2002), Vol. II, Appendices 2.5(n), (q) and (r); and

WHEREAS, on January 21, 2003, the Board again continued its public hearing on Newhall Ranch until March 25, 2003. In continuing the hearing, the Board also extended the public comment period, which commenced on November 27, 2002, and ended on January 27, 2003, to February 4, 2003 (for a total public comment period of 70 days). In addition, the Board instructed staff to prepare and circulate for public review the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis (March 2003), Vol. III-IV, which included written responses to public comments received on the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, along with other important materials and appendix documents; and

WHEREAS, on March 25, 2003, the Board conducted a concurrent public hearing regarding Newhall Ranch. The public hearing was for the Board to consider the Project Approvals and the Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001), Final Additional Analysis (October 2001), Vol. I and II, Revised Draft Additional Analysis (November 2002), Vols. I and II, and the Final Additional Analysis (March 2003), Vol. III and IV (collectively, "the Final Additional Analysis"), pursuant to the Court's writ and decision in the Newhall Ranch litigation; and

WHEREAS, at least ten days prior to the May 27, 2003, public meeting, the County's Department of Regional Planning directed the public circulation of the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis (May 2003), Vols. VI and VI, and provided that documentation, along with the appropriate staff report, to the Board for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Board has duly considered the recommendations of the Commission, the public testimony for and against the Newhall Ranch project, the recommendations and testimony of both the Department of Regional Planning and Department of Public Works, and the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, including the appendices, other documentation referenced in that environmental documentation; staff reports and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds as follows:

1. The applicant proposes a Specific Plan to guide development of a new community composed of a broad range of residential, mixed-use, and non-residential land uses within five villages on the Newhall Ranch property site. A Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP") is proposed as part of the Newhall Ranch

Specific Plan to provide wastewater treatment, disposal and reclamation of treated water for reuse within the Specific Plan. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan contains the land use plan, development regulations, design guidelines, and implementation program necessary to guide the long-term development of the Newhall Ranch community. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan serves as the zoning for the Newhall Ranch community. Subsequent development plans and subdivision maps would be required to conform with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, as well as the Countywide General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan. Build out of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is projected to take 25 to 30 years. With the exception of the WRP, approval of the entitlements presently before the Board would not, in and of themselves, allow actual construction of any component of Newhall Ranch. The applicant will still be required to file subsequent applications for tentative tract maps, conditional use permits, and oak tree permits prior to issuance of any building permits to enable actual construction of the Newhall Ranch residential, mixed-use, commercial, or business park uses.

2. The subject property, Newhall Ranch, is an 11,963-acre irregularly shaped site located in the northwestern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County in the Santa Clara River Valley. The property site is within the County's Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area. The property is one-half mile west of the Golden State Freeway (I-5) and largely southwest of the junction of I-5 and State Route 126 (SR-126), located between the Magic Mountain Theme Park on the east and the Los Angeles County/Ventura County boundary line on the west. The City of Santa Clarita is located east of the Specific Plan site just beyond I-5, approximately one mile from the Specific Plan site. SR-126 and the Santa Clara River transect the Specific Plan site from east to west, with a majority of the Specific Plan area south of SR-126 and the Santa Clara River.
3. The land uses surrounding the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site include, to the north, relatively sparse rural residential uses (the community of Val Verde), landfill uses (Chiquita Canyon), oil and natural gas production uses, high intensity business park uses (Valencia Commerce Center), urban single-family homes and low intensity commercial uses (Castaic corridor), and undeveloped land; on the east, a water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, high-intensity commercial/recreational uses (Magic Mountain Theme Park), hotels, restaurants, and service stations adjacent to I-5, urban density residential uses (Stevenson Ranch), and undeveloped land; on the south, undeveloped land; and on the west, agricultural production, oil and natural gas production, and undeveloped land.
4. Present (and historical) land uses on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site include vacant land with oil and natural gas operations; agriculture primarily

along the Santa Clara River Corridor (including the proposed WRP site), on the mesas overlooking the River, and in the wider canyon bottoms; and cattle grazing in Potrero Canyon, along the River, and in other upland and mountainous portions of Newhall Ranch. Newhall Ranch is also periodically used by the movie industry for set locations. Several employee homes, an oil company office, and miscellaneous other structures are also on site. The central and northeastern portions of the property are heavily traversed with dirt and asphalt roads, which provide access to numerous graded oil well pads and pipelines, and pumping, storage, and transmission facilities for existing oil and natural gas operations. The applicant presently leases out portions of the Specific Plan site for on-going oil and natural gas operations, as well as for cattle grazing and limited irrigated crop and dry land agricultural operations. There are major Southern California Edison Company ("SCE") electrical transmission lines and Southern California Gas Company ("SCGC") pipelines within easements traversing the property that would remain in place or be relocated. There are also a variety of electrical distribution lines and smaller natural gas and water lines that are either to remain in place, be relocated, or be removed during development.

5. Site topography is dominated by east-, west-, and northwest-trending primary ridges, with generally north- and south-trending secondary ridges. Site elevations range from approximately 825 feet above mean sea level in the Santa Clara River bottom at the County line (and nearby the WRP site) to approximately 3,200 feet above mean sea level on the ridgeline of the Santa Susana Mountains along the southern edge of the site. Slope gradients vary from moderate to steep in the hillside areas to very gentle within the Santa Clara River flood plain, in major tributary canyons, and on uplifted terrace (mesa) surfaces adjacent to the Santa Clara River. Approximately 46 percent of the Specific Plan site is comprised of slopes less than 25 percent in gradient. Distinctive elevated features include Sawtooth Ridge along the eastern side of Long/Adobe Canyon, Ayers Rock at the northern edge of Potrero Canyon, and various mesas, which lie above the Santa Clara River along its southern bank. There are numerous other distinctive ridges within the Santa Susana Mountains that comprise the southernmost portion of the property.
6. Direct access to the Specific Plan site is currently provided by SR-126. The I-5/SR-126 interchange is located approximately one-half mile east of the site. Both I-5 and SR-126 provide connections to five metropolitan area freeways (I-210, SR-118, I-405, SR-114, and SR-170). San Martinez Grande Road and Chiquito Canyon Road, north of SR-126, provide access to the northern portion of the site. South of SR-126, the site is crisscrossed by a network of paved and unpaved roads, which were established to serve the oil and natural gas operation sites, as well as cattle and agricultural uses.

7. The Specific Plan site is within the Santa Clara Valley River basin and contains ten drainage areas, all of which drain into the Santa Clara River. The Santa Clara River transects the northern portion of the Specific Plan site from east to west. Salt Creek, Potrero Canyon, Chiquito Creek, Long Canyon, San Martinez Grande, and other unnamed drainage courses also either originate on or flow through the site. Two SEAs overlie portions of the Specific Plan site, SEA 20 and SEA 23. SEA 20 is primarily noted for its diverse oak woodland habitat and its facilitation of species movement between the San Gabriel and Santa Monica mountains via the Simi Hills. The Santa Clara River Corridor SEA ("SEA 23") is noted for its wetlands and habitat for the unarmored threespine stickleback ("UTS") fish. Approximately 5,237 acres (43.8 percent) of the Specific Plan site are currently within these Significant Ecological Areas.
8. At the July 28, 1998, session of the Board's Newhall Ranch public hearing, the Board adopted a motion requiring the applicant to make significant reductions to the project design in order to address a number of issues raised by the Board, the City of Santa Clarita, Ventura County, other public agencies and organizations, as well as various Santa Clarita Valley and Ventura County residents. In response to the Board's motion of July 28, 1998, several revisions were made to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, and agreements and other project-related modifications were documented. The 1998 project-related changes included:
 - a. Reductions in the overall size of the development and reduced impacts to the two Significant Ecological Areas;
 - b. Provisions for dedication of the High Country;
 - c. Construction of the High Country trail;
 - d. Discretionary approval requirement imposed on all second housing units;
 - e. Inclusion of affordable housing;
 - f. Buried river bank stabilization;
 - g. Provision for a wider buffer along the Santa Clara River;
 - h. Development standards for view protection of the Santa Clara River and bluffs south of the river;
 - i. Consideration of contour grading and ridgeline protection as proposed by the City of Santa Clarita;

- j. Additional provisions to protect groundwater supply; and
- k. Requirement for fully improved parks and timely provision of library and fire station facilities.

In addition, the Board requested that the applicant reach agreements with the affected school districts, the Val Verde Civic Association, and the City of Santa Clarita. In response to the Board's motion of July 28, 1998, the agreements between the applicant and the Val Verde Civic Association and the school districts have been included in the Chapter 7 Appendix of the Specific Plan. Additionally, those parts of the agreement directly applicable to a section of the Specific Plan have been incorporated into the Specific Plan itself. The agreements reached between the applicant and the City of Santa Clarita also have been incorporated into the Specific Plan. The 1998 revisions, agreements, and modifications relating to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP are discussed in detail in the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning staff report, dated November 17, 1998. Specifically, the Newhall Ranch Land Use Plan changes resulting from the Board's July 28, 1998, motion are reflected in the "Land Use Plan," attached as Exhibit A to the staff report. Exhibit B to the staff report shows the revised "Land Use Plan" following implementation of the Board's motion. Exhibit C to the staff report shows the revised "Overall Land Use Plan Statistical Table" (Table 2-3-1) for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The aforementioned staff report, on file at the Department of Regional Planning, is incorporated herein by this reference, as if set forth in full.

- 9. As part of the Board's March 1999 Resolution approving the Project Approvals for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP, the Board had considered all of the revisions, agreements, and modifications to the Newhall Ranch project and had determined that none of the revisions, agreements, or modifications created any new significant project or cumulative environmental impacts, nor did such revisions increase the severity of any already identified project or cumulative impacts. To the contrary, the Board found that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the above-described revisions, agreements, and modifications to Newhall Ranch generally reduced the magnitude of the adverse environmental impacts created by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP.
- 10. Overall, the 1998 revisions, agreements, and modifications required by the Board's July 28, 1998, motion resulted in a reduction of the total number of planned dwelling units permitted by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan to 21,615 units, excluding any second units (which now require conditional use permit approval). The total acres of major Open Area were expanded to 6,138 acres from 5,885 acres, an increase of 253 acres. The land use changes directed by

the Board also resulted in a reduction in the amount of ground disturbance by approximately 210 acres, which created a corresponding reduction in the amount of grading of approximately 4,500,000 cubic yards. The table below shows the changes to the land uses for Newhall Ranch, as compared to those recommended by the Commission.

Table 1: Statistical Summary of Changes to Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (1999)						
Land Uses	Original Specific Plan		Revised Specific Plan (1998/1999)		Changes	
	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units
Residential						
Estate	1,234.2	523	1326.1	423	91.9	-100
Low	876.9	1,917	744.4	671	-132.5	-1,246
Low-Medium	2,013.0	6,856	1,796.9	6,000	-216.1	-856
Medium	841.4	7,663	845.7	7,652	4.3	-11
High	121.8	2,376	121.8	2,376		
Subtotal	5,087.3	19,335	4,835.0	17,122	-252.3	-2,213
Mixed-Use/Non Residential						
Mixed-Use	630.4	4,493	630.4	4,493		
Commercial	67.2		67.2			
Business Park	256.3		256.3			
Visitor Serving		36.7		36.7		
Subtotal	990.6	4,493	990.6	4,493	0.0	0
Major Open Areas						
High Country SMA	3,949.9		4,213.8		263.9	
River Corridor SMA	818.6		818.6			
Open Area	1,117.0		1,105.8		-11.2	
Subtotal	5,885.5		6,138.2		252.7	
Total	11,963.4	23,828	11,963.3	21,615		-2,213
Total excluding second units requiring CUP		24,351		21,615		-2,736
Total including maximum second units, each requiring CUP		24,351		22,038		-2,313

11. Since the Board's action approving the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP on March 23, 1999, and in response to the additional environmental analysis, public comments, and further motions by the Board on March 25, 2003, several revisions were made to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, along with the imposition of other conditions of approval and mitigation measures. A summary of the most current revisions, as of May 2003, include:
 - a. Creation of 64 acres of spineflower conservation easement areas as a result of a settlement agreement between the applicant and the California Department of Fish and Game and a decision by the Board to require that all development and development potential be removed from the involved 64 acres resulting in the following land use changes:
 - (i) Reduction of residential uses of 730 units; and
 - (ii) Reduction in non-residential uses of 132,000 square feet;
 - b. Creation of three spineflower Special Study Mitigation Overlay Areas;
 - c. Additional provisions to further mitigate potential impacts to spineflower, including:
 - (i) Amendments to mitigation measures regarding the exclusion of roads in all spineflower preserves and buffer areas, unless certain
 - (ii) Added mitigation requiring establishment of an appropriately sized spineflower preserve area at San Martinez Canyon; and
 - (iii) The adoption of further County staff spineflower mitigation recommendations;
 - d. Modified SEA 23 proposal to include an additional 156 acres and reducing area to be redesignated to development from 28 acres to one acre;
 - e. An increase in the span of the Potrero Bridge by 200 feet to reduce impacts to the Santa Clara River;
 - f. Addition of a requirement to dedicate 1,517 acres to the public, representing the remaining portion of the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County, adjacent to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan;

- g. Reduced sensitive habitat impacts of the Water Reclamation Plant;
 - h. Additional provisions to ensure water availability on Newhall Ranch in the long term;
 - i. Other protective measures to ensure ongoing disclosure and adequacy of future environmental documentation (*e.g.*, consultant disclosure statements, peer review funding); and
 - j. Additional project-related requirements (*e.g.*, annual status reports, revised setback requirements).
12. Based on the Board's most recent changes to the land uses for Newhall Ranch, the table below shows the Newhall Ranch Land Use Plan statistical breakdown, as approved by this resolution, as of May 2003. As shown below, the unit count for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan has been further reduced from 21,615 units (excluding second units requiring CUP) to 20,885 units (excluding second units requiring CUP).

Table 1.0-1
LAND USE PLAN STATISTICAL BREAKDOWN
 (Table 2.3-1 from Specific Plan)

LAND USES	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units	Second Units ¹	Land Use Overlays	Approx. Acre Allocation
Residential:					
Estate ¹	1,324.0	423	423	10 Neighborhood Parks	50 ac
Low	744.4	671		5 Elementary Schools	35 ac
Low-Medium	1,781.7	6,000		1 Junior High School	25 ac
Medium	841.0	7,371		1 High School	45 ac
High	121.8	2,319		1 Golf Course	180 ac
Subtotal	4,812.9	16,784	423	2 Fire Stations	2 ac
				1 Library	2 ac
Mixed-Use/Non-Residential:				1 Water Reclamation Plant	15 ac
Mixed Use ²	628.7	4,101		1 Lake	15 ac
Commercial	67.2			3 Community Parks	181 ac
Business Park	248.6			1 Electrical Substation	2 ac
Visitor Serving	36.7			Arterial Roads	331 ac
Subtotal	981.1	4,101	0		
Major Open Areas:					
High Country SMA	4,184.6				
River Corridor SMA	974.8				
Open Area	1,010.4				
Subtotal	6,169.8	0	0		
TOTAL	11,963.8	20,885	423		
(Total Units including Second units ¹)		21,308			
¹ Within each Estate lot one (1) Second Unit is eligible to be constructed with the approval of a CUP (see Second Units, Section 3.9). This may increase the total number of permitted dwelling units of 20,885 by 423, to a total maximum number of units of up to 21,308. ² Mixed-use includes commercial and residential uses.					

13. As part of the Board's most recent revisions to the Specific Plan (May 2003), including imposition of other conditions of approval and mitigation measures, the Board has determined that none of the revisions, agreements, conditions of approval, modifications, or mitigation measures create any new significant project

or cumulative environmental impacts, nor do such revisions increase the severity of any already identified project or cumulative impacts. To the contrary, the Board finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the above-summarized most recent revisions, agreements, conditions of approval, modifications, or mitigation measures to Newhall Ranch generally reduce the magnitude of the adverse environmental impacts created by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP (see, Final Additional Analysis (May 2003), Vol. VI, Topical Response 13: Description of Specific Plan Revisions And Environmental Effects of the Revisions).

14. General Plan and Sub-Plan amendments No. 94-087-(5), adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Zone Change Case No. 94-087-(5), and Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5) were heard concurrently.
15. The applicant is requesting a change in the Los Angeles County General Plan Land Use Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 1):

Land Use Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 1):

From: Non-Urban (R)
Significant Ecological Area/Habitat Management (SEA)

To: Specific Plan (SP)
Specific Plan/Significant Ecological Area/Habitat Management (SP/SEA)

16. The applicant is requesting the following changes to other Los Angeles County General Plan Policy Maps:

General Development Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 2):

From: Non-Urban Hillside (7)
Other Non-Urban and Agriculture (8)
Significant Ecological Area/Habitat Management (10)

To: Urban Expansion (4)
Significant Ecological Area/Habitat Management (10)

**Housing Development and Neighborhood
Conservation Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 3):**

From: Other Non-Urban and Non-Residential (NR)

To: Residential Expansion (RE)
Other Non-Urban and Non-Residential (NR)

Transportation Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 4):

- a. Add SR-126 as an "Existing Expressway/Freeway" from I-5 to just east of future Commerce Center Drive;
- b. Add SR-126 as a "Potential Expressway/Freeway" from just west of Commerce Center Drive to just west of San Martinez Grande Road; and
- c. Delete the "Existing Railroad Line" designation between I-5 and the Los Angeles/Ventura County boundary.

Highway Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 5):

- a. Change the portion of SR-126 from I-5 to just east of future Commerce Center Drive from "Existing Routes to Serve as Highway Connections of Major Significance Between Urban Areas, and for Non-Urban Circulation, Recreational, Agricultural, and Emergency Access" to "Existing Expressway/Freeway";
- b. Change the portion of SR-126 from just east of future Commerce Center Drive to San Martinez Grande Road from "Existing Routes to Serve as Highway Connections of Major Significance" to "Potential Expressway/Freeway";
- c. Add the following highways as "Potential Routes to Serve as Highway Connections of Major Significance Between Urban Areas, and for Non-Urban Circulation, Recreational, Agricultural, and Emergency Access":
 - (i) Potrero Valley Road from the intersection of SR-126 and San Martinez Grande Road to the easterly boundary of the Specific Plan, where it will connect with the future extension of Valencia Boulevard;

- (ii) Magic Mountain Parkway from Potrero Valley Road to the existing terminus of Magic Mountain Parkway just west of The Old Road;
- (iii) Commerce Center Drive from SR-126 to the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway on the Specific Plan site; and
- (iv) Long Canyon Road from the intersection of SR-126 and Chiquito Canyon Road south to Potrero Valley Road.

**Economic Development and Revitalization Policy Map
(see attached Exhibit 6):**

- a. Designate the Business Park land use designations (Planning Areas RW-04 and RW-24) as "Major Industrial Expansion/Infill Areas";
- b. Delete the "Major Railroad Lines" designation south of SR-126 from I-5 to the Los Angeles/Ventura County boundary; and
- c. Add SR-126 from I-5 west to the Los Angeles/Ventura County boundary as a "Major Transportation Corridor."

Sewerage Service Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 7):

- a. Delete "Proposed Major Trunk Sewers" as shown on map;
- b. Add the trunk lines shown on the Specific Plan Exhibit 2.5-3 Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan as "Proposed Major Trunk Sewers";
- c. Add the Specific Plan Water Reclamation Plant as a "Proposed Water Reclamation/Sewage Treatment Plant"; and
- d. Designate portions of the Specific Plan, which will contain urban land uses as "Areas Needing Additional Service."

Conservation/Open Space Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 8):

Delete the "Special Management Areas" designation within the Specific Plan boundaries except for the Santa Clara River Corridor (revised SEA 23) and the High Country (revised SEA 20).

Special Management Areas Map (see attached Exhibit 9):

- a. Delete SR-126 between I-5 and the Los Angeles/Ventura County boundary as a "First Priority Scenic Highway";
- b. Delete the "Hillside Management" and "Potential Agricultural Preserves" designations within the Specific Plan boundaries except within the High Country (revised SEA 20);
- c. Revise the boundaries of SEA 20 and SEA 23 to correspond with the boundaries of the High Country Special Management Area and the River Corridor Special Management Area, respectively, as shown on the Specific Plan Land Use Map;
- d. Add the Del Valle and Salt Creek fault zones as "Major Fault Zones";
- e. Add a "Mineral Resource Areas" designation near the westerly boundary of the Specific Plan; and
- f. Revise the boundaries of the "Flood Prone Areas" designation to correspond with the 50-year Capital Flood Plain of the Santa Clara River.

Urban Form Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 10):

- a. Change the areas of the Specific Plan, which will be developed with urban uses, from "Non-Urban Areas" to "Urban Areas";
- b. Show SR-126 from I-5 to the Los Angeles/Ventura County boundary as a "Major Transportation Corridor"; and
- c. Add an "Entryways" designation at SR-126 adjacent to the Los Angeles/Ventura County boundary.

Major Recreation Areas Map (see attached Exhibit 11):

Add the Regional Santa Clara River Trail within the Specific Plan boundary as a proposed "Regional Riding and Hiking Trail."

17. The applicant is requesting a change in the adopted Los Angeles County General Plan 2010 demographic projections for the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area to add the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, as follows:

	Adopted Projection	Newhall Ranch Specific Plan	Revised Projection
Population	270,000	57,903	327,903
Housing Units	93,400	20,885	114,285
Employment	111,000	18,795	129,892

18. The applicant is requesting the following changes to policy maps of the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan:

Area Plan - Land Use Policy Map (see attached Exhibit 12):

Change the designations below:

Classification	Acreage	Permitted Intensity (Units/Acre)	Buildout Potential
Non-Urban 1 (<50% Slope)	236.5	.50	118 DU
Non-Urban 1 (>50% Slope)	19.5	.5	1 DU
Non-Urban-2	1,517.0	1.00	1,517 DU
Hillside Management	4,653.7	.5	233 DU
Hillside Management/Significant Ecological Area	4,013.4	.5	201 DU
Commercial	3.4	.1875 FAR	27,770 Sq. Ft. 69 Employees
Industry	1.5	.3 FAR	19,602 Sq. Ft. 59 Employees
Floodway/Flood plain	228.6	NA	NA
Floodway/Flood plain/ Significant Ecological Area	1,289.8	NA	NA
Totals:	11,963.4		2,070 DU 47,372 Sq. Ft. 128 Employees

To: "Specific Plan" (SP)
"Specific Plan/Significant Ecological Area" (SP/SEA).

Scenic Highways Plan:

- a. Eliminate SR-126 between I-5 and the Los Angeles/Ventura County boundary as a "First Priority Study Route" and replace with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

Area Plan - Circulation Plan (see attached Exhibit 13):

- a. Reclassify SR-126 as an 8-lane State Highway from just west of I-5 to just west of Commerce Center Drive; as a 6-lane State Highway from just west of Commerce Center Drive to just west of San Martinez Grande Road/Potrero Valley Road; and as an existing 4-lane State Highway from just west of San Martinez Grande Road/Potrero Valley Road to the westerly Specific Plan boundary;
- b. Delete Pico Canyon Road from SR-126 to a point approximately 2,800 feet west of the easterly Specific Plan boundary. Retain the remaining segment of Pico Canyon Road on the Specific Plan site as an unconstructed Secondary Highway;
- c. Add Potrero Valley Road as an unconstructed Secondary Highway from SR-126 to the easterly boundary of the Specific Plan, where it joins a future extension of Valencia Boulevard (Potrero Valley Road replaces the deleted segment of Pico Canyon Road);
- d. Add Long Canyon Road as an unconstructed Major Highway from SR-126 to a point just south of the Santa Clara River Corridor and as an unconstructed Secondary Highway from just south of the Santa Clara River Corridor to the unconstructed Potrero Valley Road;
- e. Add an extension of Franklin Avenue as an unconstructed Secondary Highway from its current terminus at SR-126 southward and then westward to a connection with the unconstructed Long Canyon Road;
- f. Add an extension of Magic Mountain Parkway as an unconstructed Major Highway from its current terminus westward to the unconstructed Commerce Center Drive and as an unconstructed Secondary Highway from Commerce Center Drive to a connection with the unconstructed Potrero Valley Road;

- g. Realign the connection between Commerce Center Drive, an unconstructed Major Highway, and Magic Mountain Parkway to form a "T" intersection between these roads rather than a continuous roadway;
- h. Redesignate Chiquito Canyon Road between SR-126 and a point approximately 1,600 feet north of SR-126 as "Long Canyon Road." Add a short extension of Long Canyon Road northeast to transition into the future Business Park Road (a commercial collector as shown in the Chiquito Canyon Business Park Alternative Roadway Analysis prepared for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan). The existing Chiquito Canyon Road will form a "T" intersection with Long Canyon Road; and
- i. Realign the portion of Long Canyon Road (formerly Chiquito Canyon Road) north of SR-126 eastward to replace the existing skewed intersection of Chiquito Canyon Road/SR-126.

Area Plan - Trails Plan (see attached Exhibit 14):

Designate the Specific Plan Regional River Trail to provide the trail along the Santa Clara River as shown in the Trails Plan. Designate the Specific Plan Potrero Valley Road Community Trail to provide the Pico Canyon Trail shown in the Trails Plan. Designate that the equestrian portion of the Pico Canyon Trail is directed westerly through the High Country within Grave and Salt canyons.

Area Plan - Bikeways Plan (see attached Exhibit 14):

Designate the Specific Plan Regional River Trail to provide the bikeway shown along the Santa Clara River in the Bikeways Plan.

Plan of Bikeways, Equestrian, and Hiking Trails contained in 1991 Area Plan Update (see attached Exhibit 14):

Designate the Specific Plan Regional River Trail to provide the Bikeway, Equestrian Trail, and Hiking Trail along the Santa Clara River, as shown on the 1991 Plan Of Bikeways, Equestrian, and Hiking Trails.

19. Change the 2010 demographic projections for the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area to add the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, as follows:

	Adopted Projection	Newhall Ranch Specific Plan	Revised Projection
Population	270,000	57,903	327,903
Housing Units	93,400	20,885	114,285
Employment	111,000	18,795	129,892

20. The existing zoning designations on the property are:

Heavy Agriculture -- 2-acre minimum lot size (A-2-2)

Heavy Agriculture -- 5-acre minimum lot size (A-2-5)

Restricted Heavy Manufacturing (M-1.5)

21. The applicant is requesting approval of Zone Change 94-087-(5), which would change the zoning of the property to "Specific Plan."
22. The applicant is requesting that the Board adopt the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, dated May 2003, which has been concurrently presented to the Board.
23. The applicant is requesting approval of Conditional Use Permit 94-087-(5) for the portions of SEA 20 (Santa Susana Mountains) and SEA 23 (Santa Clara River) on the property. The findings of the Board relating to the conditional use permit are incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full.
24. The Board has already approved Vesting Tentative Parcel Map 24500-(5), which permits division of the property into 30 large lots for the purpose of sale, lease, or finance only. The findings of the Board relating to the vesting tentative parcel map are incorporated herein by this reference, as if set forth in full. There are no improvement requirements for the vesting tentative parcel map, and no construction is permitted on any of the parcels without further subdivision.
25. All of the attached exhibits are expressly incorporated and made a part of this Resolution.

26. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, as revised, incorporates design features intended to reduce environmental impacts of development and to remedy existing conditions present on the project site.
27. The technical and engineering aspects of both the Specific Plan and WRP have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, the Forester and Fire Warden, the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Department of Health Services, and the Department of Regional Planning.
28. Compatibility with surrounding land uses will be ensured through the related zone change, conditional use permit, subdivision, and environmental controls.
29. There is no evidence that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan or the WRP will be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site.
30. The proposed project is consistent with the economic portion (Urban Services Analysis) of DMS, since there will be adequate water service, sewer discharge capacity, schools, and fire service with implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final Environmental Impact Report (March 1999) ("Final EIR") and Final Additional Analysis (May 2003) (State Clearinghouse No. 95011015).

As it relates to water supplies for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board's above finding is also made in order to respond to the Court's decision in the Newhall Ranch litigation directing the County to take action to ensure that the Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies.

Based on the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.5, Water Resources, and record, the Board finds that an adequate supply of water is available to meet the demands of the Specific Plan, without creating significant environmental impacts, and consistent with the County's DMS water supply requirements.

As stated in the Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.5, the applicant has responded to the Court's direction to demonstrate availability of identified water supplies by now relying on its own primary sources of water supply. The first source is the applicant's historical alluvial groundwater produced in the County of Los Angeles that is presently committed to agriculture uses. The second source is the applicant's purchase of water from Nickel Family LLC in Kern County (the "Nickel Water"). Because these two independent primary water sources meet

the potable water needs of the Specific Plan, no potable water would be needed from State Water Project ("SWP") and Castaic Lake Water Agency ("CLWA") supplies, except as a source for supplemental water supplies, if needed.

Furthermore, as stated, the applicant has undertaken several major steps to identify supplemental water supplies to enhance the overall reliability of the water supply for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Specifically, the applicant has completed the following:

- a. Secured 7,648 AFY of additional SWP water entitlement from landowners who are served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency;
- b. Purchased 55,000 AF of groundwater banking storage capacity, which includes the ability to use up to 4,950 AF of water during dry years as a water supply from the Semitropic Water Storage District;
- c. Determined through comprehensive groundwater testing that the local Saugus aquifer can be successfully used for groundwater banking through an aquifer storage and recovery ("ASR") program;
- d. Along with members of the "Downstream Water Users," including the United Water Conservation District, forwarded a unanimously supported request to the State Department of Water Resources ("DWR") to amend the 1978 Castaic Creek Flood Flow agreement, thereby making these flows available for use in groundwater banking and for other appropriate beneficial water uses. This step improves the potential to use Castaic Creek flood flows; and
- e. Determined that CLWA could provide the applicant with supplemental water supplies, if needed.

The relationships between Newhall Ranch water demand and supply in normal/average and dry years are provided in the Final Additional Analysis, at Tables ES-1 and ES-2, and are illustrated in Chart ES-1.

Based on the data presented in the Final Additional Analysis and record, the Board further finds that the Specific Plan is consistent with the County's DMS policies as they relate to water supplies. The Final Additional Analysis and record contain an analysis determining that sufficient water supplies will be available for the Specific Plan under the County's General Plan DMS requirements. As revised by the Final Additional Analysis, Topical Response 13, the projected total water demand for the Specific Plan, as revised, is 17,395

acre-feet per year in average years and 19,134 acre-feet per year in dry years. The analysis addressed water supply requirements resulting from buildout of all pending, recorded, and approved projects listed in the County's DMS, plus the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Under the DMS analysis, there will be sufficient water supplies for the entire demand of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and all pending, approved, and recorded projects in the DMS. Because two independent primary water sources have been secured to meet the potable water needs of the Specific Plan, no additional potable water would be needed from the SWP and the CLWA supplies, except as a source for supplemental water supplies, if needed. In fact, as revised, a surplus of approximately 16,851 to 44,388 AFY would occur in average years and a surplus of approximately 16,866 to 88,403 AFY would occur in dry years.

The analysis also shows that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site is located immediately adjacent to existing development. A portion of the Newhall Ranch site is also located within the retail water service area of the Valencia Water Company. In addition, the site is within the wholesale service area of CLWA. The Specific Plan site is located approximately one-eighth of one mile from the Magic Mountain Theme Park, Castaic Junction, and the Valencia Commerce Center, and approximately three-quarters of a mile from the Valencia Industrial Park. All of these existing development areas are served by County or other public services and provide commercial services and job opportunities. As indicated above, more than enough water supplies are available to the Specific Plan to meet its projected demand, as shown in the Final Additional Analysis, subsection 2.5.5.4(a)(1), entitled "DMS General Plan Consistency," and other portions of the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings.

31. The proposed project is consistent with the social portion of the DMS since there is adequate road service, and commercial and employment facilities are located in close proximity to the project. The road service was evaluated as part of the environmental analysis in the Final EIR, and the proximity to commercial and employment facilities was evaluated as part of the field investigation and general plan/specific plan evaluation.
32. The project is consistent with the environmental portion of the DMS since there are no significant unmitigated geotechnical, flood hazard, or fire impacts, and the project does not affect publicly held or privately dedicated open space, as shown in the County General Plan. Both the Final EIR and the Final Additional Analysis evaluated numerous environmental topics as part of the assessment of the project. Mitigation measures and alternatives were evaluated as part of the environmental analysis in both the Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis.

33. In summary, the project:

- avoids premature conversion of undeveloped land to urban uses because it is proximate to, and a natural extension of, existing development;
- promotes a distribution of population consistent with service system capacity, resource availability, environmental limitations, and accessibility;
- directs urban development and revitalization efforts to protect natural and man-made amenities and to avoid severe hazard areas, such as flood prone areas, active fault zones, steep hillsides, landslide areas, and fire hazard areas;
- encourages the efficient use of land through a more concentrated pattern of urban development, including the focusing of new urban growth into areas of suitable land;
- ensures that new development in urban expansion areas will occur in a manner consistent with stated plan policies and will pay for marginal public costs that it generates; and
- focuses intensive urban uses in five villages that are located to effectively provide services throughout the Specific Plan area, including transportation facilities.

34. The recommended General Plan and Areawide Plan amendments will not place an undue burden upon the community's ability to provide necessary facilities and services, as described in the Final EIR.

35. A need exists for the proposed amendments to the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan, and modified conditions warrant a revision to these plans for the following reasons:

- a. Credible evidence exists that future population growth in Los Angeles County will exceed the current County population projection of 10.8 million people by 2010. The State Department of Finance estimated that Los Angeles County population had reached 9.8 million by January 2000. Southern California Association of Governments ("SCAG") projections adopted in 2001 forecast that the County will grow to 11.2 million people by 2015 and 11.7 million in 2020. State Department of Finance projections forecast a County population of 11.6 million by 2020 (see, SCAG, 2001 Regional Transportation Plan, Growth Forecast, and state

Department of Finance, County Population Projections, December 1998, incorporated herein by reference as if set forth in full);

- b. The addition of Newhall Ranch to all known past and future cumulative development would result in less population and fewer housing units than are projected for the Santa Clarita Valley by SCAG for 2015, but would result in a greater amount of employment, which is considered beneficial. Therefore, the project is consistent with the Growth Management Element of the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and would assist in providing sufficient housing and employment to meet anticipated regional population growth, as depicted below:

	Population	Housing Units	Employment
SCV Cumulative Buildout	441,478	152,959	202,218
1990 Census	151,052	48,883	51,594
General Plan Plus Buildout, General Plan Amendments	230,719	82,038	131,398
Newhall Ranch (Revised)	57,903	20,885	18,795
SCAG 2015 Projections	484,099	179,097	117,788

- c. The addition of the Specific Plan land uses to the General Plan would result in a jobs/housing balance of approximately 1.30 jobs per housing unit when all General Plan land uses and Newhall Ranch are built out, which is the ratio projected for the SCAG region as a whole by 2015; and
- d. The Final EIR provides sufficient environmental documentation for amendment of the County General Plan and Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan demographic projections. For each of the environmental topics in which impacts are related to levels of population, housing, or employment growth, the EIR analyzed the cumulative environmental impacts of adding the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan to all past, current, and known potential future development in the Santa Clarita Valley. The cumulative analysis included all existing population, housing, and employment which would result from buildout of all land uses in the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan and City of Santa Clarita General Plan, plus all active pending General Plan amendments in both jurisdictions which would add urban land. The EIR sections containing the

cumulative analysis include: Water Resources; Wastewater Disposal; Education; Libraries; Police; Fire; Traffic/Access; Noise; Natural Gas; Electric; Solid Waste; Parks, Recreation, and Trails; and Population, Housing, and Employment.

36. Amendments to the General Plan and Area Plan for Newhall Ranch are appropriate and proper for the following reasons:
- a. The Specific Plan is consistent with applicable policies of the Los Angeles County and Santa Clarita Valley Areawide plans, as discussed in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Chapter 7 (General Plan Consistency of the Specific Plan);
 - b. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan provides an opportunity to provide needed housing in an area which is relatively close to the Los Angeles metropolitan area, thereby meeting General Plan policies which call for promoting the efficient use of land through a more concentrated pattern of urban development;
 - c. On a localized scale, the Specific Plan site is adjacent to portions of the Santa Clarita Valley, which are already developed or planned for development in the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan. Therefore, no mainline extensions of highways or utilities through rural areas would be required. Due to the project's proximity to other existing development, the project does not constitute "leapfrog" development;
 - d. The Specific Plan would result in the expansion of housing opportunities in close proximity to the major employment centers of the Santa Clarita Valley, which are located in Valencia, and which are expected to provide approximately 100,000 jobs at buildout; and
 - e. The Specific Plan site has excellent access to regional transportation corridors. The site is bisected by SR-126, which has been widened to four lanes by Caltrans. The site is within one-half mile of I-5, California's primary north-south transportation route, which provides connections to several freeways serving Southern California.
37. Approval of the proposed General Plan and Area Plan amendments is in the interests of public health, safety, and general welfare and in conformity with good planning practices for the following reasons:
- a. Amendment of the General and Area plans offers a unique opportunity to promote development of a relatively complete "new town" composed not

only of homes, but employment, shopping, commercial and public services, cultural facilities, recreation, and natural open space;

- b. From a conservation planning perspective, the Specific Plan proposes development primarily in those portions of the site that have reduced biological integrity due to historic activities such as agriculture, grazing, and oil and gas operations;
- c. The Specific Plan provides a major addition to County open space, promotes conservation of significant ecological area resources, and expands recreational opportunities by permanently preserving over 6,170 acres of major open areas, including 5,159 acres of land designated as Significant Ecological Area, as well as other areas containing significant ridgelines, landmark features, community parks, cultural sites, river bluffs, and oak-filled canyons;
- d. Dedication of the High Country for resource conservation and recreation purposes would result in a major expansion of open space in the Santa Susana Mountains, resulting in an open space system, which would extend from I-5 to the Los Angeles County boundary, a distance of 10 miles. In addition, although not part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the board-imposed condition of requiring off-site dedication of 1,517 acres of land in the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County, adjacent to the Specific Plan, further minimizes the environmental effects on animal movement in the region, and further enhances the Specific Plan's compatibility with SEA resources, located in Los Angeles County.
- e. The Specific Plan conforms to General Plan policies designed to reduce the risk to life and property from a wide variety of potential environmental hazards, including seismic, soils, and geologic issues; flooding; erosion; wildland and urban fires; the proximity of Chiquita Canyon Landfill; and previous uses of the land such as for oil and natural gas operations. Environmental safety for future residents of the Specific Plan is ensured through methods ranging from avoidance of potential hazards to mitigation (see, Final EIR);
- f. The Hillside Preservation and Grading Plan for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan was prepared in accordance with the County Grading Ordinance and incorporates provisions of the Performance Review Criteria for Hillside Management Areas;

- g. The Specific Plan would meet County housing policies by providing housing to meet a very broad spectrum of economic and social needs, ranging from condominiums, townhomes, attached and detached single-family, and large executive and estate homes. There would also be a wide range of rental apartment and second units, which could be rented or used as "granny flats" or to meet other special needs. The economic and social integration of the community is increased by the inclusion of a wide range of densities in each of the five villages. The revised Specific Plan calls for an affordable housing component developed between the applicant and the County's Community Development Commission and Department of Regional Planning, and it requires that 2,200 dwelling units be made available as "very low," "low," or "moderate" income housing. This component includes an aggressive marketing program and compliance monitoring by the County's Community Development Commission staff;
 - h. The Specific Plan meets County General Plan policies, which require that developments pay for the required incremental services necessary to serve them. As shown in the Final EIR, Section 6.0, Fiscal Impacts of the Specific Plan, the Specific Plan is anticipated to generate a significant surplus of tax revenues over the costs of providing governmental services;
 - i. The Specific Plan incorporates substantial "Livable Community" design features that help to reduce vehicle miles traveled, and thereby to reduce air quality impacts. Land uses are arranged into five villages, of which four would have a Mixed-Use Center in which the integration of homes with retail, office, public service, and recreation uses is encouraged. Higher intensity home types are within and near Mixed-Use centers, resulting in 59 percent of all homes being within walking distance (one-quarter mile) of a Mixed-Use or Commercial Center; and
 - j. The Specific Plan offers alternatives to the automobile through inclusion of pedestrian and bicycle trails throughout the community, by reservation of right-of-way for a possible future Metrolink line, and reservation of a site for a park-and-ride lot, which may transition into a Metrolink station, and through construction of bus pull-ins to facilitate bus service.
38. Based on the above findings, approval of the recommended General Plan and Area Plan amendments are in the public interest, specifically in the interests of public health, safety, and general welfare, and are in conformity with good planning practices.

39. Based on the above findings, the recommended General Plan and Area Plan amendments are consistent with the goals, policies, and programs of the General Plan and Area Plan and, in fact, help to implement the various objectives of the project (see, Draft EIR, pages 1-8 to 1-11).
40. Based on the above findings, approval of the recommended General Plan and Area Plan amendments will enable implementation of the land use planning objectives; economic objectives; mobility objectives; parks, recreation, and open area objectives; and resource conservation objectives of the project (see, Draft EIR, pages 1-8 to 1-11).
41. Modified conditions warrant a revision in the zoning plan as it pertains to the subject property. Specifically, there is a need to place the subject property within zoning classifications that are consistent with and implement the recommended General Plan and Area Plan amendments and thereby satisfy the applicable goals, objectives, and policies of the General and Area plans.
42. The subject property is a proper location for the recommended Specific Plan zoning classifications.
43. Adoption of the proposed Specific Plan zoning classifications will be in the interests of public health, safety, and general welfare and in conformity with good planning practices.
44. The applicant in this case has satisfied the "Burden of Proof" for the requested General Plan and Area Plan amendments and Zone Change, which are needed and appropriate.
45. During the public hearings, numerous speakers testified both for and against the project. In recommending the General Plan and Area Plan amendments, both the Planning Commission and the Board heard and considered the input of staff, other local and state agencies, and members of the public with respect to the best means of implementing the various objectives of the General Plan and Area Plan on the subject property.
46. The project has generated substantial public attention and concerns. Various letters were received, copies of which are on file with the Department of Regional Planning.
47. The project site, including its inherent biological characteristics and resources, and its proposed development were reviewed by the County's Significant Ecological Technical Advisory Committee ("SEATAC") through various reports prepared by the applicant's consultants as required by the Los Angeles County

Code for areas designated as SEAs. SEATAC's findings with respect to the above were recorded in the minutes of their meetings, and comments were provided to the Commission and the Board by planning staff as well as incorporated in the environmental documentation for the project. Many of SEATAC's recommendations were incorporated in the project design throughout the processing of the project. The Board has considered the recommendations of SEATAC in approving the project.

48. The Final EIR and the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis for the project have been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 *et. seq.*) and the State and County guidelines relating thereto. The Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis contain a description of the project, document the project's potential impacts, and identify mitigation measures, which will be implemented as a part of the project. Both the Commission and the Board have independently reviewed the information contained in the Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis.
49. Implementation of the project will result in specifically identified significant effects upon the environment. However, except for adverse effects upon agricultural resources (conversion of prime agricultural land), visual qualities, air quality, biological resources, and solid waste disposal, which cannot be found to be completely mitigated, such specifically identified significant adverse effects can be reduced to acceptable levels with the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis and incorporated into the adopted Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Specific Plan and WRP.
50. With respect to the adverse effects upon agricultural resources (conversion of prime agricultural land), visual qualities, air quality, biological resources, and solid waste disposal, which cannot or may not be adequately mitigated, both the Commission and the Board have determined that the substantial benefits resulting from implementation of the project outweigh the potential unavoidable adverse effects and are acceptable based upon the overriding considerations set forth in the original and additional CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project. The Additional CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, which are being concurrently adopted by the Board, are incorporated herein by this reference, as if set forth in full.
51. The mitigation measures of the Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis are incorporated into the conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5). The Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Specific Plan and WRP, which are attached as exhibits to the CEQA findings, identify the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential adverse impacts to the environment is ensured.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles hereby:

1. Approves the Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015) prepared for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant and certifies that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in that documentation;
2. Certifies that the Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015) has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and the Court's decision and writ in the prior Newhall Ranch litigation; and that the Final Additional Analysis reflects the independent judgment of the Board;
3. Certifies that the Board has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015), in conjunction with its review of the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, prior to its approval of the General Plan and Sub-Plan amendments No. 94-087-(5);
4. Determines that the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the previously certified Final EIR and the Final Additional Analysis are the only mitigation measures for this project, which are feasible, and that the unavoidable significant effects of the project, after adoption of the conditions of approval and mitigation measures, are as described in the Final EIR, the Final Additional Analysis, and the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant;
5. Adopts the Additional CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, including the determination that the Water Reclamation Plant On Site Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts), as described in subsection 3.5.4 of the Final Additional Analysis, is the environmentally superior Water Reclamation Plant site alternative;
6. Approves and adopts the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, incorporated in the Final Additional Analysis and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, finds that the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans, which are incorporated herein by this reference, as if set forth in full, are adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during Specific Plan implementation;

7. Adopts General Plan and Sub-Plan amendments No. 94-087-(5) amending the Land Use Policy maps of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan as depicted on Exhibits 1 through 14 attached hereto and incorporated by reference.
8. Adopts the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, dated May 2003, as revised; and
9. Finds that the General Plan and Sub-Plan amendments (Newhall Ranch Specific Plan) are consistent with the goals, policies, and programs of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan.

The foregoing was on
the _____ day of _____, 2003,
adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County
of Los Angeles and ex officio the governing body
of all other special assessment and taxing districts,
agencies and authorities for which said Board so acts.

VIOLET VARONA-LUKENS, Executive Officer-
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of
the County of Los Angeles

By _____
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM
BY COUNTY COUNSEL

LLOYD W. PELLMAN

By _____
Deputy

ZONING CASE NO. 94-087-(5)

ORDINANCE NO. _____

An ordinance amending Section 22.16.230 of Title 22 - Planning and Zoning of the Los Angeles County Code, changing regulations for the execution of the General Plan, relating to Newhall Zoned District No. 118.

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 22.16.230 of the County Code is amended by amending the map of the Newhall Zoned District No. 118, as shown on the map attached hereto.

SECTION 2. The Board of Supervisors finds that this ordinance is consistent with the General Plan of the County of Los Angeles.

