

**CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING  
CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE LANDMARK VILLAGE PROJECT  
(A PORTION OF THE NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)**

---

**Los Angeles County Project No. 00-196-(5)**

**consisting of:**

General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendment Nos. 00-196-(5)

Specific Plan Amendment No. 00-196-(5)

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53108-(5)

SEA Conditional Use Permit No. 2005-01121-(5)

Oak Tree Permit No. 00-196-(5)

Conditional Use Permit No. 00-196-(5)

(including Modification to County Floodway and  
Off-Site Materials Transport Approval)

**State Clearinghouse No.: 2004021002**

(for environmental documents)

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

**October 2007**

**CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS  
FOR THE LANDMARK VILLAGE PROJECT**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 PURPOSE**

The Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") hereby recommends certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for the Landmark Village project, or the proposed project. The Landmark Village project would implement the first phase of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.<sup>1</sup> These findings and overriding considerations address the environmental effects associated with the proposed project, which is located within the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area in northwestern unincorporated Los Angeles County. These findings and overriding considerations are made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code §§21000 *et seq.*, and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§15000 *et seq.* ("CEQA Guidelines"). The potentially significant effects of the proposed project were identified and analyzed in both the Draft and Final EIRs.

Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091 require that a public agency prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Specifically, CEQA Guidelines section 15091 states, in part, that:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
  - (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR.
  - (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
  - (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

If significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a level below significant, the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the benefits of the proposed project against its significant unavoidable environmental impacts when determining whether to approve the project. (Pub. Resources Code, §21081;

---

<sup>1</sup> The Specific Plan was adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on May 27, 2003. The Specific Plan will guide the long-term development of the 11,963-acre Newhall Ranch community, comprising a broad range of residential, mixed-use, and non-residential land uses within five village areas.

CEQA Guidelines §15093.) If the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, the adverse effects may be considered "acceptable."

The Final EIR for the proposed project identified potentially significant effects. However, the Commission finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those effects to less than significant levels. Those impacts which are not reduced to less than significant levels are identified and overridden due to specific project benefits. (*See Section 8.0, Statement of Overriding Considerations*, below). Therefore, in accordance with CEQA (specifically section 21081) and the CEQA Guidelines (specifically sections 15091 and 15092), the Commission recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors certify the Final EIR for the proposed project, adopt these findings, the statement of overriding considerations, and the attached Mitigation Monitoring Plan, find the proposed project consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and approve the proposed project.

The Commission further recommends that the County Board of Supervisors adopt the following related project approvals to facilitate implementation and development of the proposed project: (i) General Plan Amendment No. 00-196-(5); (ii) Sub-Plan Amendment No. 00-196-(5); (iii) Specific Plan Amendment 00-196-(5); (iv) Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53108-(5); (v) Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 2005-01121-(5); (vi) Oak Tree Permit 00-196-(5); and (vii) Conditional Use Permit No. 00-196-(5), including modification to county floodway and off-site materials transport approval.

## **1.2 ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT OF FINDINGS**

Section 1.0 contains a summary description of the proposed project and background facts relative to the environmental review process. Section 2.0 identifies the significant impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level (even with all feasible mitigation measures having been identified and incorporated into the proposed project), while Section 3.0 identifies the potentially significant effects of the proposed project that would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. Section 4.0 identifies the proposed project's potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant. Section 5.0 focuses on significant cumulative impacts, which cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance. Section 6.0 focuses on significant cumulative impacts that have been mitigated to an insignificant level. Section 7.0 discusses the feasibility of the project alternatives, and Section 8.0 presents the statement of overriding considerations.

## **1.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project applicant, The Newhall Land and Farming Company ("Newhall"), proposes to develop the Landmark Village project site, consisting of approximately 1,044 gross acres, generally located south of State Route 126 ("SR-126"), near the intersection of Chiquito Canyon Road, north of the Santa Clara River ("the River"), and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"). The Landmark Village project site includes proposed development of the approximate 292.6-acre tract map site. To facilitate development of the Landmark Village tract map site, several off-site components, which are described in detail below, would be developed on an additional approximately 750.9 acres of land that, for the most part, is within the approved Specific Plan boundary.<sup>2</sup> For purposes of this document, the "tract map site" refers to the location of the Landmark Village development site itself, and the "project site" generally includes the tract map site, the Adobe Canyon borrow site, the Chiquito Canyon grading site, the utility corridor, the

---

<sup>2</sup> Portions of the proposed utility corridor, the proposed potable water tank site (located within the Valencia Commerce Center business park), and the proposed reclaimed water tank (built and located on Round Mountain directly east of Interstate 5) are outside the boundaries of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

water tank sites, the Long Canyon Road Bridge, bank stabilization, drainage improvements and related haul routes. As stated, the entire project site comprises approximately 1,044 gross acres.

### **1.3.1 Project Components**

The land uses included as part of the tract map site are consistent with the approved Specific Plan, which designates the tract map site for single- and multi-family residential, mixed-use, commercial land uses and various public facilities. The proposed project would include the construction of 1,444 residential dwelling units (308 single-family units and 1,136 multi-family units), up to 1,033,000 square feet of mixed-use/commercial uses, a 9-acre elementary school, a 16-acre Community Park, a fire station, public and private recreational facilities, trails, and road improvements. More specific detail about each of these components is presented below:

- **Single-Family Residential Component:** A total of 308 single-family units would be located along private and public streets, with most lot sizes ranging from approximately 4,500 to 6,000 square feet.
- **Multi-Family Residential Component:** A total of 1,136 multi-family units (e.g., townhomes; condominiums) would be built at densities ranging from 8.5 to 23 dwelling units per acre.
- **Mixed-Use/Commercial Component:** Up to 1,033,000 square feet of mixed-use/commercial areas would be constructed on approximately 36.5 acres at the proposed "Village Quad" along Wolcott Road, and "Village Center" along Long Canyon Road. This component would combine retail/commercial and office, and civic, public, and recreational uses. Multi-family units would be located in the surrounding areas.
- **Elementary School Component:** A 9-acre Castaic School District elementary school site would be built in the central portion of the tract map site. The school would consist of a main school building with modular classrooms, an adjacent playing field, and on-site parking. The school would be adjacent to the proposed Community Park, and the multi-purpose community trail along "A" Street would facilitate pedestrian access.
- **Community Park/Recreation Components:** An approximately 16-acre Community Park would be developed, and could include features such as tot lots, playground equipment, ball fields, tennis/basketball courts, picnic facilities, turf areas, and restrooms. A portion of the Community Park would be privately maintained by the Landmark Village Homeowners Association and is planned as a passive recreation area. This passive recreation area will be open to the public.
- **Recreation Areas:** Four private neighborhood recreation centers, to be maintained by one or more homeowners associations, are planned on a total of 5.2 acres. These centers primarily would serve recreational uses for nearby residential units, and would contain such amenities as pools, spas, wading pools, overhead shade structures, and/or restroom buildings. These facilities would be accessible by pedestrians through various trail connections.
- **Fire Station:** One fire station would be built west of Long Canyon Road. An agreement between Newhall and the County's Fire Department includes dedication of the land for the fire station, and construction of the fire station.
- **Trails and Paseos:** Local trails would be constructed to provide a means of pedestrian access from residential neighborhoods to and from the Community Park, recreation centers, elementary school, and mixed-use/commercial areas. The trails would adjoin major roadways and certain residential collector streets, and be separated from vehicular traffic by landscaped parkway.

- **Site Access and Circulation:** The proposed project's circulation plan includes a system of local streets with access to and from a curvilinear road ("A" Street) that traverses the site in an east/west direction. Two north/south roadways, Wolcott Road and Long Canyon Road, would connect "A" Street to the off-site highway system (SR-126). The proposed project would construct Long Canyon Road and the connection to Wolcott Road, which would provide regional access to and from SR-126. The proposed project also would construct an interim intersection with SR-126 for Long Canyon Road/SR-126. This interim intersection will be replaced in the future by a grade separated crossing when future traffic volumes determine that the crossing is warranted.

The proposed project would construct a network of collector streets to provide local access to and from land uses associated with the proposed project. These roadways would connect to "A" Street, and Wolcott and Long Canyon Roads.

Build-out of the proposed project also would require widening a segment of SR-126 to three lanes in each direction. This would further necessitate the widening of the existing bridge over Castaic Creek to accommodate a six-lane right-of-way. The proposed project would provide 8 acres, located within a 35-foot-wide strip of land along SR-126, for the future reservation of a rail right-of-way running parallel to the south side of SR-126. The mixed-use/commercial area planned along Wolcott Road would include a park and ride/future transit station lot.

- **Long Canyon Road Bridge:** The proposed project would include construction of the Long Canyon Road Bridge, which would span the width of the River, equating to a roadway segment of approximately 1,000 feet in length and approximately 100 feet in width.<sup>3</sup> A six-lane highway would be constructed that extends from the proposed realignment of the existing Chiquito Canyon Road/SR-126 intersection in a southerly direction over the River to the bridge terminus. Bridge supports would consist of concrete piers spaced approximately 100 feet apart. In addition, abutments and bank stabilization (including gunite and riprap) would be placed on either side of the bridge to protect against erosive/scouring forces.
- **Drainage/Flood Control:** The proposed project includes the Landmark Village Drainage and Water Quality Plan ("Water Quality Plan"), which includes a comprehensive series of drainage, flood control, and water quality improvements designed to protect development and preserve the Santa Clara River. Components of the Water Quality Plan include:
  - On-site surface runoff would be intercepted by curb, debris, and/or desilting inlets, and conveyed to a network of storm drains leading to treatment structures prior to discharge into the River.
  - In commercial areas, parking lot and roof runoff would be directed through landscaped parkways and grassy swales to provide initial treatment prior to discharge into the drainage system.
  - Flows from several unimproved drainages that drain the undeveloped watershed located north of SR-126 would be intercepted and conveyed through the site to the River.
  - Stormwater runoff from all urban areas within the proposed project would be routed to bioretention areas, vegetated swales, and/or extended detention basins. These improvements

---

<sup>3</sup> As part of the project approvals for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, in May 2003, the County Board of Supervisors approved a program-level SEA CUP (No. 94-087-(5)) that authorizes three elevated highway bridge crossings over the River throughout the Specific Plan boundaries, including the general alignment for the Long Canyon Road Bridge.

would operate off-line, and receive dry weather flows, small storm flows and the initial portion of large storm flows from a low-flow diversion structure in the storm drain.

- **Bank Stabilization:** Where necessary, the proposed project would construct buried bank stabilization, turf reinforcement mats, or similar bank stability protection in order to retain and enhance the River's significant riparian vegetation and habitat, allow the River to continue to function as a regional wildlife corridor, and provide flood protection pursuant to County standards. The proposed project also would install various stormwater outlet structures within the tract map site and adjacent off-site areas.
- **Potable Water:** The Valencia Water Company would provide potable water to the proposed project. Water demand would be met by drawing groundwater from the Alluvial aquifer from newly constructed replacement wells located within the Valencia Commerce Center that have been approved and permitted by the California Department of Health Services. The groundwater pumped from the alluvial aquifer has been historically used by the applicant for its agricultural operations. This water will be converted from agricultural use to municipal use.

There are currently two options for the provision of water service to the tract map site.

- **First Option:** The first water delivery system option consists of two new water tanks connected to a network of 18- to 20-inch water mains that generally follow the southern right-of-way for SR-126 and major roadways. A network of 8-inch lines located within the planned roadway network of the proposed project would distribute the water for connection to laterals located on individual lots.

With the two water tanks, a total of 4.5 million gallons of storage capacity would be available to meet the emergency and fire-flow storage capacity requirements necessary to support the project upon completion. The two-tank system provides a secondary source of supply and storage to enhance the system's reliability, safety, and efficiency.

- **Second Option:** The second water delivery system option consists of one new potable water tank and three pressure regulating stations connected to a network of 18- to 20-inch water mains that generally follow the southern right-of-way for SR-126 and major roadways. A network of 8-inch lines located within the planned roadway network would distribute the water for connection to laterals located on individual lots.

With the new water tank, a total of 10.3 million gallons of storage capacity would be available to meet the emergency and fire-flow storage capacity requirements necessary to support the project upon completion. The proposed water system, consisting of one tank and three pressure-regulating stations, provides redundant sources of supply and storage to enhance the system's reliability, safety, and efficiency.

- **Reclaimed Water:** The proposed project would use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation purposes and other allowable uses. To supply reclaimed water throughout the tract map site and provide for a backbone system to serve other areas of Newhall Ranch, a piping system would be constructed from the proposed Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"), through the tract map site, to the existing Valencia WRP. Additional operational storage also would be required, and would be provided by converting the 3.3 million gallon Round Mountain Tank, currently used for potable water, to a reclaimed water reservoir. A second storage option also was considered that would require a new tank and additional pipeline to be constructed. This storage tank option is located north of the tract map site along Chiquito Canyon Road. This site would have to be graded for construction of a reservoir. The current preferred location is the Round Mountain Tank site.

- **Wastewater:** The proposed project's wastewater/sewer plan is consistent with, and implements, the Specific Plan's approved Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan. The project-level wastewater/sewer collection system consists of gravity sewers, forced mains, and a pump station. The long-range plan is for the Newhall Ranch WRP to be constructed to serve uses within the Specific Plan area. The WRP's capacity is 6.8 mgd, with a maximum flow of 13.8 mgd. A new County sanitation district has been formed to operate the WRP.

In the interim, two options are available to treat wastewater generated by the proposed project. One option would be to construct an initial phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP to serve this subdivision, with build-out of the WRP occurring over time as demand for treatment increases. Under this approach, a network of 8-inch sewer collectors would convey effluent to an 18-inch sanitary sewer trunk line. This trunk line would be placed in a 7.5-foot-wide by 15-foot-deep (average depth) trench in the southerly portion of the SR-126 right-of-way and extend west approximately 16,100 LF, where it would connect to the headworks of the Newhall Ranch WRP. Phase 1 construction of the Newhall Ranch WRP is estimated to begin in summer 2008 and is projected to have a 12-month construction schedule.

The second option would be to construct a pump station on the project site where wastewater would be pumped back to the existing Valencia WRP, located upstream of the project along I-5, until such time as the first phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP is constructed. Under this approach, a sanitary sewer force main line would be placed in a 3-foot-wide by 4.5-foot-deep trench and extend from the tract map site easterly, approximately 18,100 LF, to the existing Valencia WRP. This alignment is within the south side of the SR-126 and Henry Mayo Drive rights-of-way, before turning south and traveling within the easterly right-of-way for The Old Road. Off-site sewer improvements would be completed in one phase, over a 6- to 12-month period.

- **Electrical/Dry Utilities:** Electrical utilities would be constructed in two phases. The first phase would relocate the existing 66 kilovolt (kV)/16kV overhead electric power line running parallel to SR-126. New power lines would be constructed from The Old Road, west beneath the existing Castaic Creek Bridge, to approximately 300 feet west of the Commerce Center Drive and Harrison Parkway intersection within an existing Southern California Edison ("SCE") easement. The second phase would construct new transmission lines continuing west along the existing SCE easement approximately 12,000 LF, crossing the Chiquito Canyon Landfill, Chiquito Canyon Road, and Chiquito Canyon Creek. The existing 66KV/16KV overhead line would be utilized to bring electricity east to the proposed Long Canyon Road. A new 16kV line would then be constructed southerly, along Long Canyon Road, and placed underground prior to reaching SR-126. Construction is projected to begin in 2008 and would be completed in six to eight months.
- **Natural Gas:** A natural gas distribution main would be constructed in two phases to serve the tract map site. (Currently, the terminus of the gas line is located at the Valencia WRP.) The first phase consists of constructing an 8-inch line extending to the approved Newhall Ranch WRP from the east end of the project site (Castaic Creek Bridge). The estimated construction start date would be in 2008, with a projected installation time of 8 to 10 months. The second phase would consist of extending the gas distribution main east of the tract map site, along the north SR-126 right-of-way to Commerce Center Drive, crossing SR-126, and continuing east along the south Henry Mayo Drive right-of-way, ultimately connecting to the existing Valencia WRP. The second phase has an estimated construction period of approximately four to six months.
- **Grading:** Off-tract map site grading is required at several locations in order to construct the tract map site. In addition to the Adobe Canyon borrow site that will be excavated for soil needed to elevate the site from the floodplain, the project requires grading in Chiquito Canyon for improvements to SR-

126, and construction of debris basins, off-site water tanks, and wastewater treatment facilities that would be connected to the tract map site by utility lines in the utility corridor.

Project-related grading would require the movement of approximately 4.2 million cubic yards of existing material (removal and recompaction), and up to 5.8 million cubic yards of import from the Adobe Canyon borrow site to meet the flood-control requirements of the tract map site. The project grading is consistent with and implements the Specific Plan's approved Conceptual Grading Plan, and the applicable Specific Plan Design Guidelines for grading and hillside management.

The off-site grading would excavate and reshape the hills and depressions forming the ridge separating Long and Adobe Canyons. Much of this work would occur along the top and bluffs of an unnamed plateau located just west of Sawtooth Ridge. The proposed grading would excavate the southeastern portion of this plateau, creating a gentler slope leading up to the top of the ridge. The grading also would alter the western facing slope leading up to the plateau, creating a bench separated by two manufactured slopes stepping down the west facing ridgeline defining Adobe Canyon. Additional earthwork is planned at the terminus of Adobe Canyon. A series of benches, swales, and debris basins also would be constructed to collect, convey, and release runoff in a controlled manner. Up to approximately 5.8 million cubic yards of earth may be excavated from the Long Canyon/Adobe Canyon area and transported across the River to the tract map site, using existing at-grade agricultural crossings which would be widened as the haul routes.

The Chiquito Canyon grading site is proposed on the ridgeline of a northeast-southwest trending hillside. The terrain on the southwesterly portion of the ridgeline gently slopes toward the intersection in a "finger" shape. The terrain becomes progressively steeper and more rugged toward the northwest portion of the ridge. The grading would lower the "finger" of land extending toward the intersection of Chiquito Canyon Road with SR-126 by approximately 60 feet, when compared to the existing elevation. Rather than a gradual incline that extends upward at increasingly greater grade, the reshaped slope would approximate the grade of SR-126 for about 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Chiquito Canyon Road. A series of benches, swales, and debris basins also would be constructed to collect, convey, and release runoff in a controlled manner. Approximately 1.2 million cubic yards of earth would be excavated from this area and placed as fill in the adjacent canyons.

Upon completion of the grading operations associated with soil import, additional work would be required for grading of the development areas, along with fine grading for development pads. The grading would consist of rough grading operations for major roads and infrastructure, drainage patterns, and building pads for the various land uses within the tract map site. Remedial grading and custom grading also may be required, depending upon future site-specific soils and geological investigations. Graded slopes would be landscaped and irrigated pursuant to County grading and erosion control requirements.

Utility installation involves earthwork such as excavation of trenches and stockpiling of soils. Earthwork volume estimates for each of the utilities are: (i) up to 182,000 cubic yards for the potable water system; (ii) up to 174,000 cubic yards for the reclaimed water system; (iii) up to 800,000 cubic yards for the sanitary sewer system; and (iv) up to 50,000 cubic yards for installation of dry utilities including electrical and natural gas.

- **Sound Walls:** The proposed project would include the construction of sound walls of varying heights within the tract map site.

### **1.3.2 Associated Project Approvals**

The following project approvals also need to be secured to authorize build-out of the proposed project:



- **General Plan Amendment:** An amendment is requested to the County's Master Plan of Highways, which is within the Transportation Element of the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan, for a highway located within the Landmark Village tract map site. The project applicant is requesting that "A" Street be downgraded from a four-lane Secondary Highway to a two-lane Collector Street. While "A" Street is an integral component of the project's circulation system, it is not critical to the overall Specific Plan and areawide circulation system. In fact, the forecasted traffic volumes on "A" Street support the requested designation change. A Collector Street can typically accommodate approximately 10,000 average daily trips ("ADT") at a Level of Service ("LOS") C. "A" Street would have traffic volumes substantially less than 10,000 ADT for the entire length of the roadway, except for the short segment between future Long Canyon Road and the roundabout near the future "A" Street/Long Canyon Road intersection. For that segment, which would have volumes ranging from 16,000 ADT to 20,000 ADT, two travel lanes in each direction are proposed. Accordingly, based on the traffic volumes forecasted for "A" Street, the roadway designation is requested to be changed to a Collector Street.
- **Sub-Plan Amendment:** The proposed project also requires an amendment to the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan; Circulation Plan to downgrade "A" Street from a Secondary Highway to a Collector Street for the reasons stated above.
- **Specific Plan Amendment:** Similarly, the proposed project requires an amendment to the Specific Plan Master Circulation Plan to change "A" Street from a Secondary Highway to a Collector Street for the reasons stated above. Furthermore, the applicant is proposing an amendment to provide a modified street design for "A" Street within the tract map site.
- **Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53108:** Approval of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map is required to subdivide the tract map site into 308 single-family units, 18 multi-family lots, 26 mixed-use lots, and lots for, among other uses, recreation, parks, a school site, and open space. The proposed map would subdivide the site into a total of 416 lots (with a total of 1,444 dwelling units).
- **SEA Conditional Use Permit:** The project applicant is requesting a project-level SEA CUP to provide the County with the regulatory framework for determining if the proposed project within the approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundaries is consistent with both the adopted Specific Plan and previously approved program-level SEA CUP No. 94-087-(5).
- **Oak Tree Permit:** An Oak Tree Permit is required under Zoning Code section 22.56.2050 for the removal of 67 of the 200 oak trees located on the project site. Up to 36 of these oak trees proposed for removal would be transplanted within the Specific Plan site. In addition, 14 oak trees would be impacted by encroachment (e.g., grading, excavation). The proposed project would not impact the remaining oak trees on the Landmark Village project site.
- **Conditional Use Permit:** Grading of hillsides within the Adobe Canyon borrow site meets the definition of a grading project under Section 22.08.070(G) of the Los Angeles County Planning and Zoning Code; and therefore, a CUP is required. In addition, the CUP is necessary for construction of the water tanks within the project site. In addition, the CUP will address the following:
  - **Modification to County Floodway:** Development of the proposed project would elevate the tract map site and result in the removal of approximately 169 acres of land from the Capital Floodplain. Therefore, the County would consider whether an adjustment to the County Floodway Boundary is needed to account for changes to the floodplain boundary resulting from the proposed project's flood protection improvements.

- ***Off-Site Materials Transport Approval:*** The Specific Plan allows the Planning Director, or Director of Public Works, to approve applications, *via* a CUP, for the off-site transport of materials over 10,000 cubic yards within the boundaries of the Specific Plan. The project will import up to 5.8 million cubic yards of fill material. The fill is needed to elevate the proposed finished pads to a minimum of 1 foot above the River's flood surface water elevation in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. Average fill heights will be approximately 10 feet; however, some areas will require approximately 20 feet of fill. The applicant proposes to use the Adobe Canyon area within the approved Specific Plan as the borrow site.

#### **1.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The overall objective of the proposed project is to implement the first phase of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, including, as it relates to Landmark Village, the Specific Plan's Master Circulation Plan; Master Trails Plan; Conceptual Backbone Drainage, Water and Sewer Plans; public facilities/services (e.g., fire, police/sheriff, schools, libraries); Resource Management Plan; Hillside Preservation and Grading Plan; and Parks, Recreation, and Open Area Plan. The project objectives, which are consistent with the Specific Plan objectives, include the following:

##### ***LAND USE PLANNING OBJECTIVES***

1. Implement a portion of one of the distinct villages within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan to allow for residential, mixed-use, and commercial development, while preserving significant natural resources and open areas.
2. Consistent with the Specific Plan, accommodate projected regional growth in a location that is adjacent to existing and planned infrastructure, urban services, transportation corridors, and major employment centers and that avoids leapfrog development.
3. Consistent with the Specific Plan, cluster development within the site to preserve regionally significant natural resource areas and sensitive habitat.
4. Provide development and transitional land use patterns that do not conflict with surrounding communities and land uses.
5. Establish land uses that permit a wide range of housing densities, types, styles, prices, and tenancy (for sale and rental).
6. Designate sites for needed public facilities, including an elementary school, parks, trails, paseos, potable water reservoirs, and recreation areas.
7. Create a highly livable, pedestrian-friendly environment that encourages alternative means of transportation to the automobile by incorporating unique site designs and enhanced pedestrian access between land uses, trails, paseos, and streets.

##### ***MOBILITY OBJECTIVES***

1. Implement the Specific Plan's Mobility Plan, as it relates to the Landmark Village project, including the design of a circulation/mobility system that encourages alternatives to automobile use.

2. Provide a safe, efficient, and aesthetically attractive street system with convenient connections to adjoining regional transportation routes.
3. Provide a walkable community through the use of innovative traffic calming techniques such as narrow streets designed to slow traffic, and pedestrian pathways.
4. Provide an efficient street circulation system that minimizes impacts on residential neighborhoods.
5. Provide a pedestrian and bicycle trails system that is segregated from vehicle traffic and that connects with supporting commercial, recreational, and other public facilities, to serve as an alternative to the automobile for surrounding residential neighborhoods.
6. Facilitate public transit options by reserving right-of-way for future Metrolink line, reserving space for a park-and-ride and/or Metrolink station, and including bus pull-ins along roadways.

***PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN AREA OBJECTIVES***

1. Provide for the recreational use of open areas that is compatible with the protection of significant natural resources.
2. Provide a range of recreational opportunities, including parks, trails and paseos, which are convenient and accessible.
3. Provide pedestrian, bicycle, and hiking trails that are consistent with the Specific Plan's Parks, Recreation, and Open Area Plan.

***RESOURCE CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES***

1. Implement the Specific Plan's Resource Management Plan as it relates to the Landmark Village project and adjacent areas.
2. Protect wetland, endangered or threatened species in the Santa Clara River as provided for within the Specific Plan.
3. Protect significant natural resources within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, consistent with the Specific Plan.
4. Preserve significant stands of oak trees, consistent with the Specific Plan.
5. Promote water conservation by encouraging the use of drought-tolerant, fire-retardant, and native plants in landscaping.
6. Provide transition and buffer zones between development and recreation areas, as well as the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, consistent with the Specific Plan.

**1.5 INITIAL STUDY AND NOTICE OF PREPARATION**

Preliminary environmental review of the proposed project was conducted by the County's Department of Regional Planning. In the Initial Study/Notice Of Preparation ("IS/NOP"), the County stated that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on several environmental impact categories,

including: (a) hazards (geotechnical, flood, and noise); (b) resources (water quality, air quality, biota, cultural resources, agricultural resources, and visual resources/aesthetics); (c) services (traffic/access, sewage disposal, education, fire/sheriff, and utilities); and (d) other categories (general, environmental safety/hazardous materials, land use, and demand for new recreation facilities).

On January 30, 2004, the County circulated the IS/NOP to responsible agencies, trustee agencies, regional agencies, County reviewing agencies, and other agencies, organizations, and interested persons for the 30-day review period required under CEQA. The IS/NOP requested that the agencies, organizations, and others provide the County with specific details about the scope and content of the environmental information to be contained in this Draft EIR, as it related to each entity's area of statutory responsibility. In addition, to facilitate local participation, the County held a scoping meeting on February 12, 2004 at the Castaic Union School District, in Valencia, California, to present the proposed project and to solicit suggestions from the public and other agencies on the scope and content of the Draft EIR.

In response to the IS/NOP and scoping meeting, comment letters and other input were received from interested agencies, organizations, and others. Based on the results of the County's IS/NOP and scoping efforts, the following topics were evaluated in the Draft and Final EIRs:

- |                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Geology and Soils;        | 12. Solid Waste Disposal;              |
| 2. Hydrology;                | 13. Sheriff Services;                  |
| 3. Water Quality;            | 14. Fire Services/Hazards;             |
| 4. Biota;                    | 15. Education;                         |
| 5. Floodplain Modifications; | 16. Parks and Recreation;              |
| 6. Visual Qualities;         | 17. Libraries;                         |
| 7. Traffic/Access;           | 18. Agricultural Resources;            |
| 8. Noise;                    | 19. Utilities;                         |
| 9. Air Quality;              | 20. Mineral Resources;                 |
| 10. Water Service;           | 21. Environmental Safety; and          |
| 11. Wastewater Disposal;     | 22. Cultural/Paleontological Resources |

## **1.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

CEQA provides a lead agency with the flexibility to prepare different types of EIRs, and to employ different procedural means to focus environmental analysis on the issues appropriate for decision at each level of environmental review. (Pub. Resources Code, §21093, subd. (a).) The certified Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR ("Program EIR")<sup>4</sup> addressed the Specific Plan at the "program" level of detail, acknowledging that further environmental review would be required in connection with preparation of project-specific tentative subdivision maps. The Program EIR also contained a separate project-level environmental analysis for the WRP, so the County could issue final approval of the WRP.

Because the proposed project implements a part of the Specific Plan, and because the certified Program EIR assessed the significant environmental effects associated with development of the entire Specific Plan area, the Final EIR for the proposed project tiered from the certified Program EIR in accordance with

---

<sup>4</sup> The Program EIR includes the Final Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP, certified on March 23, 1999, and the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, certified on May 27, 2003.

Public Resources Code section 21093, subdivision (a), and CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c). In this way, the EIR focused on site-specific issues relating to the proposed project and allowed the County, as the lead agency, to concentrate on issues that are ripe for decision and exclude from consideration issues already decided or not ripe for decision.

The Draft EIR was made available to the public for review and comment for a 60-day period. The review and comment period began on November 20, 2006, and ended on January 22, 2007. This comment period was subsequently extended by the Regional Planning Commission to February 20, 2007. Copies of the Draft EIR were available for public review at the following locations: (i) Canyon County Jo Anne Darcy Library, 18601 Soledad Canyon Road, Canyon Country, California 91351-3721; (ii) County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, Impact Analysis Section, Room 1348, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012; (iii) Newhall County Library, 22704 West 9th Street, Newhall, California 91321; and (iv) Valencia County Library, 223743 West Valencia Boulevard, Valencia, California 91355. All comment letters received in response to the Draft EIR were reviewed and are included in the Final EIR, along with written responses to each of the comments.

In addition to the public comment period identified in the paragraph above, two public hearings on the proposed project and Draft EIR were held on January 31, 2007, and February 28, 2007, before the Regional Planning Commission.

The custodian of the record of proceedings is the County's Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The proposed project's record includes, but is not limited to:

- The Draft and Final EIRs for the proposed project;
- All reports, project application materials, memoranda, maps, letters, and other planning documents, including attachments, related documents, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in those materials, prepared by the EIR consultant, the project applicant, the County, and Commission staff relating to the EIRs;
- Any minutes and transcripts of all public meetings and public hearings relating to the project;
- All notices issued by the County to comply with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, or any other law governing the processing and approval of the project;
- Matters of common knowledge to the County, which include, but are not limited to: (i) the Los Angeles County General Plan; (ii) the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan; and (iii) the Los Angeles County Subdivision and Planning and Zoning Codes, as amended;
- Any other written materials relevant to the County's compliance with CEQA, and its decision on the merits of the project, including documents that have been released for public review, and copies of reports, studies or other documents relied on in any environmental documentation for the project and either made available to the public during the public comment period or included in the County's files; and
- Regulatory approval documents governing long-term implementation of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP, including the Specific Plan and all Newhall Ranch certified environmental documentation, which is cited, incorporated by reference, or relied upon in the Landmark Village Draft or Final EIR.

## **2.0 FINDINGS FOCUSING ON SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT**

First, this section identifies the significant unavoidable impacts that require a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued by the Commission if the proposed project is approved. Based on the analysis contained in the EIR, the following impacts to biota, visual qualities, noise, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources have been determined to fall within this "significant unavoidable impact" category. Second, in addition to the identification of significant unavoidable impacts, the discussion, below, identifies significant impacts resulting from the project to biota, visual qualities, noise, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources, which have been mitigated to below a level of significance based upon the identified mitigation measures.

### **2.1 BIOTA**

#### **2.1.1 Unavoidable and Significant Impacts**

The Program EIR for the Specific Plan identified significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources, as portions of the contemplated development would occur in sensitive upland and riparian habitats and displace native species. While mitigation was recommended and adopted by the County, impacts were not reduced to a level below significant.

The proposed project, including all project components, would result in the permanent conversion of, or temporary disturbance of, more than 1,000 acres of land. The conversion will permanently decrease the amount of land available for natural habitats and the flora and fauna that inhabit them, resulting in a significant impact. Even with the inclusion of the mitigation measures identified below, impacts to biota would remain significant and unavoidable due to this permanent conversion of land, which was contemplated when the County's Board of Supervisors approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan as a whole, on May 27, 2003.

Specific significant impacts would occur with respect to the loss of mulefat scrub, coast live oak woodland, southern coast live oak riparian forest, southern willow scrub, southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest, big sagebrush scrub, coastal scrub and alliances/associations, wildlife habitat, special-status birds and other non-avian special-status wildlife species, special-status plant species, protected oaks, and California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") jurisdictional resources. Significant indirect impacts would occur as a result of increased light and glare, increased non-native plant species, and increased human and domestic animal presence.

The direct and indirect impacts associated with development and operation of the Landmark Village project are consistent with the findings of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR (Impact Sciences, Inc. March 1999) and Revised Additional Analysis (Impact Sciences, Inc. May 2003). Implementation of the mitigation measures required by the Program EIR and the Specific Plan Resource Management Plan (RMP), as well as the additional mitigation measures required by this EIR, would mitigate some, but not all, of the identified project-specific impacts to less than significant levels. However, consistent with the findings of the Program EIR, significant unavoidable impacts would occur due to the loss of special-status wildlife species, coastal scrub, wildlife habitat, and the increase in human and domestic animal presence.

#### **2.1.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to mitigate all of the biota-related impacts attributable to the proposed project to a level below significant. However, the following

feasible mitigation measures would substantially lessen the significant biota impacts as identified in the Final EIR:

**2.1.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

Eighty (80) biota-related mitigation measures were adopted in conjunction with approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. However, not all of the 80 mitigation measures are applicable to the proposed project. The following mitigation measures have been omitted because they are not applicable to the Landmark Village project: SP 4.6-28 through 4.6-33, SP 4.6-36, SP 4.6-44 through 4.6-47, SP 4.6-60 through 4.6-66, and SP 4.6-70 through 4.6-80. For additional information regarding the reasons why the identified mitigation measures are not applicable to the proposed project, please refer to revised Section 4.4, Biota, of the Final EIR.

- SP 4.6-1 The restoration mitigation areas located within the River Corridor SMA shall be in areas that have been disturbed by previous uses or activities. Mitigation shall be conducted only on sites where soils, hydrology, and microclimate conditions are suitable for riparian habitat. First priority will be given to those restorable areas that occur adjacent to existing patches (areas) of native habitat that support sensitive species, particularly Endangered or Threatened species. The goal is to increase habitat patch size and connectivity with other existing habitat patches while restoring habitat values that will benefit sensitive species.
- SP 4.6-2 A qualified biologist shall prepare or review revegetation plans. The biologist shall also monitor the restoration effort from its inception through the establishment phase.
- SP 4.6-3 Revegetation Plans may be prepared as part of a California Department of Fish and Game 1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement and/or an U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit, and shall include:
- Input from both the Project proponent and resource agencies to assure that the Project objectives applicable to the River Corridor SMA and the criteria of this RMP are met.
  - The identification of restoration/mitigation sites to be used. This effort shall involve an analysis of the suitability of potential sites to support the desired habitat, including a description of the existing conditions at the site(s) and such base line data information deemed necessary by the permitting agency.
- SP 4.6-4 The revegetation effort shall involve an analysis of the site conditions such as soils and hydrology so that site preparation needs can be evaluated. The revegetation plan shall include the details and procedures required to prepare the restoration site for planting (i.e., grading, soil preparation, soil stockpiling, soil amendments, etc.), including the need for a supplemental irrigation system, if any.
- SP 4.6-5 Restoration of riparian habitats within the River Corridor SMA shall use plant species native to the Santa Clara River. Cuttings or seeds of native plants shall be gathered within the River Corridor SMA or purchased from nurseries with local supplies to provide good genetic stock for the replacement habitats. Plant species used in the restoration of riparian habitat shall be listed on the approved project plant palette (Specific Plan Table 2.6-1, Recommended Plant Species for Habitat Restoration in the River Corridor SMA) or as approved by the permitting State and Federal agencies.

- SP 4.6-6 The final revegetation plans shall include notes that outline the methods and procedures for the installation of the plant materials. Plant protection measures identified by the project biologist shall be incorporated into the planting design/layout.
- SP 4.6-7 The revegetation plan shall include guidelines for the maintenance of the mitigation site during the establishment phase of the plantings. The maintenance program shall contain guidelines for the control of non-native plant species, the maintenance of the irrigation system, and the replacement of plant species.
- SP 4.6-8 The revegetation plan shall provide for monitoring to evaluate the growth of the developing habitat. Specific performance goals for the restored habitat shall be defined by qualitative and quantitative characteristics of similar habitats on the river (e.g., density, cover, species composition, structural development). The monitoring effort shall include an evaluation of not only the plant material installed, but the use of the site by wildlife. The length of the monitoring period shall be determined by the permitting State and/or Federal agency.
- SP 4.6-9 Monitoring reports for the mitigation site shall be reviewed by the permitting State and/or Federal agency.
- SP 4.6-10 Contingency plans and appropriate remedial measures shall also be outlined in the revegetation plan.
- SP 4.6-11 Habitat enhancement as referred to in this document means the rehabilitation of areas of native habitat that have been moderately disturbed by past activities (e.g., grazing, roads, oil and natural gas operations, etc.) or have been invaded by non-native plant species such as giant cane (*Arundo donax*) and tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.).
- SP 4.6-12 Removal of grazing is an important means of enhancement of habitat values. Without ongoing disturbance from cattle, many riparian areas will recover naturally. Grazing except as permitted as a long-term resource management activity will be removed from the River Corridor SMA pursuant to the Long-Term Management Plan set forth in Section 4.6 of the Specific Plan EIR.
- SP 4.6-13 To provide guidelines for the installation of supplemental plantings of native species within enhancement areas, a revegetation plan shall be prepared prior to implementation of mitigation (see guidelines for revegetation plans above). These supplemental plantings will be composed of plant species similar to those growing in the existing habitat patch (see Specific Plan Table 2.6-1).
- SP 4.6-14 Not all enhancement areas will necessarily require supplemental plantings of native species. Some areas may support conditions conducive for rapid "natural" reestablishment of native species. The revegetation plan may incorporate means of enhancement to areas of compacted soils, poor soil fertility, trash or flood debris, and roads as a way of enhancing riparian habitat values.
- SP 4.6-15 Removal of non-native species such as giant cane (*Arundo donax*), salt cedar or tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.), tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*), castor bean (*Ricinus communis*), if included in a revegetation plan to mitigate impacts, shall be subject to the following standards:
- First priority shall be given to those habitat patches that support or have a high potential for supporting sensitive species, particularly Endangered or Threatened species.



- All non-native species removals shall be conducted according to a resource agency approved exotics removal program.
- Removal of non-native species in patches of native habitat shall be conducted in such a way as to minimize impacts to the existing native riparian plant species.

SP 4.6-16 Mitigation banking activities for riparian habitats will be subject to State and Federal regulations and permits. Mitigation banking for oak resources shall be conducted pursuant to the Oak Resources Replacement Program. Mitigation banking for elderberry scrub shall be subject to approval of plans by the County Forester.

SP 4.6-17 Access to the River Corridor SMA for hiking and biking shall be limited to the river trail system (including the Regional River Trail and various Local Trails) as set forth in this Specific Plan.

- The River trail system shall be designed to avoid impacts to existing native riparian habitat, especially habitat areas known to support sensitive species. Where impacts to riparian habitat are unavoidable, disturbance shall be minimized and mitigated as outlined above under Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-8.
- Access to the River Corridor SMA will be limited to day time use of the designated trail system.
- Signs indicating that no pets of any kind will be allowed within the River Corridor SMA, with the exception that equestrian use is permitted on established trails, shall be posted along the River Corridor SMA.
- No hunting, fishing, or motor or off-trail bike riding shall be permitted.
- The trail system shall be designed and constructed to minimize impacts on native habitats.

SP 4.6-18 Where development lies adjacent to the boundary of the River Corridor SMA a transition area shall be designed to lessen the impact of the development on the conserved area. Transition areas may be comprised of Open Area, natural or revegetated manufactured slopes, other planted areas, bank areas, and trails. Exhibits 2.6-4, 2.6-5, and 2.6-6 indicate the relationship between the River Corridor SMA and the development (disturbed) areas of the Specific Plan. The SMAs and the Open Area as well as the undisturbed portions of the development areas are shown in green. As indicated on the exhibits, on the south side of the river the River Corridor SMA is separated from development by the river bluffs, except in one location. The Regional River Trail will serve as transition area on the north side of the river where development areas adjoin the River Corridor SMA (excluding Travel Village).

SP 4.6-19 The following are the standards for design of transition areas:

- In all locations where there is no steep grade separation between the River Corridor SMA and development, a trail shall be provided along this edge.
- Native riparian plants shall be incorporated into the landscaping of the transition areas between the River Corridor SMA and adjacent development areas where feasible for their long-term survival. Plants used in these areas shall be those listed on the approved

plant palette (Specific Plan Table 2.6-2 of the Resource Management Plan [Recommended Plants for Transition Areas Adjacent to the River Corridor SMA]).

- Roads and bridges that cross the River Corridor SMA shall have adequate barriers at their perimeters to discourage access to the River Corridor SMA adjacent to the structures.
- Where bank stabilization is required to protect development areas, it shall be composed of ungrouted rock, or buried bank stabilization as described in Section 2.5.2.a, except at bridge crossings and other locations where public health and safety requirements necessitate concrete or other bank protection.
- A minimum 100-foot-wide buffer adjacent to the Santa Clara River should be required between the top river side of bank stabilization and development within the Land Use Designations Residential Low Medium, Residential Medium, Mixed-Use and Business Park unless, through Planning Director review in consultation with the staff biologist, it is determined that a lesser buffer would adequately protect the riparian resources within the River Corridor, or that a 100-foot-wide buffer is infeasible for physical infrastructure planning. The buffer area may be used for public infrastructure, such as: flood control access; sewer, water and utility easements; abutments; trails and parks, subject to findings of consistency with the Specific Plan and applicable County policies.

SP 4.6-20 The following guidelines shall be followed during any grading activities that take place within the River Corridor SMA:

- Grading perimeters shall be clearly marked and inspected by the project biologist prior to grading occurring within or immediately adjacent to the River Corridor SMA.
- The project biologist shall work with the grading contractor to avoid inadvertent impacts to riparian resources.

SP 4.6-21 Upon final approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Special Management Area designation for the River Corridor SMA shall become effective. The permitted uses and development standards for the SMA are governed by the Development Regulations, Chapter 3 of the Specific Plan.

SP 4.6-22 Upon completion of development of all land uses, utilities, roads, flood control improvements, bridges, trails, and other improvements necessary for implementation of the Specific Plan within the River Corridor in each subdivision allowing construction within or adjacent to the River Corridor, a permanent, non-revocable *conservation and public access easement* shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.6-23, below, over the portion of the River Corridor SMA within that subdivision.

SP 4.6-23 The River Corridor SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles prior to the transfer of the River Corridor SMA ownership, or portion thereof to the management entity described in Mitigation Measure 4.6-26, below.

SP 4.6-24 The River Corridor SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* shall prohibit grazing, except as a long-term resource management activity, and agriculture within the River Corridor and shall restrict recreation use to the established trail system.

Agricultural land uses and grazing for purposes other than long-term resource management activities within the River Corridor shall be extended in the event of the filing of any legal action against Los Angeles County challenging final approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and any related project approvals or certification of the Final EIR for Newhall Ranch. Agricultural land uses and grazing for purposes other than long-term resource management activities within the River Corridor shall be extended by the time period between the filing of any such legal action and the entry of a final judgment by a court with appropriate jurisdiction, after exhausting all rights of appeal, or execution of a final settlement agreement between all parties to the legal action, whichever occurs first.

- SP 4.6-25 The River Corridor SMA conservation and public access easement shall be consistent in its provisions with any other conservation easements to State or Federal resource agencies which may have been granted as part of mitigation or mitigation banking activities.
- SP 4.6-26 Prior to the recordation of the River Corridor SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* as specified in Mitigation Measure 4.6-23, above, the land owner shall provide a plan to the County for the permanent ownership and management of the River Corridor SMA, including any necessary financing. This plan shall include the transfer of ownership of the River Corridor SMA to the Center for Natural Lands Management, or if the Center for Natural Lands Management is declared bankrupt or dissolved, ownership will transfer or revert to a *joint powers authority* consisting of Los Angeles County (4 members), the City of Santa Clarita (2 members), and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (2 members).
- SP 4.6-26a Two types of habitat restoration may occur in the High Country SMA: (1) riparian revegetation activities principally in Salt Creek Canyon; and (2) oak tree replacement in, or adjacent to, existing oak woodlands and savannahs.
- Mitigation requirements for riparian revegetation activities within the High Country SMA are the same as those for the River Corridor SMA and are set forth in Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-11 and 4.6-13 through 4.6-16, above.
  - Mitigation requirements for oak tree replacement are set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.6-48, below.
- SP 4.6-27 Removal of grazing from the High Country SMA except for those grazing activities associated with long-term resource management programs, is a principal means of enhancing habitat values in the creeks, brushland, and woodland areas of the SMA. The removal of grazing in the High Country SMA is discussed below under (b)4 Long Term Management. All enhancement activities for riparian habitat within the High Country SMA shall be governed by the same provisions as set forth for enhancement in the River Corridor SMA. Specific Plan Table 2.6-3 of the Resource Management Plan provides a list of appropriate plant species for use in enhancement areas in the High Country SMA.
- SP 4.6-34 Grading perimeters shall be clearly marked and inspected by the project biologist prior to impacts occurring within or adjacent to the High Country SMA.
- SP 4.6-35 The project biologist shall work with the grading contractor to avoid inadvertent impacts to biological resources outside of the grading area.
- SP 4.6-37 The High Country SMA shall be offered for dedication in three approximately equal phases of approximately 1,400 acres each proceeding from north to south, as follows:

1. The first offer of dedication will take place with the issuance of the 2,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch;
  2. The second offer of dedication will take place with the issuance of the 6,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch; and
  3. The remaining offer of dedication will be completed by the 11,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch.
  4. The Specific Plan applicant shall provide a quarterly report to the Departments of Public Works and Regional Planning which indicates the number of residential building permits issued in the Specific Plan area by subdivision map number.
- SP 4.6-38 Prior to dedication of the High Country SMA, a *conservation and public access easement* shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles and a conservation and management easement offered to the Center for Natural Lands Management. The High Country SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* shall be consistent in its provisions with any other *conservation easements* to State or Federal resource agencies which may have been granted as part of mitigation or mitigation banking activities.
- SP 4.6-39 The High Country SMA conservation and public access easement shall prohibit grazing within the High Country, except for those grazing activities associated with the long-term resource management programs, and shall restrict recreation to the established trail system.
- SP 4.6-40 The High Country SMA conservation and public access easement shall be consistent in its provisions with any other conservation easements to State or Federal resource agencies which may have been granted as part of mitigation or mitigation banking activities.
- SP 4.6-41 The High Country SMA shall be offered for dedication in fee to a *joint powers authority* consisting of Los Angeles County (4 members), the City of Santa Clarita (2 members), and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (2 members). The *joint powers authority* will have overall responsibility for recreation within and conservation of the High Country.
- SP 4.6-42 An appropriate type of service or assessment district shall be formed under the authority of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for the collection of up to \$24 per single family detached dwelling unit per year and \$15 per single family attached dwelling unit per year, excluding any units designated as Low and Very Low affordable housing units pursuant to Section 3.10, Affordable Housing Program of the Specific Plan. This revenue would be assessed to the homeowner beginning with the occupancy of each dwelling unit and distributed to the *joint powers authority* for the purposes of recreation, maintenance, construction, conservation and related activities within the *High Country Special Management Area*.
- SP 4.6-43 Suitable portions of *Open Area* may be used for mitigation of riparian, *oak resources*, or elderberry scrub. Mitigation activities within *Open Area* shall be subject to the following requirements, as applicable.
- River Corridor SMA Mitigation Requirements, including: Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-11 and 4.6-13 through 4.6-16; and
  - High Country SMA Mitigation Requirements, including: Mitigation Measures 4.6-27, 4.6-29 through 4.6-42, and
  - Mitigation Banking - Mitigation Measure 4.6-16.

- SP 4.6-47a Mitigation Banking will be permitted within the River Corridor SMA, the High Country SMA, and the *Open Area land use designations*, subject to the following requirements:
- Mitigation banking activities for riparian habitats will be subject to State and Federal regulations, and shall be conducted pursuant to the mitigation requirements set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 through 4.6-15 above.
  - Mitigation banking for oak resources shall be conducted pursuant to 4.6-48, below.
  - Mitigation banking for elderberry scrub shall be subject to approval of plans by the County Forester.
- SP 4.6-48 Standards for the restoration and enhancement of oak resources within the High Country SMA and the Open Area include the following (oak resources include oak trees of the sizes regulated under the County Oak Tree Ordinance, southern California black walnut trees, and mainland cherry trees/shrubs):
- To mitigate the impacts to oak resources that may be removed as development occurs in the Specific Plan Area, replacement trees shall be planted in conformance with the oak tree ordinance in effect at that time.
  - Oak resource species obtained from the local gene pool shall be used in restoration or enhancement.
  - Prior to recordation of construction-level final subdivision maps, an oak resource replacement plan shall be prepared that provides the guidelines for the oak tree planting and/or replanting. The Plan shall be reviewed by the Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning and the County Forester and shall include the following: site selection and preparation, selection of proper species including sizes and planting densities, protection from herbivores, site maintenance, performance standards, remedial actions, and a monitoring program.
  - All plans and specifications shall follow County oak tree guidelines, as specified in the County Oak Tree Ordinance.
- SP 4.6-49 To minimize the potential exposure of the development areas, Open Area, and the SMAs to fire hazards, the Specific Plan is subject to the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Protection District (LACFPD), which provides fire protection for the area. At the time of final subdivision maps permitting construction in development areas that are adjacent to Open Area and the High Country SMA, a wildfire fuel modification plan shall be prepared in accordance with the fuel modification ordinance standards in effect at that time and shall be submitted for approval to the County Fire Department.
- SP 4.6-50 The wildfire fuel modification plan shall depict a fuel modification zone the size of which shall be consistent with the County fuel modification ordinance requirements. Within the zone, tree pruning, removal of dead plant material and weed and grass cutting shall take place as required by the fuel modification ordinance.
- SP 4.6-51 In order to enhance the habitat value of plant communities that require fuel modification, fire retardant plant species containing habitat value may be planted within the fuel modification zone. Typical plant species suitable for Fuel Modification Zones are indicated in Specific

Plan Table 2.6-5 of the Resource Management Plan. Fuel modification zones adjacent to SMAs and Open Areas containing habitat of high value such as oak woodland and savannas shall utilize a more restrictive plant list, which shall be reviewed by the County Forester.

SP 4.6-52 The wildfire fuel modification plan shall include the following construction period requirements: (a) a fire watch during welding operations; (b) spark arresters on all equipment or vehicles operating in a high fire hazard area; (c) designated smoking and non-smoking areas; and (d) water availability pursuant to the County Fire Department requirements.

SP 4.6-53 If, at the time any subdivision map proposing construction is submitted, the County determines through an Initial Study, or otherwise, that there may be Rare, Threatened or Endangered, plant or animal species on the property to be subdivided, then, in addition to the prior surveys conducted on the Specific Plan site to define the presence or absence of sensitive habitat and associated species, current, updated site-specific surveys for all such animal or plant species shall be conducted in accordance with the consultation requirements set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.6-59 within those areas of the Specific Plan where such animal or plant species occur or are likely to occur.

The site-specific surveys shall include the unarmored three-spine stickleback, the arroyo toad, the Southwestern pond turtle, the California red-legged frog, the southwestern willow flycatcher, the least Bell's vireo, the San Fernando Valley spineflower and any other Rare, Sensitive, Threatened, or Endangered plant or animal species occurring, or likely to occur, on the property to be subdivided. All site-specific surveys shall be conducted during appropriate seasons by qualified botanists or qualified wildlife biologists in a manner that will locate any Rare, Sensitive, Threatened, or Endangered animal or plant species that may be present. To the extent there are applicable protocols published by either the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or the California Department of Fish and Game, all such protocols shall be followed in preparing the updated site-specific surveys.

All site-specific survey work shall be documented in a separate report containing at least the following information: (a) project description, including a detailed map of the project location and study area; (b) a description of the biological setting, including references to the nomenclature used and updated vegetation mapping; (c) detailed description of survey methodologies; (d) dates of field surveys and total person-hours spent on the field surveys; (e) results of field surveys, including detailed maps and location data; (f) an assessment of potential impacts; (g) discussion of the significance of the Rare, Threatened or Endangered animal or plant populations found in the project area, with consideration given to nearby populations and species distribution; (h) mitigation measures, including avoiding impacts altogether, minimizing or reducing impacts, rectifying or reducing impacts through habitat restoration, replacement or enhancement, or compensating for impacts by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments, consistent with CEQA (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15370); (i) references cited and persons contacted; and (j) other pertinent information, which is designed to disclose impacts and mitigate for such impacts."

SP 4.6-54 Prior to development within or disturbance to occupied unarmored threespine stickleback habitat, a formal consultation with the USFWS shall occur.

SP 4.6-55 Prior to development or disturbance within wetlands or other sensitive habitats, permits shall be obtained from pertinent Federal and State agencies and the Specific Plan shall conform to the specific provisions of said permits. Performance criteria shall include that described in

Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-16 and 4.6-42 through 4.6-47 for wetlands, and Mitigation Measures 4.6-27, 4.6-28, and 4.6-42 through 4.6-48 for other sensitive habitats.

- SP 4.6-56 All lighting along the perimeter of natural areas shall be downcast luminaries with light patterns directed away from natural areas.
- SP 4.6-57 Where bridge construction is proposed and water flow would be diverted, blocking nets and seines shall be used to control and remove fish from the area of activity. All fish captured during this operation would be stored in tubs and returned unharmed back to the river after construction activities were complete.
- SP 4.6-58 To limit impacts to water quality the Specific Plan shall conform to all provisions of required NPDES permits and water quality permits that would be required by the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- SP 4.6-59 Consultation shall occur with the County of Los Angeles ("County") and California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") at each of the following milestones:
1. Before Surveys. Prior to conducting sensitive plant or animal surveys at the Newhall Ranch subdivision map level, the applicant, or its designee, shall consult with the County and CDFG for purposes of establishing and/or confirming the appropriate survey methodology to be used.
  2. After Surveys. After completion of sensitive plant or animal surveys at the subdivision map level, draft survey results shall be made available to the County and CDFG within sixty (60) calendar days after completion of the field survey work.
  3. Subdivision Map Submittal. Within thirty (30) calendar days after the applicant, or its designee, submits its application to the County for processing of a subdivision map in the Mesas Village or Riverwood Village, a copy of the submittal shall be provided to CDFG. In addition, the applicant, or its designee, shall schedule a consultation meeting with the County and CDFG for purposes of obtaining comments and input on the proposed subdivision map submittal. The consultation meeting shall take place at least thirty (30) days prior to the submittal of the proposed subdivision map to the County.
  4. Development/Disturbance and Further Mitigation. Prior to any development within, or disturbance to, habitat occupied by Rare, Threatened, or Endangered plant or animal species, or to any portion of the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay, as defined below, all required permits shall be obtained from both USFWS and CDFG, as applicable. It is further anticipated that the Federal and State permits will impose conditions and mitigation measures required by Federal and State law that are beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Final EIR (March 1999), the Newhall Ranch DAA (April 2001) and the Newhall Ranch Revised DAA (2002). It is also anticipated that conditions and mitigation measures required by Federal and State law for project-related impacts on Endangered, Rare or Threatened species and their habitat will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns and techniques associated with project-specific grading at the subdivision map level.
- SP 4.6-67 Indirect impacts associated with the interface between the preserved spineflower populations and planned development within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall be avoided or minimized by establishing open space connections with Open Area, River Corridor, or High Country land use designations. In addition, buffers (i.e., setbacks from developed, landscaped or other use areas) shall be established around portions of the delineated

preserve(s) not connected to Open Area, the River Corridor or the High Country land use designations. The open space connections and buffer configurations shall take into account local hydrology, soils, existing and proposed adjacent land uses, the presence of non-native invasive plant species, and seed dispersal vectors.

Open space connections shall be configured such that the spineflower preserves are connected to Open Area, River Corridor, or High Country land use designations to the extent practicable. Open space connections shall be of adequate size and configuration to achieve a moderate to high likelihood of effectiveness in avoiding or minimizing indirect impacts (e.g., invasive plants, increased fire frequency, trampling, chemicals, etc.) to the spineflower preserve(s). Open space connections for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be configured in consultation with the County and CDFG. Open space connections for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be established for the entire Specific Plan area in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesa Village, or that portion of the Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs.

For preserves and/or those portions of preserves not connected to Open Area, River Corridor, or High Country land use designations, buffers shall be established at variable distances of between 80 and 200 feet from the edge of development to achieve a moderate to high likelihood of effectiveness in avoiding or minimizing indirect impacts (e.g., invasive plants, increased fire frequency, trampling, chemicals, etc.) to the spineflower preserve(s). The buffer size/configuration shall be guided by the analysis set forth in the "*Review of Potential Edge Effects on the San Fernando Valley Spineflower*," prepared by Conservation Biology Institute, January 19, 2000, and other sources of scientific information and analysis, which are available at the time the preserve(s) and buffers are established. Buffers for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be configured in consultation with the County and CDFG for the entire Specific Plan area. Buffers for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be established in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesa Village, or that portion of the Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs.

Roadways and road rights-of-way shall not be constructed in any spineflower preserve(s) and buffer locations on Newhall Ranch unless constructing the road(s) in such location is found to be the environmentally superior alternative in subsequently required tiered EIRs in connection with the Newhall Ranch subdivision map(s) process. No other development or disturbance of native habitat shall be allowed within the spineflower preserve(s) or buffer(s).

The project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for revegetating open space connections and buffer areas of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) to mitigate temporary impacts due to grading that will occur within portions of those open space connections and buffer areas. The impacted areas shall be reseeded with a native seed mix to prevent erosion, reduce the potential for invasive non-native plants, and maintain functioning habitat areas within the buffer area. Revegetation seed mix shall be reviewed and approved by the County and CDFG.

- SP 4.6-68 To protect the preserved Newhall Ranch spineflower populations, and to further reduce potential direct impacts to such populations due to unrestricted access, the project applicant, or its designee, shall erect and maintain temporary orange fencing and prohibitive signage around the Newhall Ranch preserve(s), open space connections and buffer areas, which are adjacent to areas impacted by proposed development prior to and during all phases of construction. The areas behind the temporary fencing shall not be used for the storage of



any equipment, materials, construction debris, or anything associated with construction activities.

Following the final phase of construction of any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s), the project applicant, or its designee, shall install and maintain permanent fencing along the subdivision tract bordering the preserve(s). Permanent signage shall be installed on the fencing along the preservation boundary to indicate that the fenced area is a biological preserve, which contains protected species and habitat, that access is restricted, and that trespassing and fuel modification are prohibited within the area. The permanent fencing shall be designed to allow wildlife movement.

The plans and specifications for the permanent fencing and signage shall be approved by the County and CDFG prior to the final phase of construction of any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to a Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s).

- SP 4.6-69 Indirect impacts resulting from changes to hydrology (i.e., increased water runoff from surrounding development) at the interface between spineflower preserve(s) and planned development within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall be avoided or mitigated to below a level of significance.

Achievement of this standard will be met through the documented demonstration by the project applicant, or its designee, that the storm drain system achieves pre-development hydrological conditions for the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s). To document such a condition, the project applicant, or its designee, shall prepare a study of the pre- and post-development hydrology, in conjunction with Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to spineflower preserve(s). The study shall be used in the design and engineering of a storm drain system that achieves pre-development hydrological conditions. The study must conclude that proposed grade changes in development areas beyond the buffers will maintain pre-development hydrology conditions within the preserve(s). The study shall be approved by the Planning Director of the County, and the resulting conditions confirmed by CDFG.

The storm drain system for Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to any spineflower preserves must be approved by the County prior to the initiation of any grading activities.

### **2.1.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

To further reduce the magnitude of impacts to biological resources that would result from project implementation, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

- LV 4.4-1 The Conceptual Wetland Mitigation Plan (see Final EIR, **Appendix A**) shall be implemented by the applicant (see also Mitigation Measure 4.6-63). The plan specifies, at a minimum, the following: (1) the location of mitigation sites; (2) the quantity and species of plants to be planted; (3) procedures for creating additional habitat; (4) methods for the removal of non-native plants; (5) a schedule and action plan to maintain and monitor the enhancement/restoration area; (6) a list of criteria and performance standards by which to measure success of the mitigation sites; (7) measures to exclude unauthorized entry into the riparian creation/enhancement areas; and (8) contingency measures in the event that mitigation efforts are not successful. The plan provides for the 1:1 replacement of any Southern California black walnut to be removed from the riparian corridor. The plan provides for the mitigation of big sagebrush scrub along the riparian corridor. The plan shall

be subject to the approval of CDFG, ACOE, and the County, and approved prior to issuance of the grading permit.

- LV 4.4-2 Appropriately timed focused surveys for the undescribed species of *Gnaphalium* (Special-Status Plant Species) shall be conducted by a qualified botanist prior to the commencement of grading/construction activities within suitable habitat (primarily river terraces) of the species to determine if plants have established within potential impacted areas since the time of the 2005 survey. No longer than one year shall elapse between completion of the survey and commencement of construction activities. Should the species be documented within the project boundary, avoidance measures shall be implemented to minimize impacts to individual plants. These measures shall include minor adjustments to the boundaries/location of haul routes and other project features. If, due to project design constraints, avoidance of all plants is not possible, then available methods for salvaging seeds and/or transplantation of individual plants to be impacted will be evaluated and implemented. All seed collection and/or transplantation methods, as well as the location of the receiver site for seeds/plants (assumed to be within preserved open space areas of Newhall Ranch along the Santa Clara River), shall be coordinated and approved by the County prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
- LV 4.4-3 The *Draft Slender Mariposa Lily Mitigation and Monitoring Plan* (see Final EIR, **Appendix A**) shall be implemented by the applicant. The plan incorporates the findings of the *Draft Newhall Ranch Mitigation Feasibility Study* (Dudek 2007; see Final EIR, **Appendix A**). The plan demonstrates the feasibility of replacing the number of individual plants to be removed at a 1:1 ratio and/or enhancing and protecting existing populations of the species. The plan specifies, at a minimum, the following: (1) the location of mitigation sites in protected/preserved areas within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area; (2) methods for harvesting seeds and salvaging and transplantation of individual bulbs/plants to be impacted; (3) site preparation procedures for the mitigation site; (4) a schedule and action plan to maintain and monitor the mitigation area; (5) a list of criteria and performance standards by which to measure success of the mitigation site; (6) measures to exclude unauthorized entry into the mitigation areas; and (7) contingency measures in the event that mitigation efforts are not successful. The plan shall be subject to the approval of the County prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
- LV 4.4-4 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, an oak resource replacement plan shall be prepared that provides the guidelines for the oak tree planting and/or replanting. The Plan shall demonstrate conformance with the County of Los Angeles Oak Tree Ordinance and include measures to replace the number and species of oak trees to be removed. The plan shall incorporate the findings of the *Draft Newhall Ranch Mitigation Feasibility Study* (Dudek & Associates 2007) and areas identified in the technical report as being suitable for oak woodland enhancement and creation shall be used as mitigation. Other mitigation sites may be used upon approval by the County. The Plan shall be reviewed by the County Forester. The Plan shall include the following: site selection and preparation, selection of proper species including sizes and planting densities, protection from herbivores, site maintenance, performance standards, remedial actions, and a monitoring program.
- LV 4.4-5 All oaks with driplines within 50 feet of land clearing (including brush clearing) or areas to be graded shall be enclosed in a temporary fenced zone for the duration of the clearing or grading activities. Fencing shall extend to the root protection zone (i.e., the area at least 15 feet from the trunk or half again as large as the distance from the trunk to the drip line, whichever distance is greater). No parking or storage of equipment, solvents or chemicals

that could adversely affect the trees shall be allowed within 25 feet of the trunk at any time. Removal of the fence shall occur only after the project biologist confirms the health of preserved trees.

- LV 4.4-6 Prior to initiating construction for the installation of bridges, storm drain outlets, utility lines, and/or bank protection, all construction sites and access roads within the riverbed, as well as all riverbed areas within 300 feet of the construction site and access road, shall be inspected by a qualified biologist for the presence of unarmored threespine stickleback, Santa Ana sucker and arroyo chub. The ACOE, USFWS, and the CDFG shall be notified of the inspection and shall have the option of attending. If any of the above agencies is not represented, the biologist shall file a written report of the inspection with the agency not in attendance within 14 days of the survey and no sooner than 30 days prior to any construction work in the riverbed.
- LV 4.4-7 To the degree feasible, all work within the Santa Clara River (including the construction of the Long Canyon Road Bridge) shall occur when the unarmored threespine stickleback is not present. Should construction activities within the river channel be necessary while water is present in the disturbance zone, then construction shall only be conducted as follows: (1) when water flows are insufficient to support unarmored threespine stickleback or to allow passage of the species through the disturbance area (as determined by the qualified fisheries biologist, subject to the approval of the County and CDFG); (2) it has been determined by the qualified biologist that threespine stickleback is not present within areas to be affected; or (3) if it is determined that stream diversions are necessary to complete the required work, then to avoid take of unarmored threespine stickleback the diversions of water shall be conducted in a manner that would not result in the take or possession of unarmored threespine stickleback (see LV 4.4-11).
- LV 4.4-8 Construction work areas and access roads shall be cleared of Santa Ana sucker and arroyo chub immediately before the prescribed work is to be carried out, immediately before any equipment is moved into or through the stream or habitat areas, and immediately before diverting any stream water. The removal of such species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist using procedures approved by the ACOE, USFWS, and CDFG, and with the appropriate collection and handling permits. Species shall be relocated to nearby suitable habitat areas. A plan to relocate these species shall be submitted to the ACOE, USFWS, and CDFG for review and approval no later than 30 days prior to construction.
- LV 4.4-9 All stream flows traversing a construction site or temporary access road shall be diverted around the site and under access roads (using a temporary culverts or crossings that allow fish passage). A temporary diversion channel shall be constructed using the least damaging method possible, such as blading a narrow pilot channel through an open sandy river bottom. The removal of wetland and riparian vegetation to construct the channel shall be avoided to the greatest extent feasible. The temporary channel shall be connected to a natural channel downstream of the construction site prior to diverting the stream. The integrity of the channel and diversion shall be maintained throughout the construction period. The stream channel alignment shall be restored after construction, in consultation with CDFG. The plan shall incorporate measures to assure that the Fully Protected unarmored threespine stickleback will not be taken or possessed.
- LV 4.4-10 A qualified biologist shall be present when any stream/river diversion takes place, or when blocking nets and seines are used (see also **EIR Mitigation Measure 4.6-57**), and shall patrol the areas both within, upstream and downstream of the work area to rescue any

species stranded by the diversion of the stream water or trapped by the nets/seines. Species that are collected shall be relocated to suitable locations downstream of the work area.

- LV 4.4-11 Equipment shall not be operated in areas of ponded or flowing water unless there are no practicable alternative methods to accomplish the construction work, and only after prior approval by the CDFG and the ACOE. Approval shall be acquired by submitting a request to the CDFG and the ACOE no later than 30 days prior to construction. The request must contain a biological evaluation demonstrating that no sensitive fish are currently present, or likely to be present during construction, at the construction site or along access roads.
- LV 4.4-12 Installation of bridges, culverts or other structures shall not impair movement of fish and aquatic life. Bottoms of temporary culverts shall be placed at or below channel grade. Bottoms of permanent culverts shall be placed below channel grade.
- LV 4.4-13 Water containing mud, silt, or other pollutants from construction activities shall not be allowed to enter a flowing stream or placed in locations that may be subject to normal storm flows during periods when storm flows can reasonably be expected to occur.
- LV 4.4-14 At a minimum, the following Best Management Practices shall be implemented for all construction activities occurring within or adjacent to the Santa Clara River:
- Vehicles shall not be driven or equipment operated in areas of ponded or flowing water, or where wetland vegetation, riparian vegetation, or aquatic organisms may be destroyed, except as otherwise provided for in the 404 permit or 1603 Agreement.
  - Staging/storage areas for construction equipment and materials shall be located outside of the ordinary high water mark.
  - Any equipment or vehicles driven and/or operated within or adjacent to the river shall be checked and maintained daily, to prevent leaks of materials that if introduced to water could be deleterious to aquatic life.
  - Stationary equipment such as motors, pumps, generators, and welders which may be located within the riverbed construction zone shall be positioned over drip pans. No fuel storage tanks shall be allowed in the riverbed.
  - No equipment maintenance shall be done within or near any stream where petroleum products or other pollutants from the equipment may enter these areas with stream flow.
- LV 4.4-15 Blocking nets, or fences with 0.125-inch-square mesh, 18 inches high and buried 6 inches, shall be placed downstream of the work area to assure that none of the species move into the construction area.
- LV 4.4-16 Construction activities in the riverbed shall be restricted to the following areas of temporary disturbance: (1) an 85-foot-wide zone that extends into the river from the base of the rip-rap gunite or soil cement bank protection from where it intercepts the river bottom; (2) 100 feet on either side of the outer edge of a new bridge or bridge to be modified; (3) 50-foot-wide corridor for all utility lines; and (4) 20-foot-wide temporary access ramps and roads to reach construction sites. The locations of these temporary construction sites and the routes of all access roads shall be shown on maps submitted to the ACOE and CDFG for individual project approval. The construction plans should indicate what type of vegetation, if any,

would be temporarily disturbed and the post-construction activities to facilitate natural revegetation of the temporarily disturbed areas.

- LV 4.4-17 Prior to initiating construction for the installation of bridges, storm drain outlets, utility lines, and/or bank protection, all construction sites and access roads within the riverbed, as well as all riverbed areas within 300 feet of the construction site and access road, shall be inspected by a qualified biologist for the presence of arroyo toad, southwestern pond turtle, two-striped garter snake, and south coast garter snake. The ACOE, USFWS, and the CDFG shall be notified of the inspection and shall have the option of attending. If any of the above agencies is not represented, the biologist shall file a written report of the inspection with the agency not in attendance within 14 days of the survey and no sooner than 30 days prior to any construction work in the riverbed.
- LV 4.4-18 Construction work areas and access roads shall be cleared of arroyo toad, California red-legged frog, southwestern pond turtle, two-striped garter snake, and south coast garter snake immediately before the prescribed work is to be carried out, immediately before any equipment is moved into or through the stream or habitat areas, and immediately before diverting any stream water. The removal of such species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist using procedures approved by the ACOE, USFWS, and CDFG, and with the appropriate collection and handling permits. Species shall be relocated to nearby suitable habitat areas. A plan to relocate these species shall be submitted to the ACOE, USFWS, and CDFG for review and approval no later than 30 days prior to construction.
- LV 4.4-19 In addition to the arroyo toad survey areas specified in mitigation measures **LV 4.4-17** and **LV 4.4-18**, clearance surveys for arroyo toad shall be conducted within portions of the Landmark Village project site containing agricultural fields. Should arroyo toad be identified, the USFWS shall be contacted immediately and construction activities shall be halted.
- LV 4.4-20 For all grading and construction activities a qualified biologist shall be retained by the applicant (with selection reviewed by the County) to ensure that incidental construction impacts on special-status wildlife species are avoided or minimized. The biologist shall be in possession of a Scientific Collecting permit and relocate any wildlife species (for which they are permitted to handle) that may be destroyed or adversely affected as a result of construction and/or site preparation activities. Should a state or federally listed species be encountered, construction shall be halted until a permitted biologist can relocate the animal(s). Responsibilities of the construction biological monitor include the following:
- Attend the pre-construction meeting to ensure that timing/location of construction activities do not conflict with other mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for nesting birds). Conduct meetings with the contractor and other key construction personnel describing the importance of restricting work to designated areas.
  - Discuss procedures for minimizing harm/harassment of wildlife encountered during construction.
  - Review/designate the construction area in the field with the contractor in accordance with the final grading plan. Haul roads, access roads, and on-site staging and storage areas shall be sited within grading areas to minimize degradation of habitat adjacent to these areas. If activities outside these limits are necessary, they shall be evaluated by the biologist to ensure no special-status species or habitat will be affected.

- Conduct a field review of the staking (to be set by the surveyor) designating the limits of all construction activity. Any construction activity areas immediately adjacent to riparian areas or other special-status resources (such as large trees or bird nests) may be flagged or temporarily fenced by the monitor, at his/her discretion.
- Periodically visit the site during construction to coordinate and monitor compliance with the above provisions.
- Submit to the County an immediate report of any conflicts or errors resulting in impacts to special-status resources as well as a final report on the results of construction and any recommendations for improving the process.

LV 4.4-21 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for ground disturbance, construction or site preparation activities, the applicant shall retain the services of a qualified biologist, approved by the CDFG and Los Angeles County, to conduct appropriately timed focused surveys for western spadefoot toad within all portions of the project site containing suitable breeding habitat. If western spadefoot are not identified on the project site, no further measures would be required. Should western spadefoot be identified on the project site, the following measures would be implemented:

- (a) Under the direct supervision of the qualified biologist, western spadefoot toad habitat shall be created within suitable natural sites on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area, outside of the proposed development envelope. The amount of occupied breeding habitat to be impacted by the Landmark Village project shall be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. The actual relocation site design and location shall be approved by CDFG and consist of a shallow excavated pond(s) utilizing an artificial rubber pond liner as a base. The location shall be as far away as possible from any of the homes and roads to be built. The relocation pond(s) shall be designed such that it only supports standing water for several weeks following seasonal rains in order that aquatic predators (i.e., fish, bullfrogs, crayfish, etc.) cannot become established. The size and number of ponds shall be determined by CDFG. Terrestrial habitat surrounding the proposed relocation site shall be as similar in type, aspect, and density to the location of the existing ponds as possible. No site preparation or construction activities shall be permitted in the vicinity of the currently occupied ponds until the design and construction of the pool habitat in preserved areas of the site has been completed and the relocation of all western spadefoot toad adult, tadpoles, and egg masses detected are moved to the created pool habitat to the satisfaction of the monitoring biologist and CDFG.
- (b) Based on appropriate rainfall and temperatures, generally between the months of February and April, the biologist shall conduct a series of surveys in all appropriate habitats within the development envelope prior to the initiation of construction activities. Surveys will include evaluation of all previously documented occupied areas and a reconnaissance level survey of the remaining natural areas of the site. All western spadefoot adults, tadpoles, and egg masses encountered shall be collected and released in identified relocation pond(s) described above.
- (c) The qualified biologist shall monitor the relocation site for a minimum period of five years, or as otherwise directed by CDFG. Specific monitoring requirements and success criteria shall be approved by CDFG. It is expected that minimum requirements will include annual monitoring during and immediately following peak breeding season such that surveys can be conducted for adults as well as for egg masses, larval and post

larval toads. Further, survey data will be provided to CDFG by the monitoring biologist following each monitoring period and a written report summarizing the monitoring results will be provided to CDFG at the end of the monitoring effort. Success criteria for the monitoring program shall include verifiable evidence of toad reproduction at the relocation site.

LV 4.4-22 A pre-ground disturbance survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist (subject to approval by the County) within 14 days of any disturbance activities in all areas on the project site containing suitable habitat for coast horned lizard, silvery legless lizard, coastal western whiptail, rosy boa, San Bernardino ringneck snake, and coast patch-nosed snake. If any of these species are observed within the disturbance zone, they shall be relocated to a suitable area outside of the disturbance zone. Results of the surveys and relocation efforts shall be provided to CDFG and the County. Collection and relocation of animals shall only occur with the proper scientific collection and handling permits.

LV 4.4-23 Grading activities shall be conducted to allow mobile animals the ability to escape the disturbance area into adjacent undisturbed habitat and to prevent creating fragmented islands of habitat that would eventually be cleared/graded. This shall be accomplished through phased grading, in a uniform direction towards habitats that would not be disturbed by the proposed project. The phasing of grading shall be subject to the approval of the County.

LV 4.4-24 Within 30 days of ground disturbance activities associated with construction or grading that would occur during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (typically March through August in the project region, or as determined by a qualified biologist), the applicant shall have weekly surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests of bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present in the disturbance zone or within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) of the disturbance zone. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than seven days prior to initiation of disturbance work. If ground disturbance activities are delayed, then additional pre-disturbance surveys shall be conducted such that no more than seven days will have elapsed between the survey and ground disturbance activities.

If active nests are found, clearing and construction within 300 feet of the nest (500 feet for raptors) shall be postponed or halted, at the discretion of the biologist, until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. Limits of construction to avoid an active nest shall be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or other appropriate barriers, and construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities will occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests occur. The results of the surveys, and any avoidance measures taken, shall be submitted to the County of Los Angeles within 30 days of completion of the pre-construction surveys and/or construction monitoring to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

LV 4.4-25 Thirty days prior to construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey to determine if the burrowing owl is present at the site, and the nesting status of the individuals at the site. If nesting is not occurring, construction work can proceed after any owls have been evacuated from the site using CDFG-approved burrow closure procedures and after alternative nest sites have been provided in accordance with the CDFG Staff Report on

Burrowing Owl Mitigation (10-17-95). If nesting is occurring, construction work within 500 feet shall be delayed until fledglings have left the nest (as described in **LV 4.4-25**). Pre-construction surveys shall only be conducted in areas dominated by field crops and grassland, or if such habitats occur within 500 feet of a construction zone.

- LV 4.4-26 A pre-ground disturbance survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist (subject to approval by the County) within 14 days or any disturbance activities in all areas on the project site containing suitable habitat for American badger, San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit and San Diego desert woodrat. If any of these species are observed within the disturbance zone, they shall be relocated to a suitable area outside of the disturbance zone. Results of the surveys and relocation efforts shall be provided to CDFG and the County. Collection and relocation of animals shall only occur with the proper scientific collection and handling permits.

If active San Diego desert woodrat nests (stick houses) with young are identified within the disturbance zone or within 100 feet of the disturbance zone, a fence shall be erected around the nest site with a 100-foot minimum buffer from construction activities. This buffer may be greater, if determined to be appropriate by the biologist. At the discretion of the biologist, clearing and construction within the fenced area would be postponed or halted until young have left the nest. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when disturbance activities will occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests will occur. If San Diego desert woodrats are observed within the grading footprint outside of the breeding period, individuals shall be trapped and relocated to a suitable location on or in proximity to the project site (outside of the disturbance boundary and as approved by the CDFG) by a qualified biologist in possession of a scientific collecting permit. Any stick nests found near captured woodrats shall also be salvaged and relocated into the identified relocation site where captured woodrats are to be released.

- LV 4.4-27 No earlier than 20 days prior to any grading activity that would occur during the breeding season of native bat species potentially utilizing the site (April 1 through August 31), a field survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist (retained by the applicant, with selection reviewed by the County) to determine if active roosts of special-status bats such as Townsend's big-eared bat, pallid bat, western mastiff bat, pocketed free-tail bat, and Yuma myotis are present in areas of the project site containing suitable roosting habitat, such as woodlands and buildings. If active maternity roosts are found, construction within 200 feet shall be postponed or halted, at the discretion of the biological monitor, until the roost is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the biologist. Implementation of this measure would ensure that no loss of active maternity roosts of special-status bat species will occur and, therefore, will reduce impacts on bat species to a less than significant level.

- LV 4.4-28 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall prepare a landscaping plan. This plan will be subject to review and approval by the County and CDFG and will include a plant palette composed of native or non-native non-invasive species that are adapted to the conditions found on the Landmark Village site, without requiring high irrigation rates. Irrigation of perimeter landscaping shall be limited to temporary (*i.e.*, until plants become established) drip irrigation. The landscaping plan will also include a list of invasive plant species prohibited from being planted on the project site. This list of prohibited plants will be compiled in cooperation with a qualified restoration specialist and will be distributed to future occupants of the Landmark Village site.



- LV 4.4-29 Waste and recycling receptacles that discourage foraging by wildlife species adapted to urban environments shall be installed in common areas and parks throughout the Landmark Village site.
- LV 4.4-30 The Landmark Village Home Owners Association shall supply educational information to future residents of the Landmark Village site regarding the importance of not feeding wildlife, ensuring that trash (containing food) is not accessible to wildlife, keeping the ground free of fallen fruit from trees and not leaving pet food outside.
- LV 4.4-31 Prior to use and placement on the Landmark Village site, all landscaping materials (including organic mulches) shall be inspected and certified "free" of Argentine ants. Preparation of the CC&Rs for the project site shall include language that prohibits the use of anticoagulants on an individual basis as well as part of maintenance of common areas.
- LV 4.4-32 The Home Owners Association shall fund or otherwise coordinate the regular removal of trash and debris from riparian habitats on or adjacent to the project site. The removal of trash shall be conducted in a manner as to not disturb sensitive habitats.
- LV 4.4-33 The Home Owners Association shall supply educational information to future residents regarding not allowing cats outdoors or other pets outdoors while unattended. The material shall discuss the presence of native animals (*e.g.*, coyote, bobcat, mountain lion) that could prey on pets and indicate that no actions shall be taken against native animals should they prey on pets allowed outdoors.
- LV 4.4-34 Dogs shall be required to be to leashed while using the designated trail system and shall be prohibited from within protected riparian and upland habitats bordering the tract map site.

### 2.1.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will substantially lessen biota impacts attributable to the proposed project. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which would mitigate, in part, the significant biota impacts attributable to the proposed project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, such identified impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified biota impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable biota impacts of the proposed project.

## 2.2 VISUAL QUALITIES

### 2.2.1 Unavoidable and Significant Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan has been forecasted to result in unavoidable significant impacts relating to visual qualities and aesthetics due to the conversion of open space to an urban landscape. These changes were determined to be visible from three view corridors (*i.e.*, the Santa Clara River/SR-126 corridor; the Chiquito Canyon corridor; the Interstate 5 corridor), which include a total of eight viewsheds. Two additional viewsheds, outside of the three view corridors, also were identified as being

subject to impacts. These particular impacts were determined to be unavoidable due to absence of mitigation to remediate the view change.

The proposed project would significantly alter the visual characteristics of the Santa Clara River/SR-126 corridor through its addition of residential and commercial development, roadways, bridges, and other human activity. The addition of the proposed project would obstruct and alter views of the River, bluffs, and ridgelines previously visible from this corridor. The construction activity also would substantially affect this view corridor, and is likely to result in a short-term significant impact. Views in Chiquito Canyon also would be significantly altered due to project implementation.

Further, the proposed project would increase the sources of outdoor illumination. As a result, the proposed project would increase the amount of glare (including reflected light) generated on the project site during the day and would increase the amount of light generated during the night. Given that the site presently produces little or no light or glare, as it is primarily undeveloped land, implementation of the proposed project would result in a substantial change over the present condition.

Even with the inclusion of various project design features (*see* Specific Plan, Chapters 3 and 4, containing Development Regulations and Design Guidelines that apply to the proposed project and that address grading, lighting, fencing, landscaping, signage, architecture, and site planning), and the incorporation of the mitigation measures identified below, visual impacts would remain significant and unavoidable due to the change in the visual character of the site from rural to urban.

### **2.2.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to mitigate these visual quality impacts attributable to the proposed project to a level below significant. However, the following feasible mitigation measures would substantially lessen the identified significant visual quality impacts as identified in the Draft EIR.

#### ***2.2.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures***

- SP 4.7-1 In conjunction with the development review process set forth in Chapter 5 of the Specific Plan, all future subdivision maps and other discretionary permits which allow construction shall incorporate the Development Guidelines (Specific Plan, Chapter 3) and Design Guidelines (Specific Plan Chapter 4), and the design themes and view considerations listed in the Specific Plan.
- SP 4.7-2 In design of residential tentative tract maps and site planning of multifamily areas and Commercial and Mixed-Use land use designations along SR-126, the following Design Guidelines shall be utilized:
- Where the elevations of buildings will obstruct the views from SR-126 to the south, the location and configuration of individual buildings, driveways, parking, streets, signs, and pathways shall be designed to provide view corridors of the river, bluffs, and the ridge lines south of the river. Those view corridors may be perpendicular to SR-126 or oblique to it in order to provide for views of passengers within moving vehicles on SR-126.
  - The Community Park between SR-126 and the Santa Clara River shall be designed to promote views from SR-126 of the river, bluffs, and ridge lines to the south of the river.

- Residential Site Planning Guidelines set forth in Section 4.3.1, Residential and Architectural Guidelines, set forth [in] Section 4.4.1, Residential, shall be employed to ensure that the views from SR-126 are aesthetically pleasing and that views of the river, bluffs, and ridge lines south of the river are preserved to the extent practicable.
- Mixed-Use and the Commercial Site Planning Guidelines set forth in Section 4.3.2 and Architectural Guidelines set forth Section 4.4.2 shall be incorporated to the extent practicable in the design of the Riverwood Village Mixed-Use and Commercial land use designations to ensure that the views from SR-126 are aesthetically pleasing and to preserve views of the river, bluffs, and ridge lines south of the river.
- Landscape improvements along SR-126 shall incorporate the Landscape Design Guidelines, set forth in Section 4.6 in order to ensure that the views from SR-126 are aesthetically pleasing and to preserve views of the river, bluffs, and ridge lines south of the river.

#### **2.2.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

No additional mitigation measures are recommended beyond that already incorporated into the Specific Plan and its related environmental documentation.

### **2.2.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will substantially lessen the visual quality impacts attributable to the proposed project. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which would mitigate, in part, the significant visual quality impacts attributable to the proposed project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified visual quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable visual quality impacts of the proposed project.

## **2.3 NOISE**

### **2.3.1 Unavoidable and Significant Impacts**

The Program EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan, on a project-specific and cumulative basis, would result in potentially significant impacts, specifically due to the exposure of on-site sensitive receptors to roadway and stationary noise levels that exceed applicable standards. However, the Program EIR further found that the identified mitigation measures would reduce said impacts to a level below significant.

Development of the Landmark Village site over a 54-month period would involve clearing and grading of the ground surface, trucks importing approximately 5.8 million cubic yards of fill material, and the building of the proposed improvements. These activities typically involve the temporary use of heavy equipment, smaller equipment, and motor vehicles, which generate both steady and episodic noise. This

noise would primarily affect the occupants of on-site uses constructed in the earlier phases of the development (assuming that the site is occupied in sections as other portions are still under construction) and would be audible to occupants of the off-site Travel Village Recreational Vehicle (RV) Park when construction activities occur.

Grading operations at the site and the off-site borrow sites would occur over a 46-week period. Because the Adobe Canyon borrow site is not in close proximity to existing sensitive receptors, grading operations at this site would not result in a significant noise impact. The construction noise would not be audible within the community of Val Verde due to intervening distances and topography.

On-site occupants who would have an uninterrupted line of sight to the construction noise sources could be exposed to increased noise levels during construction, resulting in potentially significant impacts unless mitigated. Noise impacts from these construction activities would be less than significant at the Travel Village RV Park. However, occupants of the RV Park could be exposed to excessive noise levels during utility corridor construction, resulting in significant impacts as construction activity occurs adjacent to the Park. Although mitigation is recommended to reduce these impacts, the resulting noise levels may continue to exceed the applicable thresholds, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. On-site construction noise would not be audible at the community of Val Verde due to distances between the site and the community of Val Verde, the intervening topography that would attenuate on-site noise, and traffic noise along SR-126 that would “drown out” on-site construction noise to the south.

In the event construction of the Long Canyon Road Bridge requires pile driving into the bed of the Santa Clara River, the noise levels associated with these activities would be audible to occupants of on-site uses constructed prior to the bridge, and would exceed County noise thresholds within 5,000 feet of the pile-driving activities. Therefore, if it is not feasible to complete the pile driving prior to occupancy of on-site noise sensitive residential uses located within 5,000 feet of the pile-driving activities, a short-term significant and unavoidable construction noise impact would occur. If pile drilling were utilized instead of pile driving, short-term noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable at noise sensitive uses located within 1,600 feet of the pile-drilling activities.

Sound levels from long-range traffic volumes along SR-126 and on proposed “A” Street would exceed the thresholds of significance for noise sensitive uses proposed along these roadways within the project boundaries. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, noise impacts at these noise sensitive uses would be reduced to levels below significant.

The project would construct a fire station which would result in periodic use of sirens and air horns during emergency responses. However, given that the fire station is located in a commercial land use location (not adjacent to residential uses) and sirens and air horns are intermittent noise sources, no significant noise impacts are expected with the construction and operation of the fire station.

Upon build-out, the project would not result in mobile or point-source noise impacts to off-site locations. However, future traffic along SR-126, with and without the project, would cause mobile source noise levels at the Travel Village RV Park to exceed 70.0 decibels on an A-weighted scale (dB(A)) community noise equivalent level (CNEL) by 2010. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.9-14 from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, once noise levels reach 70 dB(A) CNEL at certain locations on the RV Park site, the project applicant will be required to mitigate highway noise levels at Travel Village to 70 dB(A) or less.

Point sources of noise from the proposed on-site parks would include ball fields used during evening hours by the school and/or intramural events that could last for more than several hours. Noises typical of such uses would be from parking lots, participants and observers, loud speakers, *etc.* Noise levels from

these activities could exceed the County Noise Ordinance at residences within Landmark Village that are proposed in close proximity to the school and the public parks, resulting in a significant impact on the residents unless mitigated.

### **2.3.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to mitigate the identified significant and unavoidable noise-related impacts attributable to the proposed project. However, the following feasible mitigation measures would substantially lessen the other significant noise impacts, as identified in the Draft EIR:

#### **2.3.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

Certain mitigation measures adopted in connection with the Specific Plan, regarding the preparation of additional environmental studies, are omitted as they already have been satisfied by the project applicant. Those mitigation measures are as follows: SP 4.9-6 through SP 4.9-8, SP 4.9-17 (first paragraph). Other mitigation measures, SP 4.9-13 and SP 4.9-17 (second paragraph), were omitted because they are not applicable to the proposed project. For additional information regarding the reasons why the identified mitigation measures are not applicable to the proposed project, please refer to Section 4.8, Noise, of the Draft EIR.

- SP 4.9-1 All construction activity occurring on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site shall adhere to the requirements of the "County of Los Angeles Construction Equipment Noise Standards," County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Section 12.08.440 as identified in [Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR] Table 4.9-3.
- SP 4.9-2 Limit all construction activities near occupied residences to between the hours of 6:30 AM and 8:00 PM, and exclude all Sundays and legal holidays pursuant to County Department of Public Works, Construction Division standards.
- SP 4.9-3 When construction operations occur adjacent to occupied residential areas, implement appropriate additional noise reduction measures that include changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, notifying adjacent residences in advance of construction work, and installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.
- SP 4.9-4 Locate construction staging areas on-site to maximize the distance between staging areas and occupied residential areas.
- SP 4.9-5 Where new single family residential buildings are to be constructed within an exterior noise contour of 60 dB(A) CNEL or greater, or where any multi-family buildings are to be constructed within an exterior noise contour of 65 dB(A) CNEL or greater, an acoustic analysis shall be completed prior to approval of building permits. The acoustical analysis shall show that the building is designed so that interior noise levels resulting from outside sources will be no greater than 45 dB(A) CNEL.
- SP 4.9-9 All residential air conditioning equipment installed within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site shall adhere to the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Residential Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Noise Standards, County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Section 12.08.530.

- SP 4.9-10 All stationary and point sources of noise occurring on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site shall adhere to the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Section 12.08.390 as identified in Table 4.9-2, County of Los Angeles Exterior Noise Standards for Stationary and Point Noise Sources.
- SP 4.9-11 Loading, unloading, opening, closing, or other handling of boxes, crates, containers, building materials, garbage cans or similar objects between the hours of 10:00 PM and 6:00 AM in such a manner as to cause a noise disturbance is prohibited in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Section 12.08.460.
- SP 4.9-12 Loading zones and trash receptacles in commercial and Business Park areas shall be located away from adjacent residential areas, or provide attenuation so that noise levels at residential uses do not exceed the standards identified in Section 12.08.460 of the Ordinance No. 11743.
- SP 4.9-14 After the time that occupancy of uses on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site occurs, AND when noise levels at the Travel Village RV Park reach 70 dB(A) CNEL at locations where recreational vehicles are inhabited, the applicant shall construct a noise abatement barrier to reduce noise levels at the RV Park to 70 dB(A) CNEL or less.
- SP 4.9-15 Despite the absence of a significant impact, applicants for all building permits of Residential, Mixed-Use, Commercial, and Business Park land uses (Project) shall pay to the Santa Clara Elementary School District, prior to issuance of building permits, the project's pro rata share of the cost of a sound wall to be located between SR-126 and the Little Red School House. The project's pro rata share shall be determined by multiplying the estimated cost of the sound wall by the ratio of the project's estimated contribution of ADTs on SR-126 at the Little Red School House (numerator) to the total projected cumulative ADT increase at that location (denominator).<sup>5</sup> The total projected cumulative ADT increase shall be determined by subtracting the existing trips on SR-126<sup>6</sup> from the projected cumulative trips as shown in Table 1 of Topical Response 5 - Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County after adding the total Newhall Ranch ADT traveling west of the City of Fillmore.
- SP 4.9-16 Despite the absence of a significant impact, the applicant for all building permits of Residential, Mixed-Use, Commercial and Business Park land uses (Project) shall participate on a fair-share basis in noise attenuation programs developed and implemented by the City of Moorpark to attenuate vehicular noise on SR-23 just north of Casey Road for the existing single-family homes which front SR-23. The mitigation criteria shall be to reduce noise levels to satisfy state noise compatibility standards. The project's pro rata share shall be determined by multiplying the estimated cost of attenuation by the ratio of the project's estimated contribution of ADTs on SR-23 north of the intersection of SR-23 and Casey Road (numerator) to the total projected cumulative ADT increase at that location (denominator).<sup>7</sup> The total projected cumulative ADT increase shall be determined by subtracting the existing

---

<sup>5</sup> Cost of Sound Wall X (Project ADT on SR-126 @ LRSR\*/Total Projected Cumulative ADT Increase on SR-126 @ LRSR\*) \* LRSR = Little Red School House.

<sup>6</sup> 25,165 ADT using linear extrapolation from Table 1 of Topical Response 5 - Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County.

<sup>7</sup> Cost of mitigation x (Project ADT on SR-23 north of Casey Road/Total Projected cumulative ADT Increase on SR-23 north of Casey Road).

trips on SR-23 north of Casey Road<sup>8</sup> from the projected cumulative trips as shown in Topical Response 5 - Traffic Impacts of the Program EIR to State and Local Roads in Ventura County after adding the total Newhall Ranch ADT traveling south of the City of Fillmore.

### 2.3.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's noise impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

- LV 4.8-1 The project applicant, or its designee, shall not undertake construction activities that can generate noise levels in excess of the County's Noise Ordinance on Sundays or legal holidays.
- LV 4.8-2 When construction operations occur in close proximity to on- or off-site occupied residences, and if it is determined by County staff during routine construction site inspections that the construction equipment could generate a noise level at the residences that would be in excess of the Noise Ordinance, the project applicant or its designee shall implement appropriate additional noise reduction measures. These measures shall include, among other things, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, notifying residents in advance of construction work, and installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.
- LV 4.8-3 Prior to construction of the utility corridor north of the Travel Village RV Park, the project applicant or its designee shall erect solid construction and continuous temporary noise barriers south of the utility corridor north of the RV Park without blocking ingress/egress at the Park. Prior to issuance of the construction permit for the utility corridor, a qualified acoustic consultant shall be retained to specify the placement and height of the noise barriers in order to maximize their effectiveness in attenuating noise levels. Construction activities north of the RV Park shall comply with the Los Angeles County Noise Ordinance; stationary construction equipment shall be placed as far away from occupied spaces within the RV Park, and equipment shall not be permitted to idle. A qualified acoustic consultant shall be retained to monitor construction noise once a month at occupied RV spaces to ensure noise levels are in compliance with the County's Noise Ordinance for the duration of the construction.
- LV 4.8-4 To the extent feasible, the project developer shall utilize cast-in-drilled-hole piles in lieu of pile driving if residential units are constructed within 5,000 feet of the Long Canyon Bridge prior to any pile-driving activity.

Pile drilling is an alternate method of pile installation where a hole is drilled into the ground up to the required elevations and concrete is then cast into it. The estimated noise level of pile drilling at 50 feet is 80 to 95 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  compared to 90 to 105 dB(A)  $L_{eq}$  of conventional pile driving.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, pile drilling generally produces noise levels approximately 10 to 15 decibels lower than pile driving.

---

<sup>8</sup> ADT using linear extrapolation from Table 1 of Topical Response 5 - Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances*, December 1971.

- LV 4.8-5 To mitigate noise impacts on Lots 8 to 12 and Lots 20 to 24 from traffic along "A" Street, the project applicant or its designee shall, prior to occupancy, construct a minimum 6-foot wall along the northern property lines of these lots.
  
- LV 4.8-6 To mitigate noise impacts on Lots 115 to 128, 146 to 152, 188, and 313 from traffic along "A" Street, the project applicant or its designee shall, prior to occupancy, construct a minimum 5-foot wall along the northern property lines of these lots. The 5-foot wall shall wrap around the entire length of the eastern boundary of Lot 152.
  
- LV 4.8-7 To mitigate noise impacts on Lots 325, 326, 349, and 350 (condominiums and apartments east of Wolcott Road) from traffic along SR-126, the project applicant or its designee shall, prior to occupancy, construct a 7-foot berm/solid wall at top of slope along northern edge of Lots 326, 325, 349 and 350, to the northwestern corner of Lot 349. The berm/wall shall be continuous with no breaks or gaps.
  
- LV 4.8-8 To mitigate noise impacts on Lots 343 and 377 (condominium) and on Lot 376 (apartment east of Long Canyon Road) from SR-126, the project applicant or its designee shall, prior to occupancy, construct an 8-foot berm/solid wall along the northern edge of Lots 380, 381, 379, and 360. The berm/wall shall be continuous with no openings or gaps.
  
- LV 4.8-9 Prior to occupancy of Lot 346 (condominiums), the project applicant or its designee shall construct an 8-foot berm/solid wall along the eastern boundary of Lot 345 (school) to mitigate any delivery truck/garbage truck/school bus noise impacts on Lot 346 to the east.
  
- LV 4.8-10 To mitigate noise impacts on Lot 346 (condominiums west of Wolcott Road) from SR-126 the project applicant or its designee shall, prior to occupancy, construct a 10-foot berm/solid wall along the northern edge of Lot 346 from its northeastern corner to a point approximately 325 feet to the west along the lot line. From this point, a 10-foot berm/ solid wall shall be constructed through Lot 383 (open space) to the edge of the Caltrans right-of-way where the wall shall continue westerly to the northwestern corner of Open Space Lot 383. The wall shall be continuous with no openings or gaps.
  
- LV 4.8-11 Prior to occupancy of Lot 346 (condominium west of Wolcott Road), the project applicant or its designee, shall construct an 8-foot berm/solid wall along the eastern boundary of Lot 346 to mitigate delivery truck traffic noise from Lot 347 (mixed use commercial).
  
- LV 4.8-12 To mitigate delivery truck and other noises from the commercial center west of Long Canyon Road on Lot 354 (apartments west of Long Canyon Road), the project applicant or its designee shall, prior to occupancy, construct an 8-foot berm/solid wall along the eastern perimeter of Lot 354.
  
- LV 4.8-13 To mitigate noise impacts on Lot 354 (apartments west of Long Canyon Road) from SR-126, the project applicant or its designee shall, prior to occupancy, construct a 9-foot berm/solid wall along the northern boundary of Lot 354, and along the northern 200 feet of the western lot line. To preserve views of the Santa Clara River, 5/8-inch Plexiglas or transparent material with equivalent or better acoustic value may be incorporated into the wall design. In lieu of constructing the 9-foot berm/solid wall, the parcel shall be developed so that frequent use areas, including balconies, are placed towards the interior of the lot and fully shielded from noise from SR-126 by the apartment structure.



- LV 4.8-14 To mitigate noise impacts on Lot 376 (apartments east of Long Canyon Road) from delivery truck and other noise from the commercial center proposed east of Long Canyon Road, the project applicant or its designee shall, prior to occupancy, construct an 8-foot berm/solid wall along the western boundary of Lot 376.
- LV 4.8-15 Residences within mixed-use commercial areas shall be discouraged within 500 feet of the centerline of SR-126. Residences that do occur within mixed use commercial lots shall be set back as far as possible from SR-126, Wolcott Road, Long Canyon Road, and "A" Street in order to minimize the need for acoustic insulation of the units. When the plot plan for the commercial centers are complete, acoustic analyses shall be conducted by a qualified acoustic consultant to ensure that interior noise levels of any residences within the commercial centers can be feasibly reduced to 45 dB(A).
- LV 4.8-16 Balconies with direct lines of sight to SR-126, Wolcott Road, Long Canyon Road, and/or "A" Street shall be discouraged from exposure to exterior noise levels greater than the 60 dB(A) CNEL standard for single family residences or the 65 dB(A) CNEL standard for multi-family residences through architectural or site design. Alternatively, balconies shall be enclosed by solid noise barriers, such as 3/8-inch glass or 5/8-inch Plexiglas to a height specified by a qualified noise consultant.
- LV 4.8-17 All single family and multi-family structures, including multi-family units incorporated into commercial centers, within 500 feet of SR-126 and all residential units with direct lines of sight to SR-126 and/or "A" Street shall incorporate the following into the exterior wall that faces onto those roadways:
- (a) All windows, both fixed and operable, shall consist of either double-strength glass or double-paned glass. All windows facing sound waves generated from the mobile source noise shall be manufactured and installed to specifications that prevent any sound from window vibration caused by the noise source.
  - (b) Doors shall be solid core and shall be acoustically designed with gasketed stops and integral drop seals.
  - (c) If necessitated by the architectural design of a structure, special insulation or design features shall be installed to meet the required interior ambient noise level.
- LV 4.8-18 Air conditioning units shall be installed to serve all living areas of all residences incorporated into commercial centers, and those with direct lines of sight to SR-126 and/or "A" Street so that windows may remain closed without compromising the comfort of the occupants.

### **2.3.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will substantially lessen the proposed project's noise-related impacts. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which would mitigate, in part, the significant noise impacts attributable to the proposed project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding

Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified noise-related impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable noise impacts of the proposed project.

## **2.4 AIR QUALITY**

### **2.4.1 Unavoidable and Significant Impacts**

The Specific Plan's construction and operational emissions were considered significant and unavoidable due to the absence of feasible mitigation to reduce the emission levels below applicable thresholds of significance issued by the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD"). However, Newhall Ranch, including the proposed project, has been designed to reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled ("VMT"), as compared to more conventional, non-village designs. Further, the Specific Plan and the proposed project are consistent with the applicable air quality management plan.

Implementation of the Landmark Village project would generate both construction and operational air pollutant emissions. Construction-related emissions would be generated by on-site stationary sources, on- and off-road heavy-duty construction vehicles, and construction worker vehicles. Operation-related emissions would be generated by on-site and off-site stationary sources and by mobile sources. During project construction, emissions of carbon monoxide ("CO"), volatile organic compounds ("VOC"), and oxides of nitrogen ("NO<sub>x</sub>") would exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD") for all but one construction subphase. The analysis of local significance threshold ("LST") impacts suggests that fine particulate matter ("PM<sub>10</sub>") emissions could exceed the limitations in SCAQMD Rule 403. While the nitrogen dioxide ("NO<sub>2</sub>") concentrations exceed the LST thresholds, the California Ambient Air Quality Standards ("CAAQS") would be exceeded only if: (1) the actual background concentrations were as high as those on which the LSTs are based during the worst-case construction day; (2) the amount of construction activity (*e.g.*, number and types of equipment, hours of operation) assumed in this analysis actually occurred; and (3) the meteorological conditions in the data set used in the dispersion modeling analysis occurred in the vicinity of the project site on the worst-case construction day.

At project build-out, operational emissions of CO, VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> would exceed SCAQMD thresholds, primarily due to mobile source emissions in the summertime and to mobile source and wood-burning fireplace emissions in the wintertime.

No project land use would be exposed to CO hotspots and the project would not cause a CO hotspot at other locations of sensitive receptors in the project study area. In addition, population growth attributed to the proposed project is consistent with the approved Specific Plan and is within growth forecasts contained in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan ("2001 RTP") prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments ("SCAG").<sup>10</sup> The 2001 RTP forms the basis for the land use and transportation control portions of the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan ("2003 AQMP"). Because the project is within the growth forecasts for the region, it would, consequently, be consistent with the 2003 AQMP, indicating that it would not jeopardize attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards in the Santa Clarita Valley or throughout the South Coast Air Basin ("Basin").

---

<sup>10</sup> The 2001 RTP was updated by SCAG in April 2004. The 2004 RTP includes the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan within its growth forecasts. Since the 2004 RTP was prepared after the 2003 AQMP was adopted, this EIR section relies on the 2003 AQMP and, therefore, the 2001 RTP.

Mitigation measures would be implemented that would reduce construction-related and operational-related emissions to the maximum extent feasible. However, no feasible mitigation exists that would reduce the project's construction-related emissions of CO, VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, or PM<sub>10</sub> to below SCAQMD's recommended thresholds of significance.<sup>11</sup> No feasible mitigation exists to reduce the project's operational emissions of CO, VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, or PM<sub>10</sub> to less than significant. Therefore, the project's construction-related and operation-related emissions would be considered significant and unavoidable.

## **2.4.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to mitigate all of the air quality-related impacts attributable to the proposed project to a level below significant. However, the following feasible mitigation measures would substantially lessen the identified significant air quality impacts as identified in the Draft EIR:

### **2.4.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

Certain mitigation measures adopted to reduce air quality impacts associated with the Specific Plan are omitted as they already have been satisfied by the project applicant. Those mitigation measures are as follows: SP 4.10-1 through SP 4.10-5. Other mitigation measures were omitted because they are not applicable to the proposed project, and they are: SP 4.10-9 p. through SP 4.10-9 r.; SP 4.10-9 t. and SP 4.10-9 u.; SP 4.10-9 aq. through SP 4.10-9 bq.; SP 4.10-9 cn. through SP 4.10-9 cy.; and SP 4.10-13. Other mitigation measures have been removed for various reasons and they are: SP 4.10-9 a., o., and v. For additional information regarding the reasons why the above identified mitigation measures are either satisfied, not applicable, or removed, please refer to Section 4.9, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR.

SP 4.10-6 The applicant of future subdivisions shall implement all rules and regulations adopted by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD which are applicable to the development of the subdivision (such as Rule 402 - Nuisance, Rule 403 - Fugitive Dust, Rule 1113 - Architectural Coatings) and which are in effect at the time of development. The purpose of Rule 403 is to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of man-made fugitive dust sources by requiring actions to prevent, reduce, or mitigate fugitive dust emissions. Rule 403 applies to any activity or man-made condition capable of generating fugitive dust such as the mass and remedial grading associated with the project as well as weed abatement and stockpiling of construction materials (i.e., rock, earth, gravel). Rule 403 requires that grading operations either (1) take actions specified in Tables 1 and 2 of the Rule for each applicable source of fugitive dust and take certain notification and record keeping actions, or (2) obtain an approved Fugitive Dust Control Plan. A complete copy of the SCAQMD's Rule 403 Implementation Handbook, which has been included in Appendix 4.10, provides guideline tables to demonstrate the typical mitigation program and record keeping required for grading operations (Tables 1 and 2 and sample record-keeping chart). The record keeping is accomplished by on-site construction personnel, typically the construction superintendent.

Each future subdivision proposed in association with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall implement the following if found applicable and feasible for that subdivision:

---

<sup>11</sup> CO emissions would only exceed SCAQMD's threshold of significance for six weeks during the 54-month construction period, and PM10 emissions would only exceed the thresholds of significance during project on- and off-site grading operations.

**Grading**

- a. Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
- b. Replace groundcover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- c. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders according to manufacturers' specifications, to exposed piles (i.e., gravel, sand, dirt) with 5 percent or greater silt content.
- d. Water active sites at least twice daily.
- e. Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour.
- f. Monitor for particulate emissions according to district-specified procedures.
- g. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114.

**Paved Roads**

- h. Sweep paved streets at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public paved roads (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water).
- i. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.

**Unpaved Roads**

- j. Apply water three times daily, or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces.
- k. Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour or less.
- l. Pave construction roads that have a traffic volume of more than 50 daily trips by construction equipment, 150 total daily trips for all vehicles.
- m. Pave all construction access roads at least 100 feet on to the site from the main road.
- n. Pave construction roads that have a daily traffic volume of less than 50 vehicular trips.

SP 4.10-7 Prior to the approval of each future subdivision proposed in association with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, each of the construction emission reduction measures indicated below (and in Tables 11-2 and 11-3 of the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, as amended) shall be implemented if found applicable and feasible for that subdivision:

**On-Road Mobile Source Construction Emissions**

- a. Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.
- b. Provide temporary traffic controls when construction activities have the potential to disrupt traffic to maintain traffic flow (e.g., signage, flag person, detours).
- c. Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours (e.g., between 7:00 PM and 6:00 AM and between 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM).
- d. Develop a trip reduction plan to achieve a 1.5 average vehicle ridership (AVR) for construction employees.
- e. Implement a shuttle service to and from retail services and food establishments during lunch hours.
- f. Develop a construction traffic management plan that includes the following measures to address construction traffic that has the potential to affect traffic on public streets:
  - Rerouting construction traffic off congested streets;
  - Consolidating truck deliveries; and
  - Providing temporary dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off of the site.
- g. Prohibit truck idling in excess of two minutes.

**Off-Road Mobile Source Construction Emissions**

- h. Use methanol-fueled pile drivers.
- i. Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during second stage smog alerts.
- j. Prevent trucks from idling longer than two minutes.
- k. Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel-powered generators.
- l. Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline-powered generators.
- m. Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment instead of diesel.
- n. Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline.

SP 4.10-8 The applicant of future subdivisions shall implement all rules and regulations adopted by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD which are applicable to the development of the subdivision (such as Rule 402 - Nuisance, Rule 461 - Gasoline Transfer And Dispensing, Rule 1102 - Petroleum Solvent Dry Cleaners, Rule 1111 - NO<sub>x</sub> Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired, Fan-Type Central Furnaces, Rule 1138 - Control Of Emissions From Restaurant Operations, Rule 1146 - Emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen from Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters) and which are in effect at the time of occupancy permit issuance.

SP 4.10-9 Prior to the approval of each future subdivision proposed in association with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, each of the operational emission reduction measures indicated below (and in Tables 11-6 and 11-7 of the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, as amended) shall be implemented if found applicable and feasible for that subdivision.

**On Road Mobile Source Operational Emissions**

***Residential Uses***

- b. Establish shuttle service from residential subdivision to commercial core areas.
- c. Construct on-site or off-site bus stops (e.g., bus turnouts, passenger benches, and shelters).
- d. Construct off-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as overpasses and wider sidewalks.
- e. Include retail services within or adjacent to residential subdivisions.
- f. Provide shuttles to major rail transit centers or multi-modal stations.
- g. Contribute to regional transit systems (e.g., right-of-way, capital improvements, etc.).
- h. Synchronize traffic lights on streets impacted by development.
- i. Construct, contribute, or dedicate land for the provision of off-site bicycle trails linking the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes.

***Commercial Uses***

- j. Provide preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools and provide 7 foot 2 inch minimum vertical clearance in parking facilities for vanpool access.
- k. Implement on-site circulation plans in parking lots to reduce vehicle queuing.
- l. Improve traffic flow at drive-throughs by designing separate windows for different functions and by providing temporary parking for orders not immediately available for pickup.
- m. Provide videoconference facilities.
- n. Set up resident worker training programs to improve job/housing balance.
- s. Implement a lunch shuttle service from a worksite(s) to food establishments.
- w. Establish a home-based telecommuting program.
- x. Provide on-site child care and after-school facilities or contribute to off-site development within walking distance.
- y. Require retail facilities or special event centers to offer travel incentives such as discounts on purchases for transit riders.

- z. Provide on-site employee services such as cafeterias, banks, etc.
- aa. Establish a shuttle service from residential core areas to the worksite.
- ab. Construct on-site or off-site bus stops (e.g., bus turnouts, passenger benches, and shelters).
- ac. Implement a pricing structure for single-occupancy employee parking and/or provide discounts to ridesharers.
- ad. Include residential units within a commercial project.
- ae. Utilize parking in excess of code requirements as on-site park-n-ride lots or contribute to construction of off-site lots.
- af. Any two of the following:
  - Construct off-site bicycle facility improvements, such as bicycle trails linking the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes, or on-site improvements, such as bicycle paths.
  - Include bicycle parking facilities, such as bicycle lockers and racks.
  - Include showers for bicycling employees' use.
- ag. Any two of the following:
  - Construct off-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as overpasses, wider sidewalks.
  - Construct on-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as building access that is physically separated from street and parking lot traffic and walk paths.
  - Include showers for pedestrian employees' use.
- ah. Provide shuttles to major rail transit stations and multi-modal centers.
- ai. Contribute to regional transit systems (e.g., right-of-way, capital improvements, etc.).
- aj. Charge visitors to park.
- ak. Synchronize traffic lights on streets impacted by development.
- al. Reschedule truck deliveries and pickups to off-peak hours.
- am. Set up paid parking systems where drivers pay at walkup kiosk and exit via a stamped ticket to reduce emissions from queuing vehicles.
- an. Require on-site truck loading zones.
- ao. Implement or contribute to public outreach programs.

- ap. Require employers not subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202) to provide commuter information area.

**Stationary Source Operational Emissions**

***Residential***

- br. Use solar or low emission water heaters.
- bs. Use central water heating systems.
- bt. Use built-in energy-efficient appliances.
- bu. Provide shade trees to reduce building heating/cooling needs.
- bv. Use energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners.
- bw. Use double-paned windows.
- bx. Use energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights.
- by. Use lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting.
- bz. Use fuel cells in residential subdivisions to produce heat and electricity. (This measure is not yet considered technically or economically feasible. There are presently no commercially available fuel cell applications for individual home use at a reasonable cost.)
- ca. Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and include passive solar design (e.g., daylighting).
- cb. Use light-colored roofing materials to reflect heat.
- cc. Increase walls and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements.

***Commercial Uses***

- cd. Use solar or low emission water heaters.
- ce. Use central water heating systems.
- cf. Provide shade trees to reduce building heating/cooling needs.
- cg. Use energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners.
- ch. Use double-paned windows.
- ci. Use energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights.
- cj. Use lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting.
- ck. Use light-colored roofing materials to reflect heat.



cl. Increase walls and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements.

cm. Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and include passive solar design (e.g., daylighting).

SP 4.10-10 All non-residential development of 25,000 gross square feet or more shall comply with the County's Transportation Demand Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 93-0028M) in effect at the time of subdivision. The sizes and configurations of the Specific Plan's non-residential uses are not known at this time and the Ordinance specifies different requirements based on the size of the project under review. All current provisions of the ordinance are summarized in Appendix 4.10.

SP 4.10-11 Subdivisions and buildings shall comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations which are current at the time of development.

SP 4.10-12 Lighting for public streets, parking areas, and recreation areas shall utilize energy efficient light and mechanical, computerized or photo cell switching devices to reduce unnecessary energy usage.

SP 4.10-14 The sellers of new residential units shall be required to distribute brochures and other relevant information published by the SCAQMD or similar organization to new homeowners regarding the importance of reducing VMT and related air quality impacts, as well as on local opportunities for public transit and ridesharing.

#### ***2.4.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures***

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's air quality impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

LV4.9-1 Maintain construction equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers' specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust emissions.

LV4.9-2 All on-road and off-road construction equipment shall use aqueous fuel, to the extent feasible, as determined by the County of Los Angeles.

LV4.9-3 All on-road and off-road construction equipment shall employ cooled exhaust gas recirculation technology, to the extent feasible, as determined by the County of Los Angeles.

Cooled exhaust gas recirculation (EGR) reduces CO, VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions as follows: Oxygen is required for fuel to be consumed in a combustion engine. The high temperatures found within combustion engines cause nitrogen in the surrounding air to react with any unused oxygen from the combustion process to form NO<sub>x</sub>. EGR technology directs some of the exhaust gases that have already been used by the engine and no longer contain much oxygen back into the intake of the engine. By mixing the exhaust gases with fresh air, the amount of oxygen entering the engine is reduced. Since there is less oxygen to react with, fewer nitrogen oxides are formed and the amount of nitrogen oxides that a vehicle releases into the atmosphere is decreased. Based on information provided in the URBEMIS2002 model for its use in construction equipment, cooled exhaust gas recirculation technology can reduce CO and VOC emissions by 90 percent, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by 40 percent and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions by 85 percent.

- LV4.9-4 All on-road and off-road construction equipment shall employ diesel particulate filters, which can reduce PM<sub>10</sub> emissions from construction equipment by as much as 80 percent based on information provided in the URBEMIS2002 model.
- LV4.9-5 Any dry cleaners proposing to locate on site shall utilize the services of off-site cleaning operations at already SCAQMD-permitted locations. No on-site dry cleaning operations shall be permitted within Landmark Village.
- LV4.9-6 The project developer(s) shall coordinate with Santa Clarita Transit to identify appropriate bus stop/turnout locations.
- LV4.9-7 Kiosks containing transit information shall be constructed by the project applicant adjacent to selected future bus stops prior to initiation of bus service to the site.
- LV4.9-8 Wood-burning fireplaces and stoves shall be prohibited in all residential units. Use of wood in fireplaces shall be prohibited through project Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions.

### **2.4.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will substantially lessen the proposed project's air quality impacts. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which would mitigate, in part, the significant air quality impacts attributable to the proposed project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified air quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable air quality impacts of the proposed project.

## **2.5 SOLID WASTE SERVICES**

### **2.5.1 Unavoidable and Significant Impacts**

The Specific Plan's Program EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant impacts relating to solid waste disposal services because an adequate supply of landfill space had not been identified and existing hazardous management facilities in the County were inadequate. Even with the application of the recommended mitigation measures, the Program EIR concluded that these impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

As for the proposed project, site preparation and construction activities would generate approximately 20,556 tons, or an average of approximately 4,111 tons per year, of construction wastes over the 5-year build-out of the proposed project assuming no recycling, or approximately 10,278 total tons assuming a 50 percent diversion rate. Once operational, the proposed project would generate approximately 20,858 pounds per day, or approximately 3,807 tons per year, of solid waste, assuming no solid wastes would be recycled -- a worst-case scenario. The proposed project may also generate household type hazardous wastes.

Mitigation has been identified to reduce construction and operation wastes to the extent feasible. However, while the County's landfills have approved adequate capacity to service the existing population and planned growth until the year 2017, land suitable for landfill development or expansion is quantitatively finite and limited due to numerous environmental, regulatory, and political constraints. This is not to say, though, that alternative solid waste disposal technologies that could substantially reduce landfill disposal will not be developed and legislatively approved in the future; given the market forces that drive the solid waste industry, it seems reasonable to assume they will. Nevertheless, until other disposal alternatives that will be adequate to serve existing and future uses for the foreseeable future are found and because landfill space is a finite resource, the potential project solid and hazardous waste impacts are considered significant unavoidable impacts.

### **2.5.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to mitigate all of the solid waste impacts attributable to the proposed project to a level below significant. However, the following feasible mitigation measures would substantially lessen the identified significant solid waste impacts as identified in the Draft EIR:

#### ***2.5.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures***

SP 4.15-1 Each future subdivision which allows construction within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall meet the requirements of all applicable solid waste diversion, storage, and disposal regulations that are in effect at the time of subdivision review. Current applicable regulations include recycling areas that are:

- compatible with nearby structures;
- secured and protected against adverse environmental conditions;
- clearly marked, and adequate in capacity, number and distribution;
- in conformance with local building code requirements for garbage collection access and clearance;
- designed, placed and maintained to protect adjacent developments and transportation corridors from adverse impacts, such as noise, odors, vectors, or glare;
- in compliance with federal, state, or local laws relating to fire, building, access, transportation, circulation, or safety; and
- convenient for persons who deposit, collect, and load the materials.

SP 4.15-2 Future multi-family, commercial, and industrial projects within the Specific Plan shall provide accessible and convenient areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials. These areas are to be clearly marked and adequate in capacity, number, and distribution to serve the development.

SP 4.15-3 The first purchaser of each residential unit within the Specific Plan shall be given educational or instructional materials which will describe what constitutes recyclable and hazardous materials, how to separate recyclable and hazardous materials, how to avoid the use of hazardous materials, and what procedures exist to collect such materials.

SP 4.15-4 The applicant of all subdivision maps which allow construction within the Specific Plan shall comply with all applicable future state and Los Angeles County regulations and procedures for the use, collection and disposal of solid and hazardous wastes.

### **2.5.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's solid waste impacts, the following mitigation measure is incorporated:

LV 4.9-1 The project shall comply with Title 20, Chapter 20.87, of the Los Angeles County Code, Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling. The project proponent shall also provide a Waste Management Plan to recycle, at a minimum, 50 percent of the construction and demolition debris. Reports shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Environmental Programs Division.

### **2.5.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will substantially lessen the proposed project's solid waste impacts. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which would mitigate, in part, the significant solid waste services impacts attributable to the proposed project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified solid waste impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable solid waste impacts of the proposed project.

## **2.6 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

### **2.6.1 Unavoidable and Significant Impacts**

The Specific Plan's Program EIR identified the conversion of agricultural land to urban uses as a significant unavoidable impact associated with Specific Plan build-out on a project-specific and cumulative basis. The analysis also found that future residents of the Specific Plan may be incidentally exposed to agricultural-related activities; however, mitigation measures were recommended and adopted to reduce this impact to below a level of significance.

Consistent with the analysis at the Specific Plan level of environmental review, the proposed project would result in the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural land. Specifically, 194 acres of Prime Farmland, 7 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 126 acres of Unique Farmland would be converted to non-agricultural land uses, which are considered significant impacts under CEQA's thresholds of significance. No feasible mitigation exists to reduce this impact, and the irreversible loss of 327 acres of agricultural land is a significant and unavoidable impact.

## 2.6.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that no feasible mitigation measures exist to mitigate below a level of significance the proposed project's identified impacts on significant agricultural resources. However, the following feasible mitigation measure would substantially lessen the identified agricultural impacts as identified in the Draft EIR.

### 2.6.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

One mitigation measure, SP 4.4-2, adopted in connection with the Specific Plan is not applicable to the proposed project. For additional information regarding the reasons why the identified mitigation measure is not applicable, please refer to Section 4.18, Agricultural Resources, of the Draft EIR.

SP 4.4-1 Purchasers of homes located within 1,500 feet of an agricultural field or grazing area are to be informed of the location and potential effects of farming uses prior to the close of escrow.

### 2.6.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation is provided as there are no feasible mitigation measures to remedy the loss of 327 acres of significant agricultural land.

## 2.6.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will substantially lessen the proposed project's agricultural resources-related impacts. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which would mitigate, in part, the significant agricultural resources impacts attributable to the proposed project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified agricultural resources-related impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable agricultural resources impacts of the proposed project.

## 3.0 FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGATED IMPACTS

The section identifies significant adverse impacts of the proposed project that require findings to be made under Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091. On the basis of information in the Draft and Final EIRs, the Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce the identified significant impacts to less than significant levels.

### 3.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES

#### 3.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Specific Plan's Program EIR concluded that build-out of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would result in significant geologic, soil, and geotechnical impacts, but that the recommended mitigation

measures would reduce the impacts to below a level of significance. The Program EIR further determined that site-specific geologic, soil, and geotechnical analysis would be required throughout implementation of the Specific Plan.

The analysis provided in the Landmark Village Draft and Final EIRs disclosed the following potentially significant project impacts relating to the site's geologic, soil, and geotechnical conditions:

- *Dynamic Compaction and Differential Materials Response:* The tract map site is underlain by materials with different densities or strengths that are in contact. A potentially significant geotechnical impact could result if these different materials are subject to seismic waves from an earthquake.
- *Sympathetic Movement:* The tract map site, and the Adobe and Chiquito Canyon sites are underlain by geologic formations that may be subject to bedding plane slippage as a result of strong ground motion. As the Adobe and Chiquito Canyon sites are only to be used for soil removal, this impact is not potentially significant. However, a potentially significant geotechnical impact could result at the tract map site.
- *Landslides:* With regard to the Chiquito Canyon grading site, four landslides have been mapped within this area. The new alignment proposed to provide continued access to the Edison Tower would traverse a mapped landslide, and landslide movement may be triggered if the grading operations destabilize a portion of a landslide; this is potentially significant.
- *High Slope Instability:* At the tract map site, all analyzed cut-slopes, proposed grades, and compacted fill slopes would comply with gross stability and loading condition requirements, but for the compacted on-site silty sands and cuts in older Alluvium. Use of these soil types within fill slopes and stability fills may result in potentially significant impacts. In addition, the Chiquito Canyon grading site's proposed cut slope located near the existing Edison Transmission Tower, and the small cut slopes associated with the new Edison access road alignment may result in potentially significant impacts.
- *High Groundwater Levels:* Construction and development within high groundwater table areas on the tract map site could result in a potentially significant impact.
- *Substantial Grading and/or Alteration of Topography:* The proposed project may result in potentially significant impacts due to the considerable amount of grading that would occur on the sites, and due to the modification and alteration of existing topography.
- *Expansive Soils:* The shallow soils located at a few locations on the tract map site have an expansion potential of medium to high. Further, the fine-grained units of the Saugus and Pico Formations located within the Adobe and Chiquito Canyon sites are potentially very expansive. These soil types may result in potentially significant impacts to future development of the tract map site.
- *Shrink-Swell Potential:* The expected rate of shrinkage of the various near-surface materials encountered at the site, upon excavation, relocation, and compaction, is considered potentially significant.
- *Soil Corrosivity:* Shallow soils at the tract map sites and the Adobe and Chiquito Canyon sites are mildly corrosive in the presence of ferrous metals; this is potentially significant.

In compliance with Section 111 of the Los Angeles County Building Code, and according to the project geotechnical engineer (Seward), the site designated on the Geological/Geotechnical Maps, EIR Figures 4.1-1 through 4.1-3, is feasible for development, would be safe against hazards from landslide, settlement, or slippage, and development of the site would not affect off-site property, provided the mitigation measures identified below are adopted and implemented during project construction.

### **3.1.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

#### **3.1.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

Fifty-six (56) mitigation measures were adopted by the County in connection with its approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. However, not all of the 56 mitigation measures are applicable to the proposed project. The following mitigation measures have been omitted, because they are not applicable to the Landmark Village project: SP 4.1-5; SP 4.1-14; SP 4.1-16 through SP 4.1-18; SP 4.1-22 through SP 4.1-28; and SP 4.1-51 through SP 4.1-56. For additional information regarding the reasons why the identified mitigation measures are not applicable, please refer to Section 4.1, Geotechnical and Soil Resources, of the Draft EIR.

- SP 4.1-1 The standard building setbacks from ascending and descending man-made slopes are to be followed in accordance with Section 1806.4 of the Los Angeles County Building Code, unless superseded by specific geologic and/or soils engineering evaluations. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 44.)
  
- SP 4.1-2 The existing Grading Ordinance for planting and irrigation of cut-slopes and fill slopes is to be adhered to for grading operations within the project site. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 44.)
  
- SP 4.1-3 In order to safeguard against major seismic-related structural failures, all buildings within the project boundaries are to be constructed in conformance with the Los Angeles County Uniform Building Code, as applicable.
  
- SP 4.1-4 The location and dimensions of the exploratory trenches and borings undertaken by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. and R.T. Frankian & Associates are to be noted on all grading plans relative to future building plans, unless the trenches and/or borings are removed by future grading operations. If future foundations traverse the trenches or borings, they are to be reviewed and approved by the project geotechnical engineer. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 45.)
  
- SP 4.1-6 Should any expansive soils be encountered during grading operations, they are not to be placed nearer the finished surface than 8 feet below the bottom of the subgrade elevation. This depth is subject to revision depending upon the expansive potential measured during grading. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
  
- SP 4.1-7 If expansive materials are encountered at subgrade elevation in cut areas, the soils are to be removed to a depth of 8 feet below the "finished" or "subgrade" surface and the excavated area backfilled with non-expansive, properly compacted soils. This depth is subject to

- revision depending upon the expansive potential measured during grading. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-8 At the time of subdivision, which allows construction, areas subject to liquefaction are to be mitigated to the satisfaction of the project geotechnical engineer prior to site development. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-9 Subdrains are to be placed in areas of high ground water conditions or wherever extensive irrigation is planned. The systems are to be designed to the specifications of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan geotechnical engineer.
- SP 4.1-10 Subdrains are to be placed in the major and minor canyon fills, behind stabilization blankets, buttress fills, and retaining walls, and as required by the geotechnical engineer during grading operations. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-11 Canyon subdrains may be installed in "V"-ditches or in a rectangular trench excavated to expose competent material or bedrock as approved by the geotechnical engineer.
- SP 4.1-12 The vertical spacing of subdrains behind buttress fills, stabilization blankets, etc., are to be a maximum of 15 feet. The gradient is to be at least 2 percent to the discharge end. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-13 Geological materials subject to hydroconsolidation (containing significant void space) are to be removed prior to the placement of fill. Specific recommendations relative to hydroconsolidation are to be provided by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan geotechnical engineer at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 44.)
- SP 4.1-15 Subsurface exploration is required to delineate the depth and lateral extent of the landslides shown on the geologic map. This work shall be undertaken at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 15.) Landslides must be mitigated through stabilization, removal, and/or building setbacks as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan geotechnical engineer, and to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
- SP 4.1-19 Remove debris from surficial failures during grading operations prior to the placement of fill. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 16.)
- SP 4.1-20 All soils and/or unconsolidated slopewash and landslide debris is to be removed prior to the placement of compacted fills. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 45.)
- SP 4.1-21 Cut-slopes, which will expose landslide material, are to undergo geologic and geotechnical evaluation at the subdivision stage to determine their stability and degree of consolidation. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 15.) Several options are available to mitigate potential landslide failure in the proposed cut-slopes. Landslides may be stabilized with buttress fills or shear keys designed by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan geotechnical engineer; landslide material can be entirely removed and replaced with a stability fill; or the slope can be redesigned to avoid the landslide. Landslides underlying cut pad or road areas may be removed or partially removed if the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geologist and geotechnical engineer conclude that the landslide is stable and sufficiently



consolidated to build on. Landslides located on ascending natural slopes above proposed graded areas will also require evaluation for stability. Unstable landslides on natural slopes above graded areas will either require stabilization, removal, or building setbacks to mitigate potential hazards.

- SP 4.1-29 Orientations of the bedrock attitudes are to be evaluated by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan engineering geologist to identify locations of required buttress fills. Buttress fill design and recommendations, if necessary, are to be presented as mitigation during the grading plan stage. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-30 All fills, unless otherwise specifically designed, are to be compacted to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry unit weight as determined by ASTM Designation D 1557-91 Method of Soil Compaction. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-31 No fill is to be placed until the area to receive the fill has been adequately prepared and approved by the geotechnical engineer. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-32 Fill soils are to be kept free of all debris and organic material. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-33 Rocks or hard fragments larger than 8 inches are not to be placed in the fill without approval of the geotechnical engineer, and in a manner specified for each occurrence. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-34 Rock fragments larger than 8 inches are not to be placed within 10 feet of finished pad grade or the subgrade of roadways or within 15 feet of a slope face. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-35 Rock fragments larger than 8 inches may be placed in windrows, below the limits given above, provided the windrows are spaced at least 5 feet vertically and 15 feet horizontally. Granular soil must be flooded around windrows to fill voids between the rock fragments. The granular soil is to be wheel rolled to assure compaction. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-36 The fill material is to be placed in layers which, when compacted, is not to exceed 8 inches per layer. Each layer is to be spread evenly and is to be thoroughly mixed during the spreading to insure uniformity of material and moisture. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-37 When moisture content of the fill material is too low to obtain adequate compaction, water is to be added and thoroughly dispersed until the soil is approximately 2 percent over optimum moisture content. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-38 When the moisture content of the fill material is too high to obtain adequate compaction, the fill material is to be aerated by blading or other satisfactory methods until the soil is approximately 2 percent over optimum moisture content. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)

- SP 4.1-39 Where fills toe out on a natural slope or surface, a keyway, with a minimum width of 16 feet and extending at least 3 feet into firm, natural soil, is to be cut at the toe of the fill. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-40 Where the fills toe out on a natural or cut slope and the natural or cut slope is steeper than 5 horizontal to 1 vertical, a drainage bench with a width of at least 8 feet is to be established at the toe of the fill. Fills may be placed over cut slopes if the visible contact between the fill and cut is steeper than 45 degrees. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-41 When placing fills over slopes, sidewall benching is to extend into competent material, approved by the geotechnical engineer, with vertical benches not less than 4 feet. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.) Competent material is defined as being free of loose soil, heavy fracturing, or compressive soils.
- SP 4.1-42 When constructing fill slopes, the grading contractor is to avoid spillage of loose material down the face of the slope during the dumping and compacting operations. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-43 The outer faces of fill slopes are to be compacted by backing a sheepsfoot compactor over the top of the slope, and thoroughly covering all of the slope surface with overlapping passes of the compactor. Compaction of the slope is to be repeated after each 4 feet of fill has been placed. The required compaction must be obtained prior to placement of additional fill. As an alternate, the slope can be overbuilt and cut back to expose a compacted core. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I.)
- SP 4.1-44 All artificial fill associated with past petroleum activities as well as other existing artificial fill, are to be evaluated by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan geotechnical engineer at the subdivision and/or grading plan stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, 19 September 1994, Inc., p. 45.) Unstable fills are to be mitigated through removal, stabilization, or other means as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan geotechnical engineer.
- SP 4.1-45 Surface runoff from the future graded areas is not to run over any natural, cut, or fill slopes. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20.)
- SP 4.1-46 Runoff from future pads and structures is to be collected and channeled to the street and/or natural drainage courses via non-erosive drainage devices. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20.)
- SP 4.1-47 Water is not to stand or pond anywhere on the graded pads. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20.)
- SP 4.1-48 Oil and water wells that might occur on site are to be abandoned in accordance with state and local regulations. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 45.)
- SP 4.1-49 If any leaking or undocumented oil wells are encountered during grading operations, their locations are to be surveyed and the current well conditions evaluated immediately. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 21.) Measures are to be taken

to document the wells, abandonment, and remediate the well sites (if necessary) in accordance with state and local regulations.

- SP 4.1-50 The exact status and location of the Exxon (Newhall Land & Farming) oil well #31 will be evaluated at the subdivision stage. If necessary, the well will be abandoned in accordance with state and local regulations. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, p. 12.)

### **3.1.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

- LV 4.1-1 Prior to placing compacted fill, the ground surface shall be prepared by removing non-compacted artificial fill (af), Caf, loose alluvium, and other unsuitable materials. The geotechnical engineer and/or his representatives shall observe the excavated areas prior to placing compacted fill.
- LV 4.1-2 After the ground surface to receive fill has been exposed, it shall be ripped to a minimum depth of 6 inches, brought to optimum moisture content or above and thoroughly mixed to obtain a near uniform moisture condition and uniform blend of materials, and then compacted to 90 percent per the latest American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) D1557 laboratory maximum density.
- LV 4.1-3 Removal depths for alluvium, older alluvium, and overlying soil/plow pan materials range from 4 to 16 feet and shall be as indicated on the approved Geologic/Geotechnical Map.
- LV 4.1-4 Soil removals on the southwestern portion of the site shall be scheduled if possible during the summer or fall months, to minimize impacts to Grading from shallow groundwater. The contractor shall be prepared to implement dewatering systems, if necessary.
- LV 4.1-5 Pico and Saugus Formation bedrock shall be over-excavated 5 feet below proposed grade to eliminate cut-fill or bedrock-alluvium transitions in building pads. Expansive materials in the bedrock shall be over excavated 8 feet in building pad areas.
- LV 4.1-6 Slopewash that is locally present on the site adjacent to slope areas on the northern margin of the site shall be removed and recompacted prior to the placement of compacted fill.
- LV 4.1-7 Compacted artificial fill along the northern margin of the site shall be assessed for building suitability at the grading plan stage.
- LV 4.1-8 Concrete, asphalt concrete and other debris stockpiled on the site shall be removed, and either ground up for use as sub-base material, or reduced into fragments small enough to be buried in the deeper portions of the fill.
- LV 4.1-9 Where recommended removals encounter ground water, water levels shall be controlled by providing an adequate excavation bottom/slope and sumps for pumping water out as the excavation proceeds, or ground water may be lowered by installing shallow dewatering well points prior to grading. Partial removals of soils above the water table and soil improvement below the water table may be another option. Dewatering may be needed depending on the

season when the removals are performed and the actual removal depths are determined. Contractors shall use piezometric data for planning dewatering measures.

- LV 4.1-10 On-site soils, except any debris or organic matter, may be used as sources for compacted fills. Rock or similar irreducible material with a maximum dimension greater than 8 inches shall not be placed in the fill without approval of the geotechnical engineer. Rocks or hard fragments larger than 4 inches shall not compose more than 25 percent of the fill and/or lift. Any large rock fragments over 8 inches in size may be incorporated into the fill as rockfill in windrows after being reduced to the specific maximum rock fill size. Where fill depths are too shallow to allow large rock disposal, special handling or removal may be required. Much of the on-site alluvium and older alluvium is coarse-grained and lacks sufficient cohesion for surficial stability in fill slopes. Selective grading of fill materials with sufficient cohesion derived from on-site or imported fill shall be necessary for use in fill slopes.
- LV 4.1-11 The engineering characteristics of imported fill material shall be evaluated when the source area has been identified.
- LV 4.1-12 Most of the slopes proposed on the site are fill slopes. Stability fills are recommended for all of the cut-slopes on the site; therefore, no cut-slopes will remain after the completion of grading. All fill slopes shall be constructed on firm material where the slope receiving fill exceeds a ratio of 5:1 (h:v). Fill slope inclination shall not be steeper than 2:1 (h:v). The fill material within approximately one equipment width (typically 15 feet) of the slope face shall be constructed with cohesive material selectively graded from on-site or import fills. Stability fills are recommended where cut-slope faces will expose fill-over-bedrock or alluvium-over-bedrock conditions. These fills shall be constructed with a keyway at the toe of the fill slope with a minimum equipment width but not less than 15 feet, and a minimum depth of 3 feet into the firm undisturbed earth. Following completion of the keyway excavations, backfilling with certified engineered fill shall not proceed prior to the approval of the keyway by the project engineering geologist.
- LV 4.1-13 Backcut slopes for Stability fills shall be no steeper than the final face of the proposed fill.
- LV 4.1-14 Areas that are to receive compacted fill shall be observed by the geotechnical engineer prior to the placement of fill.
- LV 4.1-15 All drainage devices shall be properly installed and observed by the geotechnical engineer and/or owner's representative(s) prior to placement of backfill.
- LV 4.1-16 Fill soils shall consist of imported soils or on-site soils free of organics, cobbles, and deleterious material provided each material is approved by the geotechnical engineer. The geotechnical engineer shall evaluate and/or test the import material for its conformance with the report recommendations prior to its delivery to the site. The contractor shall notify the geotechnical engineer 72 hours prior to importing material to the site.
- LV 4.1-17 Fill shall be placed in controlled layers (lifts), the thickness of which is compatible with the type of compaction equipment used. The fill materials shall be brought to optimum moisture content or above, thoroughly mixed during spreading to obtain a near uniform moisture condition and uniform blend of materials, and then placed in layers with a thickness (loose) not exceeding 8 inches. Each layer shall be compacted to a minimum compaction of 90 percent relative to the maximum dry density determined per the latest ASTM D1557 test.

Density testing shall be performed by the geotechnical engineer to verify relative compaction. The contractor shall provide proper access and level areas for testing.

- LV 4.1-18 Rocks or rock fragments less than 8 inches in the largest dimension may be utilized in the fill, provided they are not placed in concentrated pockets. However, rocks larger than 4 inches shall not be placed within 3 feet of finish grade.
- LV 4.1-19 Rocks greater than 8 inches in largest dimension shall be taken off site, or placed in accordance with the recommendation of the soils engineer in areas designated as suitable for rock disposal.
- LV 4.1-20 Where space limitations do not allow for conventional fill compaction operations, special backfill materials and procedures may be required. Pea gravel or other select fill can be used in areas of limited space. A sand and portland cement slurry (two sacks per cubic-yard mix) shall be used in limited space areas for shallow backfill near final pad grade, and pea gravel shall be placed in deeper backfill near drainage systems.
- LV 4.1-21 The geotechnical engineer shall observe the placement of fill and conduct in-place field density tests on the compacted fill to check for adequate moisture content and the required relative compaction. Where less than specified relative compaction is indicated, additional compacting effort shall be applied and the soil moisture conditioned as necessary until adequate relative compaction is attained.
- LV 4.1-22 The Contractor shall comply with the minimum relative compaction out to the finish slope face of fill slopes, buttresses, and stabilization fills as set forth in the specifications for compacted fill. This may be achieved by either overbuilding the slope and cutting back as necessary, or by direct compaction of the slope face with suitable equipment, or by any other procedure that produces the required result.
- LV 4.1-23 Any abandoned underground structures, such as cesspools, cisterns, mining shafts, tunnels, septic tanks, wells, pipelines or other structures not discovered prior to grading shall be removed or treated to the satisfaction of the soils engineer and/or the controlling agency for the project.
- LV 4.1-24 The Contractor shall have suitable and sufficient equipment during a particular operation to handle the volume of fill being placed. When necessary, fill placement equipment shall be shut down temporarily in order to permit proper compaction of fills, correction of deficient areas, or to facilitate required field testing.
- LV 4.1-25 The Contractor shall be responsible for the satisfactory completion of all earthwork in accordance with the project plans and specifications.
- LV 4.1-26 Trench excavations to receive backfill shall be free of trash, debris or other unsatisfactory materials prior to backfill placement, and shall be observed by the geotechnical engineer.
- LV 4.1-27 Except as stipulated herein, soils obtained from the trench excavation may be used as backfill if they are essentially free of organics and deleterious materials.
- LV 4.1-28 Rocks generated from the trench excavation not exceeding 3 inches in largest dimension may be used as backfill material. However, such material shall not be placed within 12

inches of the top of the pipeline. No more than 30 percent of the backfill volume shall contain particles larger than 1 inch in diameter, and rocks shall be well mixed with finer soil.

- LV 4.1-29 Soils (other than aggregates) with a Sand Equivalent (SE) greater than or equal to 30, as determined by ASTM D 2419 Standard Test Method or at the discretion of the engineer or representative in the field, may be used for bedding and shading material in the pipe zone areas. These soils are considered satisfactory for compaction by jetting procedures.
- LV 4.1-30 No jetting shall occur in utility trenches within the top 2 feet of the subgrade of concrete slabs-on-grade.
- LV 4.1-31 Trench backfill other than bedding and shading shall be compacted by mechanical methods such as tamping sheepsfoot, vibrating or pneumatic rollers or other mechanical tampers to achieve the density specified herein. The backfill materials shall be brought to optimum moisture content or above, thoroughly mixed during spreading to obtain a near uniform moisture condition and uniform blend of materials, and then placed in horizontal layers with a thickness (loose) not exceeding 8 inches. Trench backfills shall be compacted to a minimum compaction of 90 percent relative to the maximum dry density determined per the latest ASTM D1557 test.
- LV 4.1-32 The contractor shall select the equipment and process to be used to achieve the specified density within a trench without damage to the pipeline, the adjacent ground, existing improvements, or completed work.
- LV 4.1-33 Observations and field tests shall be carried on during construction by the geotechnical engineer to confirm that the required degree of compaction within a trench has been obtained. Where compaction within a trench is less than that specified, additional compaction effort shall be made with adjustment of the moisture content as necessary until the specified compaction is obtained. Field density tests may be omitted at the discretion of the engineer or his representative in the field.
- LV 4.1-34 Whenever, in the opinion of the geotechnical engineer, an unstable condition is being created within a trench, either by cutting or filling, the work shall not proceed until an investigation has been made and the excavation plan revised, if deemed necessary.
- LV 4.1-35 Fill material within a trench shall not be placed, spread, or rolled during unfavorable weather conditions. When the work is interrupted by heavy rain, fill operations shall not be resumed until field tests by the geotechnical engineer indicate the moisture content and density of the fill are as specified.
- LV 4.1-36 Water shall never be allowed to stand or pond on building pads, nor should it be allowed to run over constructed slopes, but is to be conducted to the driveways or natural waterways via non-erodible drainage devices. In addition, it is recommended that all drainage devices be inspected periodically and be kept clear of all debris. Drainage and erosion control shall be in accordance with the standards set forth in Sections 7018 and 7019 of the 1997 Los Angeles County Uniform Building Code.
- LV 4.1-37 Modification of the existing pad grades after approval of Fine Grading by the project supervising civil engineer can adversely affect the drainage of the lots. Lot drainage shall not be modified by future landscaping, construction of pools, spas, walkways, garden walls,

etc., unless additional remedial measures (area drains, additional grading, etc.) are in compliance with Los Angeles County Codes.

- LV 4.1-38 Positive surface drainage shall be maintained away from buildings. The recommended drainage patterns shall be established at the time of Fine Grading. Roof drainage shall be collected in gutters and downspouts, which terminate at approved discharge points.
- LV 4.1-39 Permanent erosion control measures shall be initiated immediately following completion of grading.
- LV 4.1-40 All interceptor ditches, drainage terraces, down-drains and any other drainage devices shall be maintained and kept clear of debris. A qualified engineer shall review any proposed additions or revisions to these systems, to evaluate their impact on slope erosion.
- LV 4.1-41 Retaining walls shall have adequate freeboard to provide a catchment area for minor slope erosion. Periodic inspection, and if necessary, cleanout of deposited soil and debris shall be performed, particularly during and after periods of rainfall.
- LV 4.1-42 The future developers shall be made aware of the potential problems, which may develop when drainage is altered through landscaping and/or construction of retaining walls, and paved walkways. Ponded water, water directed over slope faces, leaking irrigation systems, over-watering or other conditions that could lead to excessive soil moisture, shall be avoided.
- LV 4.1-43 Slope surficial soils may be subject to water-induced mass erosion. Therefore, a suitable proportion of slope planting shall have root systems, which will develop well below 3 feet. Drought-resistant shrubs and low trees for this purpose shall be considered. Intervening areas can then be planted with lightweight surface plants with shallower root systems. All plants shall be lightweight and require low moisture. Any loose slough generated during the process of planting shall be properly removed from the slope face(s).
- LV 4.1-44 Short-term, non-plant erosion control measures shall be implemented during construction delays, adverse climate/weather conditions, and when plant growth rates do not permit rapid vegetation of graded areas. Examples of short-term, non-plant erosion control measures include matting, netting, plastic sheets, deep (5 feet) staking, etc.
- LV 4.1-45 All possible precautions shall be taken to maintain a moderate and uniform soil moisture to avoid high and/or fluctuating water content in slope materials. Slope irrigation systems shall be properly operated and maintained and system controls shall be placed under strict control.
- LV 4.1-46 A program of aggressive rodent control shall be implemented to control burrowing on slope areas.
- LV 4.1-47 Bank protection is proposed to consist of a soil cement, gunite or rip-rap liner, which is buried/concealed behind a 4:1 (h:v) fill slope. Construction of the liner will involve the excavation of a 20-foot-deep slot as shown in the details on the tentative map. Where the toe of the 4:1 slope extends beyond the removals for the slot, the alluvium shall be overexcavated 3 feet prior to placement of overlying fill.

- LV 4.1-48 Ground water will likely be encountered between a depth of 5 and 10 feet; therefore dewatering shall be undertaken to complete the lower 10 to 15 feet of the proposed slot excavation.
  
- LV 4.1-49 All final grades shall be sloped away from the building foundations to allow rapid removal of surface water runoff. No ponding of water shall be allowed adjacent to the foundations. Plants and other landscape vegetation requiring excessive watering shall be avoided adjacent to the building foundations. Should landscaping be constructed, an effective water-tight barrier shall be provided to prevent water from affecting the building foundations.
  
- LV 4.1-50 Future structures shall be designed according to standards applicable to Seismic Zone 4 of the Uniform Building Code.
  
- LV 4.1-51 Lots underlain by transitions between different material types (e.g., bedrock to fill, bedrock to alluvium, etc.) shall be over-excavated 5 feet to minimize potential adverse impacts associated with differential materials response.
  
- LV 4.1-52 Over-excavation of clay-rich bedding planes of the Saugus Formation or Pico Formation and subsequent placement of a certified fill cap is recommended to mitigate potential hazards from expansive material, and to reduce potential hazards from potential secondary seismogenic movement along bedding planes.
  
- LV 4.1-53 Stability Fills shall be analyzed at the grading plan stage based on testing of the actual materials proposed for the fill.
  
- LV 4.1-54 Most of the alluvium and older Alluvium on the site are coarse-grained and have low cohesion. These materials shall not be used within the outer 4 feet of fill slopes and Stability Fills.
  
- LV 4.1-55 Excavations deeper than 3 feet shall conform to safety requirements for excavations as set forth in the State Construction Safety Orders enforced by the State Division of Industrial Safety, CAL OSHA. Temporary excavations no higher than 12 feet shall be no steeper than 1:1 (h:v). For excavations to 20 feet in height, the bottom 3.5 feet may be vertical and the upper portion between 3.5 and 20 feet shall be no steeper than 1.5:1 (h:v). Excavations not complying with these requirements shall be shored. It is strongly recommended that excavation walls in sands and dry soils be kept moist, but not saturated at all times.
  
- LV 4.1-56 Parameters for design of cantilever and braced shoring shall be provided at the grading plan stage.
  
- LV 4.1-57 The bases of excavations or trenches shall be firm and unyielding prior to foundations or utility construction. On-site materials other than topsoil or soils with roots or deleterious materials may be used for backfilling excavations. Densification (compaction) by jetting may be used for on site clean sands or imported equivalent of coarser sand provided they have a Sand Equivalent greater than or equal to 30 as determined by ASTM D2419 test method. Recommended specifications for placement of trench backfill are presented in Appendix C of the September 27, 2000 geologic and geotechnical report.
  
- LV 4.1-58 The structural design shall include seismic geotechnical parameters in accordance with UBC requirements for Seismic Zone 4. These parameters shall be provided at the grading plan stage.



- LV 4.1-59 Shallow spread footings for foundation support of up to three-story residential, commercial or light industrial developments can adequately be derived from non-organic native soils, processed as necessary, and bedrock or engineered fill compacted as previously recommended. The composition of footings for heavier structures, if applicable, shall be addressed at the grading plan stage. Tentatively, an allowable bearing capacity of 2,500 pounds per square foot can be used for shallow foundations constructed in certified compacted fill originated from existing, near-surface soils (except vegetative soils). Lateral resistance of footing walls shall be provided at the grading plan stage.
- LV 4.1-60 Figure C4 (Appendix C), "Cut Lot (Transitional)" and "Cut-Fill Lot (Transitional)" of the September 27, 2000 geologic and geotechnical report provides a foundation grading detail for locations where foundations will straddle transition zones between cut and fill materials. If the remaining cut-fill transition is steep at depth below the building area, the geometry of the transition shall be reviewed during grading operations by the soils engineer on a site specific basis to evaluate the need for additional over-excavation removals and/or additional foundation reinforcement. Based on this review, appropriate action shall be taken as deemed necessary by the engineer. As a general guideline, steep cut/fill transitions would include slope gradients steeper than 4:1 (h:v) and overall variations in fill thickness of greater than 15 feet, which occur within 20 feet of final pad grade. Transitions between differing material types, such as bedrock and alluvium, also shall be overexcavated 5 feet as recommended in Section 1.2 of Appendix E of the September 27, 2000 Geologic and Geotechnical Report.
- LV 4.1-61 To minimize significant settlements, upper soils in areas to receive fills shall be removed and recompacted to competent materials. Specific foundation design loads shall be provided at the grading plan stage.
- LV 4.1-62 Whenever seepage of groundwater is observed, the condition shall be evaluated by the engineering geologist and geotechnical engineer prior to covering with fill material.
- LV 4.1-63 Surface drainage control design shall include provisions for positive surface gradients to ensure that surface runoff is not permitted to pond, particularly above slopes or adjacent to building foundations or slabs. Surface runoff shall be directed away from slopes and foundations and collected in lined ditches or drainage swales, via non-erodible drainage devices, which is to discharge to paved roadways, or existing watercourses. If these facilities discharge onto natural ground, means shall be provided to control erosion and to create sheet flow.
- LV 4.1-64 Fill slopes and stability fills, as applicable, shall be provided with subsurface drainage as necessary for stability.
- LV 4.1-65 Additional testing for expansive soils shall be performed at the grading plan stage and during finish grading so that appropriate foundation design recommendations for expansive soils, if applicable, can be made.
- LV 4.1-66 Testing for soil corrosivity shall be undertaken at additional locations within the project site at the grading plan stage. Final recommendations for concrete shall be in accordance with the latest UBC requirements, and a corrosion specialist shall provide mitigating recommendations for potential corrosion of metals.

- LV 4.1-67 Retaining wall geotechnical design parameters and pavement design(s) shall be provided at the grading plan stage.
- LV 4.1-68 If the proposed fills over alluvium and slopewash at either the Adobe Canyon or Chiquito Canyon sites are to be considered "structural fill," subsurface studies shall be performed to determine actual liquefaction potential of these soils. If this potential exists, it shall be addressed by removal and recompaction of the alluvium above groundwater, in order to provide a cap to bridge effects.
- LV 4.1-69 Where possible, removals that impact the mapped landslides shall be completed so as to not remove the existing landslide stability. If this is not possible, the conditions shall be geotechnically evaluated on a case-by-case basis at the Grading Plan stage in order to safely complete the necessary removals.
- LV 4.1-70 Slope stability analysis shall be performed for the 186-foot-high cut slope along the base of the existing Edison tower within the Chiquito Canyon grading site. Corrective measures, such as construction of a buttress or stability fills, shall be implemented if the proposed cut slope does not comply with the required minimum factor of safety.

### **3.1.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potentially significant geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid all potentially significant geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **3.2 HYDROLOGY**

### **3.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

The Specific Plan's Program EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would not increase site discharge during a capital storm, not result in upstream or downstream flooding, and not subject any on-site or off-site improvements to flood hazards. Therefore, the development proposed in the Specific Plan was found to result in less than significant on-site and off-site flooding impacts.

The proposed project has the potential to result in increased sedimentation and debris production on the site, and erosion and sedimentation in the Santa Clara River and creek beds during storm events, which is considered potentially significant. The sources of these impacts include: (i) site clearing and grading operations within the tract map site; (ii) the placement of up to 5.8 million cubic yards of fill on the tract map site; (iii) excavation within the project site to install the bank stabilization, to construct the Long Canyon Road Bridge, and to widen and extend the Castaic Creek Bridge; (iv) clearing, excavating, grading, and exporting of cut material from the Adobe and Chiquito Canyon grading sites; and (v) construction of the utility corridor.

### **3.2.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant hydrology-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

**3.2.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

- SP 4.2-1 All on- and off-site flood control improvements necessary to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are to be constructed to the satisfaction of the LACDPW, Flood Control Division.
- SP 4.2-2 All necessary permits or letters of exemption from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and the RWQCB for Specific Plan-related development are to be obtained prior to construction of drainage improvements. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.6, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-10 (restoration) and 4.6-11 through 4.6-16 (enhancement) (of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR).
- SP 4.2-3 All necessary streambed agreement(s) are to be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game wherever grading activities alter the flow of streams under CDFG jurisdiction. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.6, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-10 (restoration) and 4.6-11 through 4.6-16 (enhancement) (of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR).
- SP 4.2-4 Conditional Letters of Map Revision (CLOMR) relative to adjustments to the 100-year FIA floodplain are to be obtained by the applicant ~~before~~<sup>after</sup> the proposed drainage facilities are constructed.
- SP 4.2-5 Prior to the approval and recordation of each subdivision map, a Hydrology Plan, Drainage Plan, and Grading Plan (including an Erosion Control Plan if required) for each subdivision must be prepared by the applicant of the subdivision map to ensure that no significant erosion, sedimentation, or flooding impacts would occur during or after site development. These plans shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the LACDPW.
- SP 4.2-6 Install permanent erosion control measures, such as desilting and debris basins, drainage swales, slope drains, storm drain inlet/outlet protection, and sediment traps in order to prevent sediment and debris from the upper reaches of the drainage areas which occur on the Newhall Ranch site from entering storm drainage improvements. These erosion control measures shall be installed to the satisfaction of the LACDPW.
- SP 4.2-7 The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall satisfy all applicable requirements of the NPDES Program in effect in Los Angeles County to the satisfaction of the LACDPW. These requirements currently include preparation of an Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (USWMP) containing design features and Best Management Practices (BMPs) appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. In addition, the requirements currently include preparation of a Storm Water Management Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. The LACDPW shall monitor compliance with those NPDES requirements.

**3.2.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's hydrology impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

- LV 4.2-1 The on-site storm drains (pipes and reinforced concrete boxes) and open channels shall be designed and constructed for either the 25-year or 50-year capital storm.
- LV 4.2-2 Debris basins shall be constructed pursuant to LACDPW requirements to intercept flows from undeveloped areas entering into the developed portions of the site.
- LV4.2-3 Energy dissipaters consisting of either rip-rap or larger standard impact type energy dissipaters shall be installed as required by LACDPW at outlet locations to reduce velocities of runoff into the channel where necessary to prevent erosion.
- LV4.2-4 The project is required to comply with the RWQCB Municipal Permit (General MS4 Permit) Order No. 01-182, NPDES No. CAS004001 (adopted December 13, 2001), and with the state's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit, California State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 99-08-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) No. CAS000002, reissued on April 17, 1997, as amended.
- LV 4.2-5 During all construction phases, temporary erosion control shall be implemented to retain soil and sediment on the tract map site, within the Adobe Canyon borrow site, the Chiquito Canyon grading site, the utility corridor right-of-way, and the bank stabilization areas, as follows:
- Re-vegetate exposed areas as quickly as possible;
  - Minimize disturbed areas;
  - Divert runoff from downstream drainages with earth dikes, temporary drains, slope drains, etc.;
  - Reduce velocity through outlet protection, check dams, and slope roughening/terracing;
  - Implement dust control measures, such as sand fences, watering, etc.;
  - Stabilize all disturbed areas with blankets, reinforced channel liners, soil cement, fiber matrices, geotextiles, and/or other erosion resistant soil coverings or treatments;
  - Stabilize construction entrances/exits with aggregate underdrain with filter cloth or other comparable method;
  - Place sediment control BMPs at appropriate locations along the site perimeter and at all operational internal inlets to the storm drain system at all times during the rainy season (sediment control BMPs may include filtration devices and barriers, such as fiber rolls, silt fence, straw bale barriers, and gravel inlet filters, and/or with settling devices, such as sediment traps or basins); and/or
  - Eliminate or reduce, to the extent feasible, non-stormwater discharges (e.g., pipe flushing, and fire hydrant flushing, over-watering during dust control, vehicle and equipment wash down) from the construction site through the use of appropriate sediment control BMPs.

- LV 4.2-6 All necessary permits, agreements, letters of exemption from the ACOE and/or the CDFG for project-related development within their respective jurisdictions must be obtained prior to the issuance of grading permits.
  
- LV 4.2-7 By October 1st of each year, a separate erosion control plan for construction activities shall be submitted to the local municipality describing the erosion control measures that will be implemented during the rainy season (October 1 through April 15).
  
- LV 4.2-8 A final developed condition hydrology analysis (LACDPW Drainage Concept Report (DCR) and Final Design Report (FDR)) shall be prepared in conjunction with final project design when precise engineering occurs. This final analysis will be done to confirm that the final project design is consistent with this analysis. Those final calculations shall establish design features for the project that satisfy the criterion that post-development peak stormwater runoff discharge rates, velocities, and duration in natural drainage systems mimic pre-development conditions. All elements of the storm drain system shall conform to the policies and standards of the LACDPW, Flood Control Division, as applicable.
  
- LV 4.2-9 Ultimate project hydrology and debris production calculations shall be prepared by a project engineer to verify the requirements for debris basins and/or desilting inlets.
  
- LV 4.2-10 To reduce debris being discharged from the site, debris basins shall be designed and constructed pursuant to LACDPW Flood Control to intercept flows from undeveloped areas entering into the developed portions of the site.

### **3.2.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potentially significant hydrology-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **3.3 WATER QUALITY**

### **3.3.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

The Specific Plan's Program EIR identified certain potentially significant impacts related to water quality. Specifically, the Program EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would significantly increase the potential for erosion and sediment discharge downstream during grading activity. Further, on-going operation of urban uses could result in the release of fertilizers, herbicides, or other types of contaminants that could potentially impact surface water quality. Mitigation measures were adopted to reduce these potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would replace agricultural runoff with urban water runoff. However, due to the incorporation of various Best Management Practices ("BMPs"), compliance with all water quality permitting requirements, and the inclusion of specific project design features ("PFDs"), the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the concentration and loads of pollutants of concern under wet- and dry-weather conditions. Further, the impact of the proposed project on hydromodification is expected to be less than significant because the proposed drainage and hydromodification controls included in the project design will neither substantially alter the existing

drainage pattern of the River in a manner that would cause substantial erosion, siltation, or channel instability, nor substantially increase the rates, velocities, frequencies, duration, and/or seasonality of flows in manner that causes channel instability or harms sensitive habitats and/or species.

### **3.3.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant water quality-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

#### ***3.3.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures***

- SP 4.2-1 All on- and off-site flood control improvements necessary to serve the NRSP are to be constructed to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Flood Control Division.
- SP 4.2-2 All necessary permits or letters of exemption from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for Specific Plan-related development are to be obtained prior to construction of drainage improvements. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.4, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-10 (restoration) and 4.6-11 through 4.6-16 (enhancement).
- SP 4.2-3 All necessary streambed agreement(s) are to be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game wherever grading activities alter the flow of streams under CDFG jurisdiction. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.6, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-10 (restoration) and 4.6-11 through 4.6-16 (enhancement).
- SP 4.2-4 Conditional Letters of Map Revision (CLOMR) relative to adjustments to the 100-year FIA flood plain are to be obtained by the applicant after the proposed drainage facilities are constructed.
- SP 4.2-5 Prior to the approval and recordation of each subdivision map, a Hydrology Plan, Drainage Plan, and Grading Plan (including an Erosion Control Plan if required) for each subdivision must be prepared by the applicant of the subdivision map to ensure that no significant erosion, sedimentation, or flooding impacts would occur during or after site development. These plans shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.
- SP 4.2-6 Install permanent erosion control measures, such as desilting and debris basins, drainage swales, slope drains, storm drain inlet/outlet protection, and sediment traps in order to prevent sediment and debris from the upper reaches of the drainage areas which occur on the Newhall Ranch site from entering storm drainage improvements. These erosion control measures shall be installed to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.
- SP 4.2-7 The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall satisfy all applicable requirements of the NPDES Program in effect in Los Angeles County to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. These requirements currently

include preparation of an Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (USWMP) containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. In addition, the requirements currently include preparation of an SWPPP containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works shall monitor compliance with those NPDES requirements.

***3.3.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measure***

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's water quality impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

- LV 4.3-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit, and as a part of the design level hydrology study and facilities plan, the project applicant shall submit to planning staff for review drainage plans showing the incorporation into the project of those water quality and hydrologic control project design features (i.e., the post-development water quality and hydrologic control BMPs)(the "PDFs"), identified in this Section 4.3, which PDFs shall be designed to meet the standards set forth in this Section 4.3, including the sizing, capacity, and volume reduction performance standards set forth herein, all as summarized in Table 4.3-12 (below).

**Table 4.3-12  
SUSMP Requirements and Corresponding Project Design Features**

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Landmark Village PDFs
1. Runoff Flow Control	<p>Control post-development peak stormwater runoff discharge rates, velocities and duration in Natural Drainage Systems to prevent accelerated downstream erosion and to protect habitat-related beneficial uses.</p> <p>Post-development peak storm water runoff discharge rates shall not exceed the estimated pre-development rate for developments where the increased peak storm water discharge rate will result in increased potential for downstream erosion.</p> <p>Post-development runoff from the 50-year capital storm shall not exceed the predevelopment peak flow rate, burned and bulked, from the 50-year capital storm.</p>	<p>Hydromodification controls consist of (1) site design measures, including minimizing impervious surfaces through clustering development, disconnecting impervious surfaces, efficient irrigation systems, and established river buffer zones and setbacks; (2) volume reduction BMPs, including bioretention areas, vegetated swales, and extended detention basins to reduce runoff volumes through evapotranspiration and infiltration; and (3) geomorphically based bank stabilization and localized energy dissipation.</p> <p>The volume reduction PDFs are estimated to reduce the increase in average annual stormwater runoff volume by approximately 57 acre-feet per year, which is a 19 percent reduction of the predicted average post-development stormwater runoff volume without the treatment control PDFs. In addition these facilities will also receive and eliminate dry weather flows.</p> <p>50-year capital storm peak flow rate analysis is contained in the <i>Landmark Village Tentative Tract Map 53108 Drainage Concept</i>, prepared by Psomas. (Psomas, 2006) (see <b>Appendix 4.2</b>)</p>
2. Conserve Natural Areas	<p>Concentrate or cluster development on portions of a site while leaving the remaining land in a natural undisturbed condition.</p> <p>Limit clearing and grading of native vegetation at a site to the minimum amount needed to build lots, allow access, and provide fire protection.</p> <p>Maximize trees and other vegetation at each site, planting additional vegetation, clustering tree areas, and promoting the use of native and/or drought tolerant plants.</p> <p>Promote natural vegetation by using parking lot islands and other landscaped areas.</p> <p>Preserve riparian areas and wetlands.</p>	<p>The NRSP clusters development into villages, including Landmark Village. Approximately 70% (8,335 acres) of the NRSP subregion will remain undeveloped.</p> <p>Approximately 55 acres of the 292-acre Landmark Village project area will remain as open space or parks.</p> <p>Existing site land use is agriculture, so little or no native vegetation is found in pre-development conditions.</p> <p>Native and/or climate-appropriate vegetation will be utilized within the development.</p> <p>The final project stormwater system will include the use of the vegetated treatment BMPs, including bioretention (placed in common area landscaping in commercial and multi-family residential areas, roadway median strips and parking lot islands (where applicable)), vegetated swales, and an extended detention basin.</p> <p>Riparian buffers will be preserved along the Santa Clara River corridor by clustering development upland and away from the river.</p>
3. Minimize Stormwater Pollutants of Concern	<p>Minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, the introduction of pollutants of concern that may result in significant impacts generated from site runoff of directly connected impervious areas (DCIA) to the stormwater conveyance system as approved by the building official.</p>	<p>Treatment control BMPs will be selected to address the pollutants of concern for the project. These BMPs are designed per SUSMP standards to minimize introduction of pollutants to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP).</p> <p>The project will include numerous source controls, including education programs, animal waste bag stations, street sweeping and catch basin cleaning, an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program for common area landscaping in commercial areas and multi-family residential areas, use of native and/or non-invasive vegetation, and installation of a car wash pad in</p>



**Table 4.3-12  
SUSMP Requirements and Corresponding Project Design Features**

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Landmark Village PDFs
		<p>multi-family residential areas.</p> <p>An education program will be implemented that includes both the education of residents and commercial businesses regarding water quality issues. Topics will include services that could affect water quality, such as carpet cleaners and others that may not properly dispose of cleaning wastes; community car washes; and residential car washing. The education program will emphasize animal waste management, such as the importance of cleaning up after pets and not feeding pigeons, seagulls, ducks, and geese.</p> <p>Vegetated treatment control BMPs will allow for infiltration of treated stormwater.</p>
4. Protect Slopes and Channels	<p>Project plans must include BMPs consistent with local codes and ordinances and the SUSMP requirements to decrease the potential of slopes and/or channels from eroding and impacting stormwater runoff:</p> <p>Convey runoff safely from the tops of slopes and stabilize disturbed slopes.</p> <p>Utilize natural drainage systems to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>Control or reduce or eliminate flow to natural drainage systems to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>Stabilize permanent channel crossings.</p> <p>Vegetate slopes with native or drought tolerant vegetation.</p> <p>Install energy dissipaters, such as riprap, at the outlets of new storm drains, culverts, conduits, or channels that enter unlined channels in accordance with applicable specifications to minimize erosion with the approval of all agencies with jurisdiction, e.g., the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG).</p>	<p>There are no significant slopes or natural drainage channels within the developed portion of the project in the post-developed condition.</p> <p>Natural slopes and native vegetation on slopes adjacent to the Santa Clara River will be preserved and/or, if impacted during construction, they will be restored and enhanced.</p> <p>Project PDFs, including swales, bioretention areas, and water quality basins (hydrologic source controls), will reduce flows to natural channels through infiltration and evapotranspiration.</p> <p>The banks of the Santa Clara River at portions of this site will be stabilized primarily using buried bank stabilization. After the implementation of these measures and other flow control and volume reduction PDFs, the Santa Clara River will be capable of handling the expected flow volumes, velocities, and durations with little or no erosion.</p> <p>Native vegetation will be used in all plant palettes placed on restored slopes.</p> <p>All outlet points to the Santa Clara River will include localized energy dissipaters per the Newhall Ranch Resource Development and Management Plan.</p>
5. Provide Storm Drain System Stenciling and Signage	<p>All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the project area must be stenciled with prohibitive language and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping.</p> <p>Signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping, must be posted at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area.</p> <p>Legibility of stencils and signs must be maintained.</p>	<p>All storm drain inlets and water quality inlets will be stenciled or labeled.</p> <p>Signs will be posted in areas where dumping could occur.</p> <p>The Home Owners Association will maintain stencils and signs.</p>
6. Properly Design Outdoor Material Storage Areas	<p>Where proposed project plans include outdoor areas for storage of materials that may contribute pollutants to the storm water conveyance system measures to mitigate</p>	<p>Pesticides, fertilizers, paints, and other hazardous materials used for maintenance of common areas, parks, commercial areas, and multifamily residential common</p>

**Table 4.3-12  
SUSMP Requirements and Corresponding Project Design Features**

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Landmark Village PDFs
	impacts must be included.	areas will be kept in enclosed storage areas.
7. Properly Design Trash Storage Areas	<p>All trash containers must meet the following structural or treatment control BMP requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trash container areas must have drainage from adjoining roofs and pavement diverter around the areas.</li> <li>• Trash container areas must be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash.</li> </ul>	All outdoor trash storage areas will be covered and isolated from stormwater runoff.
8. Provide Proof of Ongoing BMP Maintenance	Applicant required to provide verification of maintenance provisions through such means as may be appropriate, including, but not limited to legal agreements, covenants, and/or Conditional Use Permits.	<p>The Home Owners Associations or Commercial Business Owner Associations will be responsible for operation and maintenance of site-based BMPs (such as bioretention placed in common area landscaping in multi-family residential areas and commercial areas).</p> <p>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works will be responsible for maintenance of village-level and sub-regional BMPs (vegetated swales and extended detention basins).</p>
9. Design Standards for Structural or Treatment Control BMPs	Post-construction Structural or Treatment Control BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (infiltrate or treat) stormwater runoff using either volumetric treatment control BMPs or flow-based treatment control BMPs sized per listed criteria.	<p>Stormwater treatment facilities will be designed to meet or exceed the sizing standards in the Los Angeles County SUSMP requirements.</p> <p>Volume-based treatment control BMPs for the project will be designed to capture 80 percent or more of the annual runoff volume per Criteria 2 of the MS4 Permit.</p> <p>Flow-based BMPs will be sized using Criteria 3, which will provide 80 percent capture of annual runoff volume per criteria of the MS4 Permit.</p> <p>The size of the facilities will be finalized during the design stage by the project engineer with the final hydrology study, which will be prepared and approved to ensure consistency with this analysis prior to issuance of a final grading permit.</p> <p>Types of treatment control BMPs that will be employed include vegetated swales, bioretention, and dry extended detention basins, and a combination thereof.</p>
10.B.1 Properly Design Loading/Unloading Dock Areas (100,000 ft <sup>2</sup> Commercial Developments)	<p>Cover loading dock areas or design drainage to minimize run-on and runoff of stormwater.</p> <p>Direct connections to storm drains from depressed loading docks (truck wells) are prohibited.</p>	<p>Loading dock areas will be covered or designed to preclude run-on and runoff.</p> <p>Direct connections to storm drains from depressed loading docks (truck wells) will be prohibited.</p> <p>Below grade loading docks for fresh food items will drain through a Treatment Control BMP applicable to the use, such as a catch basin insert.</p> <p>Loading docks will be kept in a clean and orderly condition through weekly sweeping and litter control, at a minimum and immediate cleanup of spills and broken containers without the use of water.</p>
10B.2. Properly Design Repair/Maintenance Bays (100,000)	Repair/maintenance bays must be indoors or designed in such a way that does not allow stormwater run-on or contact with	Commercial areas will not have repair/maintenance bays or the bays will comply with design requirements.

**Table 4.3-12  
SUSMP Requirements and Corresponding Project Design Features**

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Landmark Village PDFs
ft <sup>2</sup> Commercial Developments)	<p>stormwater runoff.</p> <p>Design a repair/maintenance bay drainage system to capture all wash water, leaks, and spills. Connect drains to a sump for collection and disposal. Direct connection of the repair/maintenance bays to the storm drain system is prohibited. If required by local jurisdiction, obtain an Industrial Waste Discharge Permit.</p>	
10B.3. Properly Design Vehicle/ Equipment Wash Areas (100,000 ft <sup>2</sup> Commercial Developments)	<p>Self-contained and/or covered, equipped with a clarifier, or other pretreatment facility, and properly connected to a sanitary sewer.</p>	<p>Areas for washing/steam cleaning of vehicles will be self-contained or covered with a roof or overhang; will be equipped with a wash racks and with the prior approval of the sewer agency; will be equipped with a clarifier or other pretreatment facility; and will be properly connected to a sanitary sewer.</p>
10.C. Properly Design Equipment/ Accessory Wash Areas (Restaurants)	<p>Self-contained, equipped with a grease trap, and properly connected to a sanitary sewer.</p> <p>If the wash area is to be located outdoors, it must be covered, paved, have secondary containment, and be connected to the sanitary sewer.</p>	<p>Food preparation areas shall have either contained areas or sinks, each with sanitary sewer connections for disposal of wash waters containing kitchen and food wastes.</p> <p>If located outside, the containment areas or sinks shall also be structurally covered to prevent entry of storm water. Adequate signs shall be provided and appropriately placed stating the prohibition of discharging washwater to the storm drain system.</p>
10.D. Properly design fueling area (Retail Gasoline Outlets)	<p>The fuel dispensing area must be covered with an overhanging roof structure or canopy. The cover's minimum dimensions must be equal to or greater than the area within the grade break. The cover must not drain onto the fuel dispensing area and the downspouts must be routed to prevent drainage across the fueling area.</p> <p>The fuel dispensing area must be paved with Portland cement concrete (or equivalent smooth impervious surface). The use of asphalt concrete shall be prohibited.</p> <p>The fuel dispensing areas must have a 2% to 4% slope to prevent ponding, and must be separated from the rest of the site by a grade break that prevents run-on of urban runoff.</p> <p>At a minimum, the concrete fuel dispensing area must extend 6.5 feet (2.0 meters) from the corner of each fuel dispenser, or the length at which the hose and nozzle assembly may be operated plus 1 foot (0.3 meter), whichever is less.</p>	<p>Retail gasoline outlets will comply with design requirements.</p>
10.E.1. Properly design fueling area (Automotive Repair Shops)	<p>See requirement 10.D. above.</p>	<p>Automotive repair shop fueling areas will comply with design requirements.</p>

**Table 4.3-12  
SUSMP Requirements and Corresponding Project Design Features**

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Landmark Village PDFs
10.E.2. Properly design repair/maintenance bays (Automotive Repair Shops)	See requirement 10.B.2 above.	Automotive repair shop repair/maintenance bays will comply with design requirements.
10.E.3. Properly design vehicle/equipment wash areas (Automotive Repair Shops)	Self-contained and/or covered, equipped with a clarifier, or other pretreatment facility, and properly connected to a sanitary sewer or to a permitted disposal facility.	Automotive repair shop vehicle/equipment wash areas will comply with design requirements.
10.E.4. Properly design loading/unloading dock areas (Automotive Repair Shops)	See requirement 10.B.1 above.	Automotive repair shop loading/unloading dock areas will comply with design requirements.
10.F.1. Properly Design Parking Area (Parking Lots)	Reduce impervious land coverage of parking areas. Infiltrate runoff before it reaches the storm drain system. Treat runoff before it reaches storm drain system.	Commercial and multi-family parking lots will incorporate bioretention facilities located in islands to promote filtration and infiltration of runoff. Stormwater runoff from parking lots will be directed to treatment control BMPs, including swales, water quality basins and/or bioretention areas, and/or catch basin media filters in compliance with SUSMP requirements.
10.F.2. Properly Design to Limit Oil Contamination and Perform Maintenance (Parking Lots)	Treat to remove oil and petroleum hydrocarbons at parking lots that are heavily used. Ensure adequate operation and maintenance of treatment systems particularly sludge and oil removal.	See above. Treatment of runoff in detention basins, bioretention areas, or bioswales and catch basin inserts will be used to address oil and petroleum hydrocarbons from high-use parking lots. The Home Owners Associations or Business Owners will be responsible for operation and maintenance of treatment control BMPs that serve private parking lots.
13. Limitation of Use of Infiltration BMPs	Infiltration is limited based on design of BMP, pollutant characteristics, land use, soil conditions, and traffic. Appropriate conditions (groundwater >10 feet from grade) must exist to utilize infiltration to treat and reduce stormwater runoff for the project.	The proposed treatment control BMPs are not considered infiltration BMPs; they allow for infiltration of fully-treated runoff only.

*Source:* Landmark Village Draft EIR, Section 4.3, Water Quality

### 3.3.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant water quality-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant water quality-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

### 3.4 TRAFFIC/ACCESS

#### 3.4.1 Potential Significant Impacts

As approved, the Specific Plan would generate 357,000 average daily trips ("ADT"). The Specific Plan's Program EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant impacts, but that the identified mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to below a level of significance.

The Landmark Village project would generate 41,900 ADT at buildout. The proposed project would be built out in three phases. During Phase 1 (build-out of 500 residential units) and Phase 2 (build-out of remaining residential component, the elementary school, 100,000 square feet of commercial space, and a park), potentially significant impacts are expected at the Wolcott/SR-126 and Commerce Center Drive/SR-126 intersections. During Phase 3 (build-out of balance of commercial uses), potentially significant impacts are expected at the following intersections: I-5/Southbound Ramps/SR-126; Wolcott/SR-126; Commerce Center Drive/SR-126; and Chiquito-Long Canyon/SR-126.

Traffic signals also will be needed at the Chiquito Canyon Road/Long Canyon Road/SR-126 intersection during Phase 1 of the proposed project, and at the Long Canyon Road/A Street intersection for build-out conditions. In addition, while the proposed project would not impact the Congestion Management Program's ("CMP") highway system, it may result in a potentially significant impact to transit as a result of the increased demand generated by residents.

#### 3.4.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant traffic/access-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

##### ***3.4.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures***

Certain Specific Plan mitigation measures required future development under the Specific Plan to prepare additional studies and those measures are: SP 4.8-2, SP 4.8-6, SP 4.8-10, and SP 4.8-13. The project applicant already has complied with such measures by preparing the required studies and analyses; and, therefore, these measures have been removed from the mitigation described below. For additional information regarding such measures, please refer to Section 4.7, Traffic/Access, of the Draft EIR.

SP 4.8-1 The applicants for future subdivision maps which permit construction shall be responsible for funding and constructing all on-site traffic improvements except as otherwise provided below. The obligation to construct improvements shall not preclude the applicants' ability to seek local, state, or federal funding for these facilities. *(All on-site traffic improvements included as part of the Landmark Village project will be funded and/or constructed by the project applicant.)*

SP 4.8-3 The applicants for future subdivisions shall provide the traffic signals at the 15 locations labeled B through P in Figure 4.8-17 [of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Final EIR] as well as any additional signals warranted by future subdivision design. Signal warrants shall be prepared as part of the transportation performance evaluations noted in Mitigation 4.8-2 [of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Final EIR]. *(Two of the intersections within the Landmark Village site will be signalized intersections, including the one intersection depicted as signalized by Specific Plan Figure 4.8-17, Long Canyon Road/A Street. This EIR, Section*

*4.7, in combination with the traffic report presented in EIR Appendix 4.7, provides the required signal warrants.)*

- SP 4.8-4 All development within the Specific Plan shall conform to the requirements of the Los Angeles County Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance. *(The Landmark Village project would conform to the County's TDM Ordinance.)*
- SP 4.8-5 The applicants for all future subdivision maps which permit construction shall consult with the local transit provider regarding the need for, and locations of, bus pull-ins on highways within the Specific Plan area. All bus pull-in locations shall be approved by the Department of Public Works, and approved bus pull-ins shall be constructed by the applicant. *(Final locations of bus pull-ins will be coordinated with the local transit provider and the Department of Public Works and constructed in conjunction with the project.)*
- SP 4.8-7 Each future performance evaluation which shows that a future subdivision map will create significant impacts on SR-126 shall analyze the need for additional travel lanes on SR-126. If adequate lane capacity is not available at the time of subdivision, the applicant of the subdivision shall fund or construct the improvements necessary to serve the proposed increment of development. Construction or funding of any required facilities shall not preclude the applicant's ability to seek state, federal, or local funding for these facilities. *(The future performance evaluation presented in this EIR, Section 4.7, determined that the Landmark Village project would cause a significant impact at the SR-126/I-5 interchange at buildout and would be responsible for its fair share of the improvements to this interchange.). (This improvement has since been completed.)*
- SP 4.8-8 Project-specific environmental analysis for future subdivision maps which allow construction shall comply with the requirements of the *Congestion Management Program* in effect at the time that subdivision map is filed. *(The future performance evaluation presented in this EIR, Section 4.7, complies with the requirements of the Congestion Management Program presented in effect.)*
- SP 4.8-9 Prior to the recordation of the first subdivision map which permits construction, the applicant for that map shall prepare a transportation evaluation including all of the Specific Plan land uses which shall determine the specific improvements needed to the following intersections with SR-126 in the City of Fillmore and community of Piru in Ventura County: A, B, C, D and E Streets, Old Telegraph, Olive, Central, Santa Clara, Mountain View, El Dorado Road, and Pole Creek (Fillmore), and Main/Torrey and Center (Piru). The related costs of those intersection improvements and the project's fair share shall be estimated based upon the expected Specific Plan traffic volumes. The transportation performance evaluation shall be based on the Los Angeles *County Master Plan of Highways* in effect at that time and shall be approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The applicant's total funding obligation shall be equitably distributed over the housing units and non-residential building square footage (i.e., Business Park, Visitor Center, Mixed Use, and Commercial) in the Specific Plan, and shall be a fee to be paid to the City of Fillmore and the County of Ventura at each building permit. *(This EIR, Section 4.7, in combination with the traffic reports presented in EIR Appendix 4.7, provides the required transportation evaluation of SR-126 intersections in Ventura County. As discussed in the EIR, Subsection 9.b.(3), buildout of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would contribute to potentially significant cumulative impacts at the intersection of Center Street and Telegraph Road (SR-126) in the Ventura County community of Piru. Pursuant to mitigation measure LV-4.7-18, below, the applicant will pay to Ventura County its fair-share of the costs to implement*

*recommended roadway improvements at the Center Street/Telegraph Road intersection. Additionally, as discussed in the EIR, Subsection 9.b.(4), buildout of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would contribute to potentially significant cumulative impacts at two intersections in the Ventura County City of Fillmore. Pursuant to **Mitigation Measure LV-4.7-17**, the applicant will pay \$300,000 to the City of Fillmore as its agreed-upon fair-share of the costs to construct transportation-related improvements deemed necessary by the City of Fillmore.)*

- SP 4.8-11 The applicant of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall participate in an I-5 developer fee program, if adopted by the Board of Supervisors for the Santa Clarita Valley. *(The Board of Supervisors has not adopted a developer fee program for the Santa Clarita Valley. However, the applicant will participate in funding its fair share of mainline improvements in accordance with **Mitigation Measure LV-4.7-16**.)*
- SP 4.8-12 The applicant of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall participate in a transit fee program, if adopted for the entire Santa Clarita Valley by Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita. *(The applicant will be required to pay the applicable transit fees in place at the time of map recordation.)*

### **3.4.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's traffic impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

- LV 4.7-1 The project applicant shall construct all on-site local roadways and intersections to County of Los Angeles codes and regulations.
- LV 4.7-2 The main access for River [Landmark] Village will be provided from SR-126 via the existing intersections of Wolcott Way and Chiquito Canyon Road. Future phases of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (NRSP) will provide access to and from south via Long Canyon Road. Unless an updated long range study is prepared which demonstrates that the intersections will adequately handle the area build-out traffic as at grade intersections, adequate road right of way shall be reserved for future grade separated interchanges at these two locations, as approved in the NRSP.
- LV 4.7-3 80. Wolcott/SR-126 -The project applicant shall add a northbound left turn lane and a northbound right turn lane (resulting in 1 northbound left turn lane, 1 northbound through lane and 1 northbound right turn lane) and shall convert a shared southbound left turn lane/southbound through lane to a dedicated southbound through lane (resulting in 1 southbound left turn lane, 1 southbound through lane, and 1 southbound right turn lane) and shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed.
- LV 4.7-4 110. Chiquito Canyon-Long Canyon/SR-126 -The project applicant shall add a northbound left turn lane and a northbound right turn lane (resulting in 1 northbound left turn lane, 1 northbound through lane, and 1 northbound right turn lane), shall add a southbound left turn lane (resulting in 1 southbound left turn lane and 1 shared southbound through lane/southbound right turn lane), and shall add a westbound left turn lane (resulting in 1 westbound left turn lane, 2 westbound through lanes, and 1 westbound right turn lane) and shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of

Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed.

- LV 4.7-5 The study is based on the Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model and assumes the following roadway improvements will be in place with Phase I of the project. In accordance with the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines (TIARG), these improvements shall be made a condition of approval for the project to be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed:

Reconstruct the Golden State (I-5) Freeway/SR-126 Freeway interchange by adding access to eastbound SR-126 from southbound I-5, access to southbound I-5 from westbound SR-126, direct access to northbound I-5 from westbound SR-126, and widening bridge to 8 lanes. [This measure has been completed.]

Construct Newhall Ranch Road segment between Vanderbilt Way and Copper Hill Drive/Rye Canyon Road.

- LV 4.7-6 Although the traffic study prepared for the project determined that a traffic signal is not warranted at the school, the project applicant shall be required to monitor for the possible installation of a traffic signal once the school is fully occupied.

- LV 4.7-7 80. Wolcott/SR-126 -The project applicant shall add a northbound left turn lane and 2 northbound right turn lanes (resulting in 1 northbound left turn lane, 1 northbound through lane, and 2 northbound right turn lanes), shall add a eastbound right turn lane (resulting in 1 eastbound left turn lane, 2 eastbound through lanes, and 1 eastbound right turn lane), and shall add a second westbound left turn lane (resulting in 2 westbound left turn lanes, 2 westbound through lanes, and 1 westbound right turn lane) and shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed. Signals shall be modified to the satisfaction of Public Works.

- LV 4.7-8 7. I-5 SB Ramps/SR-126 -The project applicant shall add a third westbound through lane (resulting in 3 westbound through lanes and a free flow westbound right turn lane) and shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed. [This measure has been completed.]

- LV 4.7-9 80. Wolcott/SR-126 -The project applicant shall add a third east bound through lane (resulting in 1 east bound left turn lane, 3 east bound through lanes, and 1 east bound right turn lane) and shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed.

- LV 4.7-10 110. Chiquito Canyon/Long Canyon/SR-126 -The project applicant shall add a second northbound through lane and a second northbound right turn lane (resulting in 1 northbound left turn lane, 2 northbound through lanes, and 2 northbound right turn lanes). The project applicant shall also add a southbound right turn lane (resulting in 1 southbound left turn lane, 1 southbound through lane, and 1 southbound right turn lane), shall add 1 eastbound right



turn lane (resulting in 1 eastbound left turn lane, 2 eastbound through lanes, and 1 eastbound right turn lane), and shall add a second westbound left turn lane (resulting in 2 westbound left turn lanes, 2 westbound through lanes, and 1 westbound right turn lane) or construct a grade separated crossing to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed. Signals shall be modified to the satisfaction of Public Works.

- LV 4.7-11 7. I-5 SB Ramps/SR-126 -The project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to: add a third southbound lane (resulting in 2 southbound lanes, 1 shared southbound left turn lane/1 southbound right turn lane, and 1 dedicated southbound right turn lane); add a third and fourth eastbound through lane (resulting 4 four eastbound through lanes and 1 free flow eastbound right turn lane); and add a fourth westbound through lane (resulting in 4 westbound through lanes and 1 free flow westbound right turn lane). (Project share = 38.3 percent. The project may elect to pay by phase as each phase gets recorded: Phase I= 8.3 percent, Phase II= 8.1 percent and Phase III= 21.9 percent)<sup>12</sup> Said improvements shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed. (This measure has been completed.)
- LV 4.7-12 8. I-5 NB Ramps/SR-126 -The project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to: add a third northbound left turn lane (resulting in 3 northbound left turn lanes and 1 northbound right turn lane); add a third and fourth eastbound through lane (resulting in 4 eastbound through lanes and 1 free flow eastbound right turn lane); and add a third westbound through lane (for 3 westbound through lanes and 1 free flow westbound right turn lane). (Project Share = 20.8 percent. The project may elect to pay by phase as each phase gets recorded: Phase I= 4.7 percent, Phase II= 4.0 percent and Phase III= 12.1 percent)<sup>13</sup> Said improvements shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed. (This measure has been completed.)
- LV 4.7-13 80. Wolcott/SR-126 -The project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to: add a second southbound left turn lane (resulting in 2 southbound left turn lanes, 1 southbound through lane, and 1 southbound right turn lane); add a second eastbound left turn lane (resulting in 2 eastbound left turn lanes, 3 eastbound through lanes, and 1 eastbound right turn lane); and add a third westbound through lane (resulting in 2 westbound left turn lanes, 3 westbound through lanes, and 1 westbound right turn lane). (Project Share = 62.1 percent. The project may elect to pay by phase as each phase gets recorded: Phase I= 12.2 percent, Phase II= 19.3 percent and Phase III= 30.6 percent)<sup>14</sup> Said improvements shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed.

---

<sup>12</sup> Percentage pro-rata calculation figures were determined by the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, written communication of December 9, 2004.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

- LV 4.7-14 81, 82, 83 and 94. Commerce Center/SR-126 -The project applicant shall finance its fair share of the cost to construct a Grade Separated Interchange. (Project Share = 33.8 percent. The project may elect to pay by phase as each phase gets recorded: Phase I= 6.6 percent, Phase II= 9.1 percent and Phase III= 18.1 percent) Said improvements shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed.
- LV 4.7-15 110. Chiquito Canyon/Long Canyon Road/SR-126 -The project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to: add a second northbound left turn lane (resulting in 2 northbound left turn lanes, 2 northbound through lanes and 2 northbound right turn lanes); add a second southbound left turn lane, and second and third southbound through lanes (resulting in 2 southbound left turn lanes, 3 southbound through lanes and 1 southbound right turn lane); add a second eastbound left turn lane and third eastbound through lane (resulting in 2 eastbound left turn lanes, 3 eastbound through lanes, and 1 eastbound right turn lane); and add a third westbound through lane (resulting in 2 westbound left turn lanes, 3 westbound through lanes, and 1 westbound right turn lane) (Project Share = 62 percent) or construct a grade separated crossing to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. Said improvements shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed.
- LV 4.7-16 Prior to issuance of occupancy permits for the elementary school, a painted school pedestrian crossing with associated signing shall be installed across A Street and across U Street at the elementary school access from A Street. Driver behavior shall be monitored as the community develops and, if necessary, additional treatments shall be installed to further enhance the pedestrian crossing. These may include crossing guards at an intersection, such as the A Street/U Street intersection, and pedestrian activated in-pavement warning lights or overhead flashing lights to identify the pedestrian crossing. These warnings can be configured with automated detection units that would activate the lights automatically given the presence of a pedestrian rather than relying on the children to manually engage the system.
- LV 4.7-17 Applicable transit mitigation fees shall be paid by the project applicant at the time of final map recordation, unless modified by an approved development agreement.
- LV 4.7-18 Prior to the commencement of project construction activities, the applicant shall institute construction traffic management controls in accordance with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) traffic manual. These traffic management controls shall include measures determined on the basis of site-specific conditions including, as appropriate, the use of construction signs (e.g., "Construction Ahead") and delineators, and private driveway and cross-street closures.
- LV 4.7-19 The traffic signals shall be installed at the following intersections. The design and the construction of the traffic signals shall be the sole responsibility of the project. The signals shall be completed at their ultimate design locations and operational to the satisfaction of Public Works concurrently with the installation of the curb, gutter, the first lift of asphalt pavement, and the temporary traffic detection loops, if needed.

Phase I: Wolcott Way at Henry Mayo Drive (SR-126)

Phase II: Chiquito Canyon Road and Long Canyon Road (Future) at Henry Mayo Drive (SR-126)

Phase III: Long Canyon Road at "Y" Street and "A" Street (TT 53108)

LV 4.7-20 The developer shall coordinate with and notify the Castaic Union School District (CUSD) that traffic circulation plan and the drop-off/pick-up procedures shall be prepared and submitted to Traffic and Lighting Division for review and approval. The Traffic and Lighting Division recommends a mechanism for enforcement and levying of noncompliance penalties be included in the plan. The CUSD shall prepare informational packets containing the approved drop-off/pick-up procedures and provide to the parents/guardians of students of the school. The recordation of the phase containing Lot 345 where the school is proposed shall be withheld until the student drop-off/pick-up procedures, the informational packets or brochures, and the revised school site plan have been received and approved by Public Works.

### **3.4.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant traffic/access impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant traffic/access-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **3.5 WATER SERVICE**

### **3.5.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

The prior analysis of the Specific Plan forecasted that an adequate supply of water exists in the Santa Clarita Valley to meet the demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Nonetheless, the County adopted 22 water-related Specific Plan mitigation measures.

The proposed project would generate a total water demand of 1,038 acre-feet per year ("afy"), specifically 702 afy of potable water demand and 336 afy of non-potable water demand. Potable water demand (702 afy) would be met by the Valencia Water Company through the use of the project applicant's rights to 7,038 afy of local groundwater from the Alluvial aquifer, which is presently used by the applicant for agricultural irrigation. Because this water is already used to support the applicant's existing agricultural uses, there is not expected to be any significant environmental effects resulting from the use of such water to meet the potable demands of the Landmark Village project, which is part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area. In addition, due to project conditions, the amount of local groundwater that will be used to meet the potable demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, including the Landmark Village project, cannot exceed the amount of water historically and presently used by the applicant for agricultural uses. Therefore, no net increase in local groundwater use will occur with implementation of this project pursuant to the Specific Plan.

Non-potable water demand (336 afy) would be met through the use of recycled (reclaimed) water from the initial phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP, with build-out of the WRP occurring over time as demand for treatment increases with implementation of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Alternatively, if the Newhall Ranch WRP is not operating at the time of project occupancy, the non-potable water demand

would be met through the use of recycled water from the existing Valencia WRP, located upstream of the Landmark Village project site.

Accordingly, the proposed project's water demand would be met by relying on two primary sources of water supply, namely, the applicant's agricultural water supplies and recycled water supplied by the Newhall Ranch WRP or the existing Valencia WRP. Because these two independent water sources meet the water needs of the proposed project, no potable water would be needed from the existing or planned water supplies of Castaic Lake Water Agency ("CLWA"), including imported water from CLWA's State Water Project ("SWP") supplies. Nonetheless, CLWA's water supplies, including imported water from the SWP, are assessed in this EIR for informational purposes.

Based on the project-level analysis, an adequate supply of water is available to serve the Landmark Village project. In addition, because the Landmark Village project would utilize local water supplies (groundwater and recycled water), and because it would not rely on imported SWP supplies from CLWA, the proposed project would not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative water supply impacts in the Santa Clarita Valley.

### **3.5.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant water service-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

#### ***3.5.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures***

Certain Specific Plan mitigation measures are not applicable to the proposed project, and were omitted from these findings for that reason. Those measures are: SP 4.11-5, SP 4.11-11 through SP 4.11-14, SP 4.11-18, and SP 4.11-20. In addition, other Specific Plan mitigation measures already have been complied with by the project applicant *via* the preparation of particular environmental studies or similar documentation of water availability, and have been omitted for that reason. Those measures are SP 4.11-6 and SP 4.11-17. For additional information regarding such measures, please refer to Section 4.10, Water Service, of the Draft EIR.

- SP 4.11-1 The proposed Specific Plan shall implement a water reclamation system in order to reduce the Specific Plan's demand for imported potable water. The Specific Plan shall install a distribution system to deliver non-potable reclaimed water to irrigate land uses suitable to accept reclaimed water, pursuant to Los Angeles County Department of Health Standards.
- SP 4.11-2 Landscape concept plans shall include a palette rich in drought-tolerant and native plants.
- SP 4.11-3 Major manufactured slopes shall be landscaped with materials that will eventually naturalize, requiring minimal irrigation.
- SP 4.11-4 Water conservation measures as required by the State of California shall be incorporated into all irrigation systems.
- SP 4.11-7 Prior to commencement of use, all uses of recycled water shall be reviewed and approved by the State of California Health and Welfare Agency, Department of Health Services.

- SP 4.11-8 Prior to the issuance of building permits that allow construction, the applicant of the subdivision shall finance the expansion costs of water service extension to the subdivision through the payment of connection fees to the appropriate water agency(ies).
- SP 4.11-9 Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that the Upper Santa Clara Water Committee (or Santa Clarita Valley Water Purveyors), made up of the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 36, Newhall County Water District, Santa Clarita Water Division of CLWA and the Valencia Water Company, prepare an annual water report that will discuss the status of groundwater within the Alluvial and Saugus Aquifers, and State Water Project water supplies as they relate to the Santa Clarita Valley. The report will also include an annual update of the actions taken by CLWA to enhance the quality and reliability of existing and planned water supplies for the Santa Clarita Valley. In those years when the Committee or purveyors do not prepare such a report, the applicant at its expense shall cause the preparation of such a report that is acceptable to the County to address these issues. This annual report shall be provided to Los Angeles County who will consider the report as part of its local land use decision-making process.
- SP 4.11-10 Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), in cooperation with other Santa Clarita Valley retail water providers, continue to update the *UWMP* for Santa Clarita Valley once every five years (on or before December 31) to ensure that the County receives up-to-date information about the existing and planned water supplies in the Santa Clarita Valley. The County will consider the information contained in the updated *UWMP* in connection with the County's future local land use decision-making process. The County will also consider the information contained in the updated *UWMP* in connection with the County's future consideration of any Newhall Ranch tentative subdivision maps allowing construction.
- SP 4.11-15 Groundwater historically and presently used for crop irrigation on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site and elsewhere in Los Angeles County shall be made available by the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, to partially meet the potable water demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The amount of groundwater pumped for this purpose shall not exceed 7,038 AFY. This is the amount of groundwater pumped historically and presently by the Newhall Land and Farming Company in Los Angeles County to support its agricultural operations. Pumping this amount will not result in a net increase in groundwater use in the Santa Clarita Valley. To monitor groundwater use, the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide the County an annual report indicating the amount of groundwater used in Los Angeles County and the specific land upon which that groundwater was historically used for irrigation. For agricultural land located off the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site in Los Angeles County, at the time agricultural groundwater is transferred from agricultural uses on that land to Specific Plan uses, The Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide a verified statement to the County's Department of Regional Planning that Alluvial aquifer water rights on that land will now be used to meet Specific Plan demand.
- SP 4.11-16 The agricultural groundwater used to meet the needs of the Specific Plan shall meet the drinking water quality standards required under Title 22 prior to use.
- SP 4.11-19 A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Water Resource Monitoring Program has been entered into between United Water Conservation District and the Upper Basin Water

Purveyors, effective August 20, 2001.<sup>15</sup> The MOU/Water Resource Monitoring Program, when executed, will put in place a joint water resource monitoring program that will be an effective regional water management tool for both the Upper and Lower Santa Clara River areas as further information is developed, consistent with the MOU. This monitoring program will result in a database addressing water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over various representative water cycles. The parties to the MOU intend to utilize this database to further identify surface water and groundwater impacts on the Santa Clara River Valley. The applicant, or its designee, shall cooperate in good faith with the continuing efforts to implement the MOU and Water Resource Monitoring Program.

As part of the MOU process, the United Water Conservation District and the applicant have also entered into a "Settlement and Mutual Release" agreement, which is intended to continue to develop data as part of an on-going process for providing information about surface and groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley. In that agreement, the County and the applicant have agreed to the following:

"4.3 Los Angeles County and Newhall will each in good faith cooperate with the parties to the MOU and will assist them as requested in the development of the database calibrating water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over multi-year water cycles. Such cooperation will include, but not be limited to, providing the parties to the MOU with historical well data and other data concerning surface water and groundwater in the Santa Clara River and, in the case of Newhall, providing Valencia Water Company with access to wells for the collection of well data for the MOU.

4.4 Los Angeles County and Newhall further agree that the County of Los Angeles will be provided with, and consider, the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program in connection with, and prior to, all future Newhall Ranch subdivision approvals or any other future land use entitlements implementing the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. If the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program identifies significant impacts to surface water or groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley, Los Angeles County will identify those impacts and adopt feasible mitigation measures in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act."

SP 4.11-21 The applicant, in coordination with RWQCB staff, shall select a representative location upstream and downstream of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and sample surface and groundwater quality. Sampling from these two locations would begin upon approval of the first subdivision map and be provided annually to the RWQCB and County for the purpose of monitoring water quality impacts of the Specific Plan over time. If the sampling data results in the identification of significant new or additional water quality impacts resulting from the Specific Plan, which were not previously known or identified, additional mitigation shall be required at the subdivision map level.

SP 4.11-22 Beginning with the filing of the first subdivision map allowing construction on the Specific Plan site and with the filing of each subsequent subdivision map allowing construction, the Specific Plan applicant, or its designee, shall provide documentation to the County of Los Angeles identifying the specific portion(s) of irrigated farmland in the County of Los

---

<sup>15</sup> See, Appendix F to Final Additional Analysis (Memorandum of Understanding Between the Santa Clara River Valley Upper Basin Water Purveyors and United Water Conservation District, dated August 2001).

Angeles proposed to be retired from irrigated production to make agricultural water available to serve the subdivision. As a condition of subdivision approval, the applicant or its designee, shall provide proof to the County that the agricultural land has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the subdivision.

### **3.5.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of the above Specific Plan mitigation measures as part of the Landmark Village project would mitigate impacts to water resources to less than significant levels. As a result, no additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR are required or necessary, because the Landmark Village project does not result in any significant water-related impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measures.

### **3.5.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant water service-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant water service-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **3.6 WASTEWATER DISPOSAL**

### **3.6.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

The Specific Plan's Program EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan without mitigation would result in significant impacts to wastewater disposal, but that construction of the Newhall Ranch WRP and associated waste transmission infrastructure, as well as implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, would reduce impacts to a level below significant.

The proposed project would generate a worst-case average total of 0.41 million gallons per day ("mgd") of wastewater that would be treated by the Newhall Ranch WRP. The treatment capacity of the Newhall Ranch WRP would be 6.8 mgd, with a maximum flow of 13.8 mgd. Until the development of the Newhall Ranch WRP is completed, there are two options for the temporary conveyance and treatment of wastewater generated by the proposed project. The first option is to construct an initial phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP to serve the project site, with build-out of the WRP occurring over time as demand for treatment increases. As the WRP is intended to serve the Specific Plan area, of which the proposed project is a part, the initial phase of the WRP would be designed and constructed to accommodate the project's predicted wastewater generation of 0.41 mgd. The second option would temporarily direct wastewater flows to the Valencia WRP until the first phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP is complete. Based on the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County ("CSDLAC") future wastewater generation estimates and the planned expansion of the Saugus and Valencia WRPs, the Valencia WRP would have sufficient capacity to temporarily accommodate the project's predicted wastewater generation of 0.41 mgd. For these reasons, wastewater disposal impacts would be less than significant.

### **3.6.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant wastewater disposal-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

**3.6.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

- SP 4.12-1 The Specific Plan shall reserve a site of sufficient size to accommodate a water reclamation plant to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.
- SP 4.12-2 A 5.8 to 6.9 mgd water reclamation plant shall be constructed on the Specific Plan site, pursuant to County, state and federal design standards, to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.
- SP 4.12-3 The Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan shall be implemented pursuant to County, state and federal design standards.
- SP 4.12-4 Prior to recordation of each subdivision permitting construction, the applicant of each subdivision shall obtain a letter from the new County sanitation district stating that treatment capacity will be adequate for that subdivision.
- SP 4.12-5 All facilities of the sanitary sewer system will be designed and constructed for maintenance by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and/or the new County sanitation district or similar entity in accordance with their manuals, criteria, and requirements.
- SP 4.12-6 Pursuant to Los Angeles County Code, Title 20, Division 2, all industrial waste pretreatment facilities shall, prior to the issuance of building permits, be reviewed by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Industrial Waste Planning and Control Section and/or the new County sanitation district, to determine if they would be subject to an Industrial Wastewater Disposal Permit.
- SP 4.12-7 Each subdivision permitting construction shall be required to be annexed into the Los Angeles County Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District.

**3.6.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

No additional mitigation measures beyond those identified above are required or necessary, because the proposed project does not result in any significant wastewater disposal impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measures.

**3.6.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potentially significant wastewater disposal-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant wastewater disposal-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

**3.7 SHERIFF SERVICES**

**3.7.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

The Program EIR for the Specific Plan determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would significantly increase the demand for sheriff (police) protection services throughout the Newhall Ranch



site and the local vicinity. The Program EIR further estimated that the Specific Plan would require the services of an additional 20 sworn officers and 8.5 civilian support personnel at build-out. However, the Program EIR also concluded that adoption of the recommended mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Construction of the proposed project would increase the incidence of petty crimes on the site and also would increase construction traffic on SR-126 that may potentially delay emergency vehicles traveling through the area. Potentially significant impacts to the Sheriff's Department also may arise as a result of project design, lighting, landscape materials, and building orientation, which could limit visibility or offer concealment.

Notably, while build-out of the proposed project would significantly increase the demand for police protection and traffic-related services from the County Sheriff's Department on the project site and the local vicinity, in terms of personnel (both deputies and supportive personnel) and equipment needed to adequately serve the project, these impacts can be mitigated through the payment of new tax revenues generated by the project as it builds out. Therefore, any potential impacts to the Sheriff's Department would be less than significant. Additionally, although not made necessary by the proposed project, the applicant has entered into negotiations with the Sheriff's Department for the provision of a Sheriff station site within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan that would serve all uses within the Specific Plan boundary.

Similarly, the proposed project also would increase demands for Department of California Highway Patrol ("CHP") services in the project area, which also is a potentially significant impact. Through increased revenues generated by the project as it builds out (via motor vehicle registration and drivers license fees paid by new on-site residents and businesses), the funding for additional staffing and equipment would be made available to the CHP for allocation by the State CHP office to the Santa Clarita Valley station to meet future demands. Therefore, project-related impacts to the CHP would be less than significant.

### **3.7.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant sheriff services-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

#### ***3.7.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures***

SP 4.17-1 As subdivision maps are submitted to the County for approval in the future, the applicant shall incorporate County Sheriff's Department design requirements (such as those pertaining to site access, site security lighting, etc.) which will reduce demands for Sheriff's service to the subdivisions and which will help ensure adequate public safety features within the tract designs.

#### ***3.7.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures***

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's sheriff services impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

LV 4.13-1 Construction signs shall be posted with a reduced construction zone speed limit. These signs shall be posted to the satisfaction of the California Highway Patrol.

- LV 4.13-2 Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project applicant, or its designee, shall retain the services of a private security company to patrol the construction site, as necessary, to minimize, the potential for trespass, theft, and other unlawful activity associated with construction-related activities.
- LV 4.13-3 Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project applicant, or its designee shall prepare an approved traffic management plan for construction activities affecting rights-of-way within the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
- LV 4.13-4 A long-term funding agreement with the California Highway Patrol shall be explored to supplement the personnel assigned to the Newhall California Highway Patrol Area commensurate with the increased growth generated by the Landmark Village project.

### **3.7.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant sheriff services-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant sheriff services-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **3.8 FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES**

### **3.8.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

The Specific Plan's Program EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would significantly increase the demand for fire protection services. The Program EIR recommended and the County adopted four mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Construction of the proposed project has the potential to increase the risk of fire due to the use of mechanical equipment in vegetated areas, cutting and grinding metal, welding, and the storage of flammable materials (*e.g.*, fuel and wood). Further, occupancy of the tract map site would result in an increase in fire hazards and a corresponding increase in the need for fire protection services, including paramedic services. The increased service demands would result from the development of the proposed project adjacent to natural areas, which have wildfire potential, and the ordinary fire risks associated with residential, commercial, and office uses.

### **3.8.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant fire protection services-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

#### ***3.8.2.1 Newhall Ranch Mitigation Measures***

One mitigation measure adopted in connection with the Specific Plan has been omitted as it is no longer applicable, because it has been superceded by the ongoing negotiations and agreement between the project applicant and the County's Fire District (see SP 4.18-4). For additional information regarding the

reasons why the identified mitigation measure has been omitted, please refer to Section 4.14, Fire Protection Services, of the Draft EIR.

- SP 4.18-1 At the time of final subdivision maps permitting construction in development areas that are adjacent to Open Area and the High Country SMA, a Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan shall be prepared and submitted for approval by the County Fire Department. The Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan shall include the following construction period requirements: (a) a fire watch during welding operations; (b) spark arresters on all equipment or vehicles operating in a high fire hazard area; (c) designated smoking and non-smoking areas; and (d) water availability pursuant to County Fire Department requirements. The wildfire fuel modification plan shall depict a fuel modification zone in conformance with the Fuel Modification Ordinance in effect at the time of subdivision. Within the zone, tree pruning, removal of dead plant material and weed and grass cutting shall take place as required by the County Forester. Fire resistant plant species containing habitat value may be planted in the fuel modification zone.
- SP 4.18-2 Each subdivision and site plan for the proposed Specific Plan shall provide sufficient capacity for fire flows of 1,250 gallons per minute (gpm) at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) residual pressure for a two-hour duration for single family residential units, and 5,000 gpm at 20 psi residual pressure for a five-hour duration for multi-family residential units and commercial/retail uses, or whatever fire flow requirement is in effect at the time of subdivision and site plan approval.
- SP 4.18-3 Each subdivision map and site plan for the proposed Specific Plan shall comply with all applicable building and fire codes and hazard reduction programs for Fire Zones 3 and 4 that are in effect at the time of subdivision map and site plan approval.

### ***3.8.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures***

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's fire protection services impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

- LV 4.14-1 Prior to approval of a final subdivision map for the project, the applicant must prepare and submit for approval by the County Fire Department a fuel modification plan, a landscape plan and an irrigation plan for the project, as required by Section 1117.2.1 of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code.
- LV 4.14-2 The applicant will construct three fully equipped and furnished fire stations (including all ancillary requirements such as landscaping, parking, fuel tanks, storage rooms, etc., required for normal fire station operations). Such stations are to be conveyed to the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County (the "Fire District") in lieu of developer fees. The Fire District shall approve all plans and designs for the three fire stations. The applicant will dedicate fire station sites for all three fire stations within Newhall Ranch. Two fire station sites will have a building pad consisting of a minimum net buildable area of 1.25 acres, and one fire station site will have a building pad consisting of a minimum net buildable area of 1.5 acres; the locations and configurations of each site shall be approved by the Fire District.

Two of the three fire stations to be constructed by the applicant will not exceed 11,000 square feet; the third fire station to be constructed by the applicant will not exceed 13,500 square feet. Future changes in federal, state, or local requirements may affect these station minimum sizes.

One of the three fire stations will be located within the Landmark project, at a location approved by the Fire District. Such station shall be 11,000 square feet constructed upon a minimum 1.25 net building pad. The fully constructed, equipped, and furnished station shall be conveyed to the Fire District prior to the issuance of the 723<sup>rd</sup> certificate of occupancy issued for the Landmark project. Additionally, the applicant shall provide funding for the purchase of one Fire District standard, fully equipped fire pumper engine and paramedic squad prior to the issuance of the 723<sup>rd</sup> certificate of occupancy.

For the remaining two fire stations, the Fire District will evaluate with the applicant the requirements of first-phase protection based upon projected response/travel coverage with the goal of achieving five-minute response coverage. The results of such evaluation shall include requirements for first-phase fire protection ("fire protection plan") and the criteria for timing the development of each of the fire stations, which will be defined in a Memorandum of Understanding between the applicant and the Fire Chief of the Fire District. Prior to the commencement of the operation of any of the three fire stations, fire service may be delivered to Newhall Ranch from existing fire stations or from temporary fire stations to be provided by the applicant at mutually agreed-upon locations, to be replaced by the permanent stations, which will be located within the Newhall Ranch development. The use of such temporary fire stations must be approved by the Fire District and detailed in the MOU. The applicant and the Fire District will annually review the fire protection plan to evaluate development and market conditions and modify the Memorandum of Understanding accordingly.

- LV 4.14-3 If the project applicant alters the Fire District's road access, it must provide paved access acceptable to the Fire District from Chiquito Canyon Road to the Del Valle facility.
- LV 4.14-4 The proposed development shall provide multiple ingress/egress access for the circulation of traffic, and emergency response issues. Said determinations shall be approved through the tentative map approval.
- LV 4.14-5 The development of this project shall comply with all applicable code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows and fire hydrants. Specifics for said requirements shall be established during the review and approval process of the tentative map.
- LV 4.14-6 This property is located within the area described by the Forester and Fire Warden as a Fire Zone 4, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). All applicable fire code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire hydrants, fire flows, brush clearance and fuel modification plans, must be met.
- LV 4.14-7 Specific fire and life safety requirements for the construction phase will be addressed at the building fire plan check. There may be additional fire and life safety requirements during this time.
- LV 4.14-8 Every building constructed shall be accessible to Fire Department apparatus by way of access roadways, with an all-weather surface of not less than the prescribed width and indicated on the Tentative or Exhibit "A" maps. The roadway shall be extended to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls when measured by an unobstructed route around the exterior of the building.

- LV 4.14-9 Access roads shall be maintained with a minimum of ten (10) feet of brush clearance on each side. Fire access roads shall have an unobstructed vertical clearance clear-to-sky with the exception of protected tree species. Protected tree species overhanging fire access roads shall be maintained to provide a vertical clearance of thirteen (13) feet, six (6) inches. Applicant to obtain all necessary permits prior to the commencement of trimming of any protected tree species.
- LV 4.14-10 The maximum allowable grade shall not exceed 15% except where topography makes it impractical to keep within such grade; in such cases, an absolute maximum of 20% will be allowed for up to 150 feet in distance. The average maximum allowed grade, including topographical difficulties, shall be no more than 17%. Grade breaks shall not exceed 10% in ten (10) feet.
- LV 4.14-11 When involved with a subdivision in unincorporated areas within the County of Los Angeles, Fire Department, requirements for access, fire flows and hydrants are addressed at the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee meeting during the subdivision tentative map stage.
- LV 4.14-12 Fire sprinkler systems are required in some residential and most commercial occupancies. For those occupancies not requiring fire sprinkler systems, it is encouraged that fire sprinkler systems be installed. This will reduce potential fire and life losses. Systems are now technically and economically feasible for residential use.
- LV 4.14-13 Prior to construction, the following items shall be addressed:
- a. Installation and inspection of the required all weather access to be provided as determined by either the tentative map review process or building penult issuance.
  - b. Fire hydrants shall be installed and tested prior to the clearance for the commencement of construction.
- LV 4.14-14 The development may require fire flows up to 8,000 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for up to a four-hour duration as outlined in the 2002 County of Los Angeles Fire Code Appendix III-AA. Final fire flows will be based on the size of buildings, their relationship to other structures, property lines, and types of construction used.
- LV 4.14-15 Fire hydrant spacing shall be based on fire flow requirements as outlined in the 2002 County of Los Angeles Fire Code Appendix III-BB. Additional hydrants will be required if hydrant spacing exceeds specified distances.
- LV 4.14-16 All access devices and gates shall comply with California Code of Regulations, Title 19, Article 3.05 and Article 3.16. Los Angeles County Fire Department Regulation #5.
- LV 4.14-17 The development may require fire flows up to 5,000 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for up to a five-hour duration. Final fire flows will be based on the size of buildings, their relationship to other structures, property lines, and types of construction used. Fire flows shall be established as part of the tentative map review process with the submittal of architectural details to determine actual flow requirement. If adequate architectural detail is unavailable during the tentative map review process, maximum fire

flows will be established with the ability of the fire flow to be changed during the actual architectural plan review by Fire Prevention Engineering for building permit issuance.

- LV 4.14-18 Fire hydrant spacing shall be 300 feet and shall meet the following requirements:
- a. No portion of lot frontage shall be more than 200 feet via vehicular access from a public fire hydrant.
  - b. No portion of a building shall exceed 400 feet via vehicular access from a properly spaced public fire hydrant.
  - c. Additional hydrants will be required if hydrant spacing exceeds specified distances.
  - d. When cul-de-sac depth exceeds 200 feet on a commercial street, hydrants shall be required at the corner and mid-block.
  - e. A cul-de-sac shall not be more than 500 feet in length, when serving land zoned for commercial use.
- LV 4.14-19 Turning radii shall not be less than 32 feet. This measurement shall be determined at the centerline of the road. A Fire Department approved turning area shall be provided for all driveways exceeding 150 feet in length and at the end of all cul-de-sacs.
- LV 4.14-20 All on-site driveways/roadways shall provide a minimum unobstructed width of 28 feet, clear-to-sky. The on-site driveway is to be within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of any building. The centerline of the access driveway shall be located parallel to, and within 30 feet of an exterior wall on one side of the proposed structure.
- LV 4.14-21 Driveway width for non-residential developments shall be increased when any of the following conditions will exist:
- a. Provide 34 feet in width, when parallel parking is allowed on one side of the access roadway/driveway. Preference is that such parking is not adjacent to the structure.
  - b. Provide 42 feet in width, when parallel parking is allowed on each side of the access roadway/driveway.
  - c. Any access way less than 34 feet in width shall be labeled "Fire Lane" on the final recording map, and final building plans.
  - d. For streets or driveways with parking restrictions: The entrance to the street/driveway and intermittent spacing distances of 150 feet shall be posted with Fire Department approved signs stating "NO PARKING - FIRE LANE" in three inch high letters. Driveway labeling is necessary to endure access for Fire Department use.
- LV 4.14-22 Single-family detached homes shall require a minimum fire flow of 1,250 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for a two-hour duration. Two-family dwelling units (duplexes) shall require a fire flow of 1,500 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for a two-hour duration. When there are five or more condominium units are taking access on a single driveway, the minimum fire flow shall be

increased to 1,500 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for a two-hour duration.

LV 4.14-23 Fire hydrant spacing shall be 600 feet and shall meet the following requirements:

- a. No portion of lot frontage shall be more than 450 feet via vehicular access from a public fire hydrant.
- b. Lots of 1 acre or more shall place no portion of a structure where it exceeds 750 feet via vehicular access from a properly spaced public fire hydrant.
- c. When cul-de-sac depth exceeds 450 feet on a residential street, fire hydrants shall be required at the corner and mid-block.
- d. Additional hydrants will be required if hydrant spacing exceeds specified distances during the tentative map review process or building permit plan check.

LV-4.14-24 Streets or driveways within the development shall be provided with the following:

- a. Provide 36 feet in width on all streets where parking is allowed on both sides.
- b. Provide 34 feet in width on cul-de-sacs up to 700 feet in length. This allows parking on both sides of the street.
- c. Provide 36 feet in width on cul-de-sacs from 701 to 1,000 feet in length. This allows parking on both sides of the street.
- d. For streets or driveways with parking restrictions: The entrance to the street/driveway and intermittent spacing distances of 150 feet shall be posted with Fire Department approved signs stating "NO PARKING - FIRE LANE" in three-inch high letters. Driveway labeling is necessary to ensure access for Fire Department use.
- e. Turning radii shall not be less than 32 feet. This measurement shall be determined at the centerline of the road.

LV 4.14-25 A Fire Department approved turning area shall be provided for all driveways exceeding 150 feet in length and at the end of all cul-de-sacs.

LV 4.14-26 All access devices and gates shall meet the following requirements:

- a. Any single-gated opening used for ingress and egress shall be a minimum of 26 feet in width, clear-to-sky.
- b. Any divided gate opening (when each gate is used for a single-direction of travel - i.e., ingress or egress) shall be a minimum width of 20 feet clear-to-sky.
- c. Gates and/or control devices shall be positioned a minimum of 50 feet from a public right-of-way, and shall be provided with a turnaround having a minimum of 32 feet of turning radius. If an intercom system is used, the 50 feet shall be measured from the right-of-way to the intercom control device.
- d. All limited access devices shall be of a type approved by the Fire Department.

- e. Gate detail plans shall be submitted for review and approval to the Fire Department as part of the tentative map submittal or prior to installation. These plans shall show all locations, widths, and details of the proposed gates.

### **3.8.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant fire protection services-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant fire protection services-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **3.9 EDUCATION**

### **3.9.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

Implementation of the Specific Plan was forecasted to significantly increase the demand for educational services within the boundary of Newhall Ranch and in the local vicinity. However, the Program EIR concluded that adoption of the recommended mitigation measures and the execution of three school facilities/funding agreements would reduce the impacts to below a level of significance.

The Castaic Union School District ("Castaic District") and the William S. Hart Union High School District ("Hart District") currently provide public elementary, junior high/middle school, and senior high school education to the proposed project. The proposed project would generate an estimated 336 new elementary students, 93 new middle school students, and 161 new senior high school students for the two Districts at build-out.

The "School Facilities Funding Agreement Between the Castaic Union School District and Newhall Land and Farming Company" ("Castaic School Funding Agreement"), effective November 20, 1997, would mitigate the potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project relating to increased demand for educational services. Under the Castaic School Funding Agreement, the project applicant and the Castaic District have provided a financing schedule and a financing plan, in combination with certain mitigation payments, which will provide permanent facilities, including land, buildings, furnishings and equipment to house grades K-5 and 6-8 students who will reside in the Riverwood Village Planning Area of the Specific Plan. (The Landmark Village project is part of the Riverwood Village Planning Area.)

Project-specific impacts relating to increased demand on the Hart District are mitigated through the separate "School Facilities Funding Agreement Between the William S. Hart Union High School District and The Newhall Land and Farming Company" ("Hart School Funding Agreement"), effective October 1998. The Hart School Funding Agreement conditionally obligates the applicant to provide up to three additional junior high schools and two additional senior high schools to the Hart District.

### **3.9.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant education-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:



**3.9.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

- SP 4.16-1 The Specific Plan developer shall reserve five elementary schools sites, one junior high school site and one high school site, of 7 to 10, 20 to 25, and 40 to 45 acres in size, respectively, depending upon adjacency to local public parks and joint use agreements.
- SP 4.16-2 The developer of future subdivisions which allow construction will comply with the terms and conditions of the School Facilities Funding Agreement between The Newhall Land and Farming Company and the Newhall School District.
- SP 4.16-3 The developer of future subdivisions which allow construction will comply with the terms and conditions of the School Facilities Funding Agreement between The Newhall Land and Farming Company and the William S. Hart Union High School District.
- SP 4.16-4 The developer of future subdivisions which allow construction will comply with the terms and conditions of the School Facilities Funding Agreement between The Newhall Land and Farming Company and the Castaic Union School District.
- SP 4.16-5 In the event that School District boundaries on the Specific Plan site remain unchanged, prior to recordation of all subdivision maps which allow construction, the developer of future subdivisions which allow construction is to pay to the Castaic Union School District the statutory school fee for commercial/industrial square footage pursuant to Government Code Sections 65995 and 65996, unless a separate agreement to the contrary is reached with the District.

**3.9.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

No additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the Specific Plan's Program EIR are required or necessary, because the proposed project does not result in any potentially significant education impacts after implementation of the above measures.

**3.9.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant education-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant education-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

**3.10 LIBRARY SERVICES**

**3.10.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

The Program EIR for the Specific Plan identified potentially significant impacts resulting from implementation of the Specific Plan as a result of the significantly increased demands that would be placed on library facilities and library materials due to the increased residency in the Santa Clarita area. The Program EIR recommended a mitigation program, adopted by the County, that facilitated collaboration between the project applicant and the County to ensure that adequate library services are funded and provided; and, therefore, impacts were reduced to a level below significance.

The proposed project will be serviced by the County Library's Valencia Library. The Santa Clarita Valley area, generally, is also served by the County's Newhall Library and Canyon County Jo Anne Darcy Library, and the Santa Clarita Valley Bookmobile. Existing library facility space in the Santa Clarita Valley does not meet the County Library's service guidelines. Build-out of the proposed project would require the addition of 1,840 square feet of library facilities, 10,120 additional library items, and four additional public computers. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

### **3.10.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant library services-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

#### **3.10.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

SP 4.19-1 The developer will provide funding for a maximum of two libraries (including the site(s), construction, furniture, fixtures, equipment, and materials) to the County Librarian. The developer will dedicate a maximum of two library sites for a maximum of two libraries located in Newhall Ranch in lieu of the land component of the County's library facilities mitigation fee, in accordance with the provisions of Section 22.72.090 of Section 2 of Ordinance No. 98-0068. The actual net buildable library site area required and provided by the developer will be determined by the actual size of the library building(s), the Specific Plan parking requirements, the County Building Code, and other applicable rules.

The total library building square footage to be funded by the developer will not exceed 0.35 net square feet per person. The developer's funding of construction of the library(s) and furnishings, fixtures, equipment and materials for the library(s) will be determined based on the cost factors in the library facilities mitigation fee in effect at the time of commencement of construction of the library(s).

Prior to County's issuance of the first residential building permit of Newhall Ranch to the developer, the County Librarian and the developer will mutually agree upon the library construction requirements (location, size, funding and time of construction) based upon the projected development schedule and the population of Newhall Ranch based on the applicable number of average persons per household included in the library facilities mitigation fee in effect at the time. Such mutual agreement regarding the library construction requirements ("Library Construction Plan") and the criteria for timing the completion of the library(s) will be defined in a MOU between the developer and the County Librarian. Such MOU shall include an agreement by the developer to dedicate sufficient land and pay the agreed amount of fees on a schedule to allow completion of the library(s) as described below. The developer's funding for library facilities shall not exceed the developer's fee obligation at the time of construction under the developer fee schedule.

If two libraries are to be constructed, the first library will be completed and operational by the time of County's issuance of the 8,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch, and the second library will be completed and operational by the time of County's issuance of the 15,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch. If the County Librarian decides that only one library will be constructed, the library will be completed and operational by the time of County's issuance of the 10,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch.

No payment of any sort with respect to library facilities will be required under Section 2.5.3.d. of the Specific Plan in order for the developer to obtain building permits for nonresidential buildings.

### **3.10.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

No additional mitigation measures beyond that identified in the Specific Plan are required or necessary, because the proposed project would not result in any significant library services-related impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measures.

### **3.10.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant library services-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant library services-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **3.11 UTILITIES**

### **3.11.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

The Specific Plan's Program EIR identified potentially significant impacts to electricity and natural gas, as build-out under the Specific Plan would increase demand for both utility types and require the provision of new delivery infrastructure. The Program EIR concluded that implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce all utilities impacts to below a level of significance.

The proposed project would require energy resources and infrastructure to serve the project site during the construction and operational phases. While projections for energy supply and demand by Southern California Edison and the Southern California Gas Company indicate that both agencies would have sufficient electricity and natural gas supply to serve the proposed project.

### **3.11.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant utilities-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

#### **3.11.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

Certain Specific Plan mitigation measures have been omitted as they are not applicable to the proposed project (*see*, SP 4.14-6 [electricity]). For additional information regarding the reasons why the identified mitigation measures have been omitted, please refer to Section 4.19, Utilities, of the Draft EIR.

#### **Electricity**

SP 4.14-1 All development within the Specific Plan area shall comply with the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations*).

- SP 4.14-2 Southern California Edison or other energy provider is to be notified of the nature and extent of future development on the Specific Plan site prior to recordation of all future subdivisions.
- SP 4.14-3 All future tract maps are to comply with Southern California Edison or other energy provider guidelines for grading, construction, and development within SCE easements.
- SP 4.14-4 Electrical infrastructure removals and relocations are to be coordinated between the Specific Plan engineer and Southern California Edison or other energy provider as each tract is designed and constructed.
- SP 4.14-5 All future tract maps are to be reviewed by Los Angeles County to ensure adequate accessibility to Edison or other energy provider facilities as a condition of their approvals.

**Natural Gas**

- SP 4.13-1 All development within the Specific Plan area shall comply with the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations*).
- SP 4.13-2 A letter from the Southern California Gas Company or other gas provider is to be obtained prior to recordation of all future subdivisions stating that service can be provided to the subdivision under construction.
- SP 4.13-3 The Specific Plan is to meet the requirements of SCGC in terms of pipeline relocation, grading in the vicinity of gas mains, and development within Southern California Gas Company easements. These requirements would be explicitly defined by SCGC at the future tentative map stage.
- SP 4.13-4 All potential buyers or tenants of property in the vicinity of Southern California Gas Company transmission lines are to be made aware of the line's presence in order to assure that no permanent construction or grading occurs over and within the vicinity of the high-pressure gas mains.

**3.11.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

No additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the Specific Plan's Program EIR, as set forth above, are required or necessary, because the proposed project would not result in any significant electricity and natural gas utilities impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measures.

**3.11.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant utilities-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant utilities-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

### 3.12 ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

#### 3.12.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Specific Plan's Program EIR determined that potentially significant hazardous materials impacts would result from implementation of the Specific Plan. Specifically, on-site impacts would occur with respect to past and present oil and natural gas production operations, existing Southern California Edison electrical transmission lines, existing high-pressure natural gas lines, the future transport of hazardous waste along SR-126, and due to the proximity of Chiquita Canyon Landfill. However, the Program EIR further found that implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level below significant.

As for the proposed project, soil staining has been observed near abandoned oil wells and pipelines, above-ground storage tanks, and equipment storage areas. Unless mitigated, these potentially contaminated soils could result in significant impacts, especially if construction utilizing the soils, or contamination within the soils, was permitted without proper monitoring and testing. Additionally, various oil wells (and their associated production areas) and pipelines are believed to exist throughout the project site, and any release of hazardous materials from these areas could pose a potentially significant impact. Finally, debris containing potentially hazardous materials, including asbestos-containing materials, has been observed.

#### 3.12.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant environmental safety-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

##### 3.12.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

Certain mitigation measures relating to environmental safety have been omitted because they are not applicable to the proposed project (*see*, SP 4.21-1, SP 4.21-4). For additional information regarding the reasons why the identified mitigation measures are not applicable, please refer to Section 4.21, Environmental Safety, of the Draft EIR.

- SP 4.21-2 Only non-habitable structures shall be located within SCE easements.
- SP 4.21-3 Prior to issuance of grading permits, all abandoned oil and natural gas-related sites must be remediated to the satisfaction of the California Department of Oil and Gas, the Los Angeles County Hazardous Materials Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles region).
- SP 4.21-5 The Specific Plan is to meet the requirements of Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) in terms of pipeline relocation, grading in the vicinity of gas mains, and development within SCGC easements. These requirements would be explicitly defined at the future tentative map stage.
- SP 4.21-6 All potential buyers or tenants of property in the vicinity of Southern California Gas Company transmission lines are to be made aware of the line's presence in order to assure that no permanent construction or grading occurs over and within the vicinity of the high-pressure gas mains.

- SP 4.21-7 In accordance with the provisions of the Los Angeles County Building Code, Section 308(d), all buildings and enclosed structures that would be constructed within the Specific Plan located within 25 feet of oil or gas wells shall be provided with methane gas protection systems. Buildings located within 25 feet and 200 feet of oil or gas wells shall, prior to the issuance of building permits by the County of Los Angeles, be evaluated in accordance with the current rules and regulations of the State of California Division of Oil and Gas.
- SP 4.21-8 In accordance with the provisions of the Los Angeles County Building Code, Section 308(c), all buildings and structures located within 1,000 feet of a landfill containing decomposable material (in this case, Chiquita Canyon Landfill) shall be provided with a landfill gas migration protection and/or control system.
- SP 4.21-9 In accordance with the provisions of the Los Angeles County Code, Title 11, Division 4, Underground Storage of Hazardous Materials regulations, the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works shall review, prior to the issuance of building permits by the County of Los Angeles, any plans for underground hazardous materials storage facilities (e.g., gasoline) that may be constructed or installed within the Specific Plan.

**3.12.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's environmental safety impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

- LV-4.21-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, those areas of the Landmark Village tract map property, the Adobe Canyon borrow site, and the Chiquito Canyon grading site identified as formerly containing above-ground storage tanks, current agricultural storage areas and current soil staining by the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of Landmark Village Tentative Tract Map No. 53108, Highway 126, Newhall Ranch, California (BNA Environmental, May 2004) and Addendum Letter Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of Proposed Water Tank Locations and Utility Corridor Easements Associated With the Proposed Landmark Village Development Tentative Tract Map No. 53108, State Highway 126, Newhall Ranch, California (BNA Environmental, September 2004), shall be investigated for the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons and hazardous materials and/or wastes, and, where necessary, shall be remediated in conformance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, to the satisfaction of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas, the Los Angeles County Hazardous Materials Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles region).
- LV-4.21-2 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, all former oil wells located on the Landmark Village tract map property, the Adobe Canyon borrow site and the Chiquito Canyon grading site shall be reabandoned according to the requirements of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas, if such sites are to be disturbed or are located in an area of development.
- LV-4.21-3 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, all pipelines located on the Landmark Village tract map property or the Chiquito Canyon grading site that will no longer be used to transport oil products shall be reabandoned according to the requirements of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas. The soil beneath these pipelines shall be assessed for petroleum hydrocarbons. Any contaminated soil located within grading operations or development areas shall be remediated in conformance with applicable federal, state, and

local laws, to the satisfaction of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas, the Los Angeles County Hazardous Materials Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles region). Any pipeline to remain in use shall be assessed for hydrocarbon leakage.

- LV-4.21-4 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, all scattered suspect asbestos-containing material debris located on the Landmark Village tract map property, the Adobe Canyon borrow site and the Chiquito Canyon grading site shall be disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local requirements.
- LV-4.21-5 In the event that previously unidentified, obvious, or suspected hazardous materials, contamination, underground storage tanks, or other features or materials that could present a threat to human health or the environment are discovered during construction, construction activities shall cease immediately until the subject site is evaluated by a qualified professional. Work shall not resume until appropriate actions recommended by the professional have been implemented to demonstrate that contaminant concentrations do not exceed risk-based criteria.

### **3.12.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant environmental safety-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant environmental safety-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **3.13 CULTURAL/PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

### **3.13.1 Potential Significant Impacts**

The Program EIR for the Specific Plan concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources. However, the Program EIR further concluded that the recommended mitigation measures would reduce those impacts to a level below significant.

As to the proposed project's archaeological impacts, no portion of the tract map site would directly or indirectly impact either of the two known archaeological sites (*i.e.*, CA-LAN-2233 and CA-LAN-2234) identified during the Phase I study for the Specific Plan. However, the Chiquito Canyon grading site and the utility corridor south of SR-126 would pass near CA-LAN-2233 and CA-LAN-2234. Phase II fieldwork was undertaken in the southern portion of CA-LAN-2233, and all extant artifacts were recovered, which fully mitigates any potentially significant impact that would have resulted from land disturbances required for the utility corridor. Phase II fieldwork undertaken at the CA-LAN-2234 site demonstrated that no intact cultural resources are present, and impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

As for the potential paleontological impacts, the proposed project site is underlain by geologic units with high to low paleontologic potential ratings. Specifically, the Pico and Saugus Formations underlie the project site, and as these formations have a high potential for yielding paleontological resources, the impact is potentially significant. Further, the proposed project is also underlain by Quaternary older

alluvium, which has a moderate potential for yielding paleontological resources. The potential for the exposure of fossils in these geologic units is considered a potentially significant impact.

### **3.13.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant cultural/paleontological resources-related impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

#### **3.13.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures**

- SP 4.3-1 Any adverse impacts to California-LAN-2133, -2235, and the northern portion of -2233 are to be mitigated by avoidance and preservation. Should preservation of these sites be infeasible, a Phase III data recovery (salvage excavation) operation is to be completed on the sites so affected, with archaeological monitoring of grading to occur during subsequent soils removals on the site. This will serve to collect and preserve the scientific information contained therein, thereby mitigating all significant impacts to the affected cultural resource.
  
- SP 4.3-2 Any significant effects to California-LAN-2241 are to be mitigated through site avoidance and preservation. Should this prove infeasible, an effort is to be made to relocate, analyze, and re-inter the disturbed burial at some more appropriate and environmentally secure locale within the region.
  
- SP 4.3-3 In the unlikely event that additional artifacts are found during grading within the development area or future roadway extensions, an archaeologist will be notified to stabilize, recover and evaluate such finds.
  
- SP 4.3-4 As part of an inspection testing program, a Los Angeles County Natural History Museum-approved inspector is to be on site to salvage scientifically significant fossil remains. The duration of these inspections depends on the potential for the discovery of fossils, the rate of excavation, and the abundance of fossils. Geological formations (like the Saugus Formation) with a high potential will initially require full time monitoring during grading activities. Geologic formations (like the Quaternary terrace deposits) with a moderate potential will initially require half-time monitoring. If fossil production is lower than expected, the duration of monitoring efforts should be reduced. Because of known presence of microvertebrates in the Saugus Formation, samples of at least 2,000 pounds of rock shall be taken from likely horizons, including localities 13, 13A, 14, and 23. These samples can be stockpiled to allow processing later to avoid delays in grading activities. The frequency of these samples will be determined based on field conditions. Should the excavations yield significant paleontological resources, excavation is to be stopped or redirected until the extent of the find is established and the resources are salvaged. Because of the long duration of the Specific Plan, a reassessment of the paleontological potential of each rock unit will be used to develop mitigation plans for subsequent subdivisions. The report shall include an itemized inventory of the fossils, pertinent geologic and stratigraphic data, field notes of the collectors and include recommendations for future monitoring efforts in those rock units. Prior to grading, an agreement shall be reached with a suitable public, non-profit scientific repository, such as the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History or similar institution, regarding acceptance of fossil collections.



### **3.13.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

To further reduce the magnitude of the project's cultural/paleontological resources impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

- LV 4.22-1 Although no other significant cultural resources were observed or recorded, all grading activities and surface modifications must be confined to only those areas of absolute necessity to reduce any form of impact on unrecorded (buried) cultural resources that may exist within the confines of the project area. In the event that resources are found during construction, activity shall stop and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the resources. If the find is determined to be a historical or unique archaeological resource, contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation should be available. Construction work may continue on other parts of the construction site while historical/archeological mitigation takes place, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(i).
- LV 4.22-2 For archeological sites accidentally discovered during construction, there shall be an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archeologist. If the find is determined to be a historical or unique archeological resource, as defined under CEQA, contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation shall be provided. Construction work may continue on other parts of the construction site while historical/archeological mitigation takes place, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(i).

### **3.13.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant cultural/paleontological resources-related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant cultural/paleontological resources-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **4.0 FINDINGS ON LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS**

### **4.1 FLOODPLAIN MODIFICATIONS**

#### **4.1.1 Less Than Significant Impact**

Implementation of the Specific Plan was not forecasted to significantly alter river hydrology or the mosaic of habitats along the Santa Clara River corridor because the effects associated with the proposed floodplain modifications would be infrequent, and not substantially alter flows, water velocities, and water depths. Therefore, under the Specific Plan, the Santa Clara River would retain sufficient width to enable natural fluvial processes to continue.

The floodplain modifications associated with the proposed project include the Long Canyon Road Bridge, bank stabilization along portions of the Santa Clara River, and the import of soils from off-site grading areas to remove mostly agricultural lands and non-native grasslands by raising these land areas above the floodplain to allow for development and the placement of bank protection. Even with these modifications, the proposed project's hydraulic impacts would be localized, and not cause significant

hydrological impacts adjacent to or downstream from the proposed project site. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on the unarmored threespine stickleback, arroyo toad, California red-legged frog, southwestern pond turtle, and two-striped garter snake are less than significant.

#### **4.1.2 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant impacts relating to floodplain modifications. Accordingly, changes or alterations are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

### **4.2 PARKS AND RECREATION**

#### **4.2.1 Less Than Significant Impact**

The Program EIR identified certain potentially significant impacts related to parks, recreation, and trails if the Specific Plan were implemented absent mitigation. Accordingly, the Specific Plan included land for community, neighborhood, and regional parks, an extensive trail system, and set aside significant areas for permanent open space. The Program EIR concluded that the inclusion of parkland and the significant public benefits provided reduced potential impacts to a level below significant.

The proposed project would result in a parkland dedication equivalent of approximately 7.1 acres per 1,000 persons, which is greater than the County and Quimby Act requirements of 3.0 acres per 1,000 persons. In fact, while the basic Quimby Act parkland obligation for the subdivision is 11.34 net acres, the proposed project will exceed the Quimby Act obligation by 13.12 acres by providing for a 9.74-net-acre Community Park, a 6.39-acre private park, 5.23 net acres of recreational centers, and a 3.10-net-acre trail easement. Therefore, because the proposed project meets the County's parkland requirements, and exceeds the Quimby Act parkland standards, it would result in a less than significant impact on a project-specific and cumulative basis.

Similarly, impacts to regional parks are anticipated to be less than significant as the Specific Plan set aside 4,214 acres of land characterized as regional parkland. State and federal recreation areas and forests also are not expected to be subject to a potentially significant impact as such parks charge user fees and are funded *via* taxes. Finally, the proposed project would beneficially impact the County's trail system as it would fulfill the objectives of the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan.

#### **4.2.2 Mitigation Measures**

The mitigation measures below, while not required to mitigate any potentially significant impacts, are nevertheless recommended as part of the project approval to ensure that the proposed project will not result in any parks and recreation-related impacts upon implementation:

##### ***4.2.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures***

SP 4.20-1 Development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan will provide the following acreages of parks and open area:

- Ten public Neighborhood Parks totaling 55 acres,
- Open Areas totaling 1,106 acres of which 186 acres are Community Parks,
- High Country Special Management Area of 4,214 acres,

- River Corridor Special Management Area of 819 acres,
- A 15-acre lake,
- An 18-hole golf course, and
- A trail system consisting of:
  - Regional River Trail,
  - Salt Creek Corridor
  - Community trails, and
  - Unimproved trails.

SP 4.20-2 Prior to the construction of the proposed trail system, the Specific Plan applicant shall finalize the alignment of trails with the County Department of Parks and Recreation.

SP 4.20-3 Trail construction shall be in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation trail system standards.

#### **4.2.2.2 Landmark Village Mitigation Measures**

No additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the Specific Plan are required or necessary as the proposed project does not result in any significant park, recreation, and trail impacts.

#### **4.2.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will ensure that the impacts to parks and recreation, as identified in the Final EIR, remains at less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid the parks and recreation-related impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

### **4.3 MINERAL RESOURCES**

#### **4.3.1 Less Than Significant Impacts**

The Specific Plan site is underlain by mineral and gravel deposits, and contains three types of Mineral Resource Zones ("MRZs") as identified by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. In 2003, the County determined that existing land uses on the Newhall Ranch site would give way to a Specific Plan zoning designation to allow for development of a mixed-use planned community.

The proposed project site, utility corridor, and borrow site are located within a MRZ 2 zone, which indicates that the area may contain significant mineral deposits present. The water tank sites are located in the MRZ-3 zone, which indicates that mineral deposits are expected to occur in this area, but the extent of such deposits is unknown at the present time. However, neither the tract map site, utility corridor, borrow site, nor water tank sites are located in active mineral extraction operation areas. Further, the tract map site, utility corridor, borrow site, and water tank sites are not identified as a "locally-important mineral resource recovery site" or a "regionally significant construction aggregate resource area" by the County's General Plan, the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan, or the Specific Plan. In addition, at the

time the Newhall Ranch site was designated by the County as "Specific Plan," which serves as the zoning designation for the property, there were no areas within Newhall Ranch used for mineral extraction.

The Specific Plan zoning designation allows the area to be available for mineral extraction uses on a limited basis in areas that are already proposed for, and in association with, development (*i.e.*, on tentative tract map sites). Furthermore, the majority of mineral resources of value are expected to be located in the River Corridor and not on the proposed project site, and the continued availability of these resources would not be significantly affected by the proposed project. Therefore, project implementation will not result in a significant impact in relation to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

### **4.3.2 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant impacts relating to mineral resources. Accordingly, changes or alterations are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

### **4.4 EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the following impacts, identified in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, associated with the proposed project are less than significant and no mitigation is required:

<i>Environmental Resource Category</i>	<i>Environmental Impact</i>
<i>Aesthetics</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.</li> </ul>
<i>Agricultural Resources</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No conflict with an existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.</li> </ul>
<i>Air Quality</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No conflict with or obstruction of implementation of the applicable air quality plan.</li> <li>• No creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</li> </ul>
<i>Cultural Resources</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No substantial adverse change in the significant of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5.</li> <li>• No disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</li> </ul>
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</li> <li>• No emission of hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</li> <li>• No site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.</li> </ul>
<i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No placement within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.</li> </ul>

<i>Environmental Resource Category</i>	<i>Environmental Impact</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.</li> <li>• No inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.</li> </ul>
<i>Land Use and Planning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No physical division of an established community.</li> <li>• No conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</li> </ul>
<i>Population and Housing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.</li> <li>• No displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.</li> </ul>
<i>Transportation/Traffic</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No resulting change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.</li> <li>• No substantially increase in hazards due to design features of the roadway or incompatible uses.</li> <li>• No inadequate emergency access.</li> <li>• No inadequate parking capacity.</li> <li>• No conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.</li> </ul>

**5.0 FINDINGS FOCUSING ON SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WHICH CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE**

**5.1 BIOTA**

**5.1.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

The cumulative conversion of open area planned for by various development projects throughout the region will permanently decrease the amount of land available for natural habitats, and the flora and fauna that inhabit them. When viewed individually, it may be possible for other projects to mitigate potential project-specific significant impacts through the implementation of habitat replacement programs and the requirements of various applicable regulatory processes. However, no project proposed on the edge of an existing urban environment can mitigate, from a biological perspective, the permanent conversion of large blocks of open space area and the associated loss of plant and wildlife habitat. The proposed project contributes to this significant cumulative impact.

**5.1.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available, other than those recommended to mitigate project-specific impacts identified in these CEQA findings, to mitigate to below a level of significance the proposed project's contribution to the identified cumulative biota-related impacts.

### **5.1.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will result in the identified significant cumulative impacts to biota resources. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which would mitigate, in part, the proposed project's contribution to the identified significant cumulative impacts to biota resources, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant cumulative impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, these cumulative impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified cumulative biota impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see **Section 8.0**, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable cumulative biota impacts of the proposed project.

## **5.2 VISUAL QUALITIES**

### **5.2.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

The analysis of the proposed project's cumulative visual qualities impacts tiers from and incorporates the analysis found in the Specific Plan's Program EIR. Incorporation and reliance on the Program EIR's analysis is appropriate as it has been determined that the proposed project would not have any cumulative effects that were not previously examined as part of the Specific Plan's environmental review. Accordingly, the proposed project, consistent with the analysis in the Program EIR, would result in a significant unavoidable visual impact when considered in conjunction with build-out of all existing, planned, approved, and pending development projects along I-5 and SR-126.

### **5.2.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available, other than those recommended to mitigate project-specific impacts identified in these CEQA findings, to mitigate the cumulative visual qualities impacts attributable to the proposed project to a level below significance.

### **5.2.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will result in significant cumulative impacts to visual qualities. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which would mitigate, in part, the significant cumulative visual qualities impacts attributable to the proposed project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant cumulative impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, these cumulative impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified cumulative visual qualities impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable cumulative visual qualities impacts of the proposed project.

## 5.3 AIR QUALITY

### 5.3.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project shows at least a one percent per year reduction in CO, VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions, and is likely to result in a similar reduction of SO<sub>x</sub>. Furthermore, the proposed project is consistent with and would not frustrate the implementation of the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan. Accordingly, per significance thresholds set forth by the South Coast Air Quality Management District, the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable.

Nonetheless, as a conservative and "worst-case" approach, the proposed project would increase emissions in the air basin, which already is in non-attainment for O<sub>3</sub> (of which VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> are precursors), PM<sub>10</sub>, and CO. Therefore, the proposed project would result in cumulatively considerable significant impacts to air quality.

### 5.3.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available, other than those recommended to mitigate project-specific impacts identified in these CEQA findings, to mitigate the cumulative air quality impacts attributable to the proposed project to a level below significance.

### 5.3.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the proposed project will result in significant cumulative impacts to air quality. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which would mitigate, in part, the significant cumulative air quality impacts attributable to the proposed project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant cumulative impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified air quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts of the proposed project.

## 5.4 SOLID WASTE SERVICES

### 5.4.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

Under the cumulative build-out scenario, the proposed project and all forecasted future development are expected to produce 395,452 tons per year of solid waste. This quantity represents the cumulative solid waste generation under a worst-case scenario, without any recycling activities in place. The proposed project's share of 3,807 tons per year would represent 0.96 percent of this total.

New landfills would need to be developed and/or other waste disposal options implemented in order to accommodate this future growth. However, as land suitable for landfill development/expansion is quantitatively finite and limited, due to numerous environmental, regulatory and political constraints, the proposed project's contribution to such impacts is considered cumulatively considerable.

#### **5.4.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that the State of California, *via* the California Integrated Waste Management Act, requires cities and counties to reduce the amount of solid waste entering existing landfills through the use of recycling, reuse, and waste prevention efforts. In addition, many jurisdictions have adopted construction and demolition debris recycling ordinances to reduce the amount of construction waste. The Commission finds that these legislative efforts will substantially lessen the identified cumulative solid waste services impacts.

#### **5.4.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will result in significant cumulative impacts to solid waste services. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the identified significant cumulative impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified solid waste services impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable cumulative solid waste services impacts of the proposed project.

### **5.5 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

#### **5.5.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

Build-out of the Specific Plan and other reasonably foreseeable future related cumulative development in the region would result in the conversion of agricultural soils to non-agricultural uses. Given that implementation of the proposed project, including development of the tract map site and related off-site improvements, would eliminate 327 acres of agricultural land, the proposed project's contribution to the conversion of agricultural land in the region is considered cumulatively considerable.

#### **5.5.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the identified cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

#### **5.5.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will result in significant cumulative impacts to agricultural resources. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the identified significant cumulative impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified agricultural resources impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see Section 8.0*, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable cumulative agricultural resources impacts of the proposed project.



**6.0 FINDINGS FOCUSING ON SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

**6.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES**

**6.1.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

Geotechnical impacts tend to be site-specific in nature, rather than cumulative. Further, each development site is subject to, at a minimum, uniform site development and construction standards relative to seismic and other geologic conditions that are prevalent within the region. These standards include the Los Angeles County and Uniform Building Codes.

The proposed project's grading activities at the Adobe Canyon borrow site, the Chiquito Canyon grading site, and the utility corridor would foster future development. And, while not a component of this proposed project, future development is proposed to occur under the Specific Plan at the Adobe and Chiquito Canyon sites. Within the Adobe Canyon site and near the proposed water tank site, various slopes may be potentially unstable and/or subject to debris flow hazard. Moreover, three suspected translational failures have been mapped within the proposed grading limits at the Adobe Canyon site. Before future development could occur at this location, subsurface exploration and analysis would be required. Therefore, while the proposed project does not contemplate future development in either Adobe Canyon or Chiquito Canyon, development at these sites may result in potentially significant geologic and soils impacts.

**6.1.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that potentially significant cumulative geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

- LV 4.1-71 If the proposed fills over alluvium and slopewash at either Adobe Canyon or Chiquito Canyon are to be considered "structural fill," subsurface studies shall be performed to determine actual liquefaction potential of these soils. If this potential exists, it shall be addressed by removal and recompaction of the alluvium above groundwater, in order to provide a cap to bridge effects.
- LV 4.1-72 If future development is proposed within either Adobe Canyon or Chiquito Canyon, subsurface exploration and analyses shall be conducted to determine landslide stability. Means to mitigate the potential effects of landslides, including complete or partial removal, buttressing, avoidance, or building setbacks shall be identified at that time.
- LV 4.1-73 Slope stability analysis shall be performed for the 186-foot-high cut slope along the base of the existing Edison tower within the Chiquito Canyon grading site. Corrective measures, such as construction of a buttress or stability fills, shall be implemented if the proposed cut slope does not comply with the required minimum factor of safety.
- LV 4.1-74 The natural slopes surrounding the proposed water tank site within the Adobe Canyon borrow site shall be evaluated to determine the gross stability of the natural slopes. This study shall include subsurface investigation to determine the specific geologic conditions. Corrective measures such as avoidance, cutting back to a shallower angle, or buttressing with compacted fill shall be implemented if the natural slopes do not meet the minimum required factor of safety.

LV 4.1-75 A study shall be conducted to evaluate potential debris flows in the vicinity of the proposed water tank located in the Adobe Canyon borrow site. Corrective measures such as the construction of debris walls and/or basins, control of runoff or removal of loose surficial materials shall be implemented to mitigate this impact.

### **6.1.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potentially significant cumulative geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid all potentially significant cumulative geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **6.2. HYDROLOGY**

### **6.2.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

All projects within the Santa Clara River's tributary watershed and unincorporated Los Angeles County would be subject to the same general requirements as the proposed project. These development requirements include those imposed by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works' ("LACDPW") Flood Control Division, which are designed to ensure that upstream or downstream flooding, downstream erosion, and sedimentation do not occur. Furthermore, these projects also would be subject to other requirements that the LACDPW may specifically identify as needed due to the unique topographic and geologic characteristics of individual project sites. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative flooding, erosion, and/or sedimentation impacts.

### **6.2.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that because other projects within Los Angeles County would be subject to the same requirements as the proposed project, and additional requirements imposed on a case-by-case basis by the LACDPW, no additional mitigation measures are required to ensure that cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project remain at a level below significance.

### **6.2.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to hydrology. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.3 WATER QUALITY**

### **6.3.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

With regards to surface water and groundwater quality, as the effluent generated by the proposed project will not produce concentrations of pollutants of concern that would be expected to cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards, the proposed project's incremental effect on surface water and groundwater quality is not significant. Furthermore, other projects would be required to comply with

regulations designed by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board ("LARWCQB"), which assures that regional development will not adversely affect water quality.

As for groundwater recharge, urbanization of the region has been accompanied by long-term stability in groundwater pumping and levels, which is attributed, in part, to the significant volume of natural recharge that occurs in streambeds. The addition of imported State Water Project water to the region also has contributed to groundwater recharge. Therefore, impacts to groundwater recharge are not expected to be cumulatively considerable due to the lack of groundwater depletion and the historic recharge rates.

Finally, as to hydromodification, based upon fluvial and geomorphic studies, the proposed project's inclusion of hydromodification controls as project design features, the requirement that future development control water flow through compliance with a regional program, and the natural occurrence of large-scale changes in the Santa Clara River as a response to major episodic events, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative hydromodification impacts is less than significant.

### **6.3.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that because other projects within Los Angeles County would be subject to the same or similar mitigation measures as the proposed project, no further mitigation measures are required to ensure that cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project remain less than significant.

### **6.3.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to water quality. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.4 FLOODPLAIN MODIFICATIONS**

### **6.4.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

The analysis of the proposed project's cumulative impacts resulting from floodplain modifications tiers from and incorporates the analysis found in the Specific Plan's Program EIR. The Program EIR concluded that the reduction in floodplain area caused by the bank protection would not significantly increase the overall water velocities or water depth because the volume of flow carried in the shallow, slow-moving areas along the margins of the Santa Clara River is small. Further, variations would be localized and limited in scope, especially when viewed in the entirety of the Santa Clara River corridor within the Specific Plan site and downstream. Accordingly, as the overall mosaic of habitats within the River would be maintained, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact.

### **6.4.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that no additional mitigation measures, beyond those recommended to mitigate biota impacts in these CEQA findings, are required because no significant cumulative impacts to biological resources are anticipated due to the proposed bank stabilization, Long Canyon Road Bridge, or changes in the floodplain.

### **6.4.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to floodplain modifications. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project

are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.5 TRAFFIC/ACCESS**

### **6.5.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

With regard to the proposed project's cumulative impact on state highways and freeways within the County, one freeway segment would operate at deficient conditions under the long-range cumulative setting: I-5 s/o Valencia Boulevard (PM Peak Hour - Southbound Direction). However, per methodology and thresholds set forth in the applicable Congestion Management Plan, this impact is not significant. Nonetheless, Newhall has committed, in a mitigation measure set forth below (see LV 4.7-21), to participate in capacity augmentation of this freeway segment on a fair-share basis.

The proposed project also would result in a cumulatively considerable impact to the community of Piru, which lies within Ventura County. Long-range traffic modeling indicates that the intersection of Center Street and Telegraph Road would operate at an unacceptable level of service.

Finally, the proposed project, in conjunction with other projects, would significantly impact circulation in the community of Fillmore, which also lies within Ventura County. Build-out under the Specific Plan would specifically impact five SR-126 intersections within Fillmore: (i) E Street and Ventura Street; (ii) D Street and Ventura Street; (iii) B Street and Ventura Street; (iv) Pole Creek Road and Ventura Street; and (v) El Dorado Road and Ventura Street. In 2000, Fillmore and Newhall entered into an agreement, whereby Fillmore deemed the payment of \$300,000 as adequately representing the costs associated with transportation improvements needed within its jurisdiction as a result of build-out of the Newhall Ranch. Accordingly, a mitigation measure identified below (see LV 4.7-22) confirms the payment of that amount as mitigation for cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project.

### **6.5.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that potentially significant cumulative traffic/access impacts of the proposed project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

- LV 4.7-21 The project applicant shall fund fair share capacity augmentation of the segment of I-5 south of Valencia Boulevard in an amount commensurate with the project's incremental increase in cumulative traffic levels, as shown on Table 4.7-30. All other development that would impact the affected freeway segment shall also pay a fair share of required funding.
- LV 4.7-22 Concurrent with issuance of the first building permit for Landmark Village, the project applicant shall submit a one-time payment of \$300,000 to the City of Fillmore (City) in Ventura County to fund transportation-related improvements in the City consistent with the March 2000 agreement entered into between The Newhall Land and Farming Company and the City.
- LV 4.7-23 Concurrent with the issuance of each Newhall Ranch Specific Plan building permit, the project applicant shall pay to the County of Ventura that development's pro-rata share of the entire Newhall Ranch Specific Plan's fair-share (nine percent) of the costs to implement the following roadway improvements at the intersection of Center Street and Telegraph Road (SR-126) in the Ventura County community of Piru: (1) Re-stripe the Center Street southbound approach lane resulting in separate left and right turn lanes; (2) Add a

westbound right turn deceleration lane to Telegraph Road; and (3) Install a traffic signal at the intersection when warranted.

### **6.5.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potentially significant cumulative traffic/access impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels provided the County requires fair-share participation from other projects. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid all potentially significant cumulative traffic/access impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **6.6 NOISE**

### **6.6.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

The proposed project would result in significant cumulative impacts primarily as a result of increased traffic on SR-126 and other local roadways following build-out of the proposed project and other developments in the Santa Clarita Valley. The increased traffic noise, which would exceed standards set for transient lodging, would significantly impact users of the Travel Village RV Park.

### **6.6.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that mitigation for cumulative noise impacts to users of the Travel Village RV Park is provided for in Specific Plan mitigation Measure SP 4.9-14, which has been recommended to mitigate project-specific impacts. (See *infra* Section 2.3.) No other cumulative mitigation measures are required.

### **6.6.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the recommended mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce the potentially significant cumulative noise impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which mitigate or avoid all potentially significant cumulative noise impacts of the proposed project as identified in the Final EIR.

## **6.7 WATER SERVICE**

### **6.7.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

Because the proposed project has its own independent water supply, the proposed project would not result in or contribute to a significant cumulative impact on water supply or service in the Santa Clarita Valley.

### **6.7.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that mitigation measures are not required as the proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to water supplies or services.

### **6.7.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to water supplies or services. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.8. WASTEWATER DISPOSAL**

### **6.8.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

The proposed project is not expected to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to wastewater disposal availability because safeguards have been put in place by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County to ensure that sewer connection permits are not issued if there is inadequate capacity.

### **6.8.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that cumulative development would be required to implement similar mitigation and be subject to similar limitations as those identified for the proposed project on a project-by-project basis. Therefore, no additional mitigation is recommended or required.

### **6.8.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to wastewater disposal. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.9 SHERIFF SERVICES**

### **6.9.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

All new development projects within the Santa Clarita Valley would be individually responsible for funding increases in service demands, through various tax and funding mechanisms, attributable to each respective project. Therefore, cumulative impacts to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and California Highway Patrol are not expected to be significant. Additionally, the proposed project would not contribute to potentially significant cumulative emergency access impacts because the proposed circulation plan facilitates evacuation in the case of an emergency and otherwise provides adequate site access to emergency personnel. Further, the additional access provided by the proposed project would facilitate region wide evacuation plans and would be included in the County's Emergency Evacuation Plans, as amended.

### **6.9.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that because the proposed project would fully mitigate any potentially significant project-specific impacts to law enforcement services, and because cumulative development would be subject to the same or similar mitigation obligations as the proposed project, no additional cumulative mitigations measures are required.

### **6.9.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to sheriff services. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.10 FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES**

### **6.10.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

If the Santa Clarita Valley builds out consistently with the currently adopted area and general plans, a significant cumulative impact on the current level of fire protection services would occur unless the equipment and personnel resources of the fire department were to increase proportionately. However, impacts resulting from new development would be reduced by compliance with state and county fire codes, standards and guidelines, and incorporation of project-specific mitigation measures. Moreover, new development in the planning area would be required to participate in the Developer Fee Program, which is the funding mechanism in place at the county-level for mitigating impacts to fire protection services. Therefore, no significant cumulative fire-related impacts are expected as a result of the proposed project.

### **6.10.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that because cumulative development will be subject to the same or similar required mitigation obligations as the proposed project, no mitigation measures are required.

### **6.10.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to fire protection services. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.11 EDUCATION**

### **6.11.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

The proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact if it does not contribute its fair share to mitigate school facility impacts resulting from the increased demand for educational services. However, as discussed in these CEQA findings, Newhall has entered into school facilities/funding agreements with the respective school districts. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulative impact. Further, because such mechanisms would need to be implemented for each new residential development in the Santa Clarita Valley, cumulative impacts on schools caused by other future residential development would be reduced to less than significant levels.

### **6.11.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that no mitigation measures are required to address the potential for cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project as the project-specific mitigation measures (see these CEQA findings, above) fully address and mitigate all project-related impacts. Furthermore, the Commission

finds that the obligation for other development projects to comply with existing school facilities/funding agreements and/or mechanisms will ensure that cumulative impacts are not significant.

### **6.11.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to education. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.12 PARKS AND RECREATION**

### **6.12.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

The proposed project exceeds the park acreage required by state and county law; therefore, the proposed project results in no additional demand for parkland acreage. Further, the proposed project would benefit the cumulative demand for parkland by providing 16 acres of community parkland, along with trails and private recreation centers, when compared with the 11 acres of parkland required to serve the needs of the population that would be generated by the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not exacerbate the current shortage of local parks and would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact.

### **6.12.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that as the proposed project does not contribute to cumulative park, recreational, or trail impacts in the region, no additional mitigation measures are required.

### **6.12.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to parks and recreation. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.13 LIBRARY SERVICES**

### **6.13.1 Significant Cumulative Impact**

Although the proposed project, in conjunction with other projects, will generate additional demand for library services, this impact is not potentially significant because the County requires that new development either pay an impact fee of \$737.00 per residential unit, or construct adequate library facilities that comply with the County's guidelines.

### **6.13.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that, because all new residential developments in the unincorporated area of the Santa Clarita Valley will be subject to the library impact fee on a project-by-project basis, no additional mitigation is required.

### **6.13.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to library services. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are



neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.14 UTILITIES**

### **6.14.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

The analysis of the proposed project's cumulative utilities impacts tiers from and incorporates the analysis found in the Specific Plan's Program EIR, which fully evaluated the cumulative impacts on energy supply and infrastructure associated with development of the entire Specific Plan area. The Program EIR concluded that the cumulative development scenario would not significantly impact electricity or natural gas. Therefore, the proposed project, as well, would have a less than significant impact on electricity and natural gas resources.

### **6.14.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that because cumulative development would be subject to Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which includes regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission, no further mitigation for cumulative development is required.

### **6.14.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to utilities. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.15 MINERAL RESOURCES**

### **6.15.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

The Newhall Ranch site, which includes the proposed project site, is zoned for Specific Plan land uses. Therefore, the County has no plans to utilize the proposed project site for long-term mineral extraction. Accordingly, the proposed project would not result in a long-term cumulatively considerable loss of mineral resources.

### **6.15.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that mitigation measures are not required because implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable loss of mineral resources.

### **6.15.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to mineral resources. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.16 ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY**

### **6.16.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

As man-made hazards are site-specific issues, the proposed project would not result in cumulative impacts relating to environmental safety.

### **6.16.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that no mitigation measures are required because implementation of the proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to environmental safety.

### **6.16.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to environmental safety. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **6.17 CULTURAL/PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

### **6.17.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts**

Although cultural resources are present on-site, the feasible mitigation identified in connection with project-specific impacts (see these CEQA Findings, above) will ensure that the proposed project does not contribute to significant cumulative impacts. In fact, if the mitigation measures are carried out, a positive impact on cumulative cultural resources information would occur. That is, the mitigation measures would result in the acquisition of additional scientific information about the prehistory of the region and the gathered artifacts would be preserved for future analysis, study, and viewing.

### **6.17.2 Mitigation Measures**

The Commission finds that the mitigation measures identified in relation to project-specific impacts are all that is recommended or required as the proposed project does not contribute to any cumulatively considerable cultural or paleontological impacts.

### **6.17.3 Findings**

The Commission finds that the proposed project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to cultural/paleontological resources. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the proposed project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

## **7.0 FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

The Final EIR concluded that the proposed project would result in six unavoidable significant impacts relating to biota, visual qualities, noise, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources. Based on considerations of avoiding or substantially lessening these unavoidable significant impacts, as well as consideration of the basic project objectives and public comments, the following alternatives to the proposed project were identified: (i) No Project/No Development Alternative; (ii) No Project/Future Development Alternative; (iii) Floodplain Avoidance Alternative; and (iv) Cluster Alternative. These alternatives are analyzed in further detail below. Consistent with the analysis below, the environmentally

superior alternative is the No Project/No Development Alternative. However, this alternative is not consistent with the policies and goals of the Specific Plan, and fails to meet any of the basic project objectives. CEQA also requires that, if the No Project/No Development Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified, which, here, would be the Cluster Alternative.

#### **7.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 - NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the project site would remain in its present condition and would be used for limited agricultural purposes. Under this alternative, the potential project-related impacts associated with development of the project site would not occur.

However, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in bank stabilization along the tract map site and portions of the utility corridor and erosion protection along other portions of the utility corridor, thereby allowing continued sedimentation/erosion to occur at these locations. Also, in its current state, there is no flood protection on the tract map site, except in limited areas, such as adjacent to the Castaic Creek Bridge. Consequently, 10- through 100-year storm events experienced under the no project condition would result in flooding on portions of the tract map site. In contrast, the proposed project would elevate the tract map site out of the floodplain and construct bank protection at various locations, thereby removing the flood hazard that presently exists.

Further, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives set forth above.

#### **7.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 - NO PROJECT/FUTURE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE**

Under *CEQA Guidelines* section 15126.6(e)(3)(B), if disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, then this "no project" consequence (*i.e.*, No Project/Future Development scenario) should be discussed.

Disapproval of the proposed project would not necessarily preclude future development of the property, especially considering that the Specific Plan permits a maximum of 1,444 dwelling units and approximately 1.5 million square feet of commercial land uses within the planning areas that constitute the tract map site.

In addition to being planned for developed use, the project site is located near existing water, sewer, natural gas, telephone, and cable lines that are present within existing roadway rights-of-way. Further, the site is located within the existing service area of both sheriffs and fire department stations and all public services are readily available to serve future site development. Given that the property currently is planned for residential and commercial land uses that can be served by the existing infrastructure, it is reasonable to assume that the site will likely be developed at some time in the future if the currently proposed project is not approved. The environmental impacts associated with such a development alternative likely would be comparable to those identified for the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project/Future Development Alternative likely would not avoid or substantially lessen any of the proposed project's identified significant effects.

Whether or not the No Project/Future Development Alternative would attain any of the project objectives is dependent upon the specific type of development that ultimately would occur under this alternative. Therefore, any conclusion in this respect, by necessity, would be speculative.

### **7.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 - FLOODPLAIN AVOIDANCE ALTERNATIVE**

The Floodplain Avoidance Alternative retains the overall layout of the proposed project, except that this alternative would not place development within areas of the tract map site presently at a lower elevation than the 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency elevation. Therefore, under this alternative, it would not be necessary to elevate portions of the tract map site out of the floodplain area. Bank stabilization would continue to be required along the perimeter of the reduced development footprint fronting the Santa Clara River, the base of the Long Canyon Road Bridge, and the south side of the utility corridor.

This alternative would reduce development by 286 dwelling units along with a reduction of 828,000 square feet of commercial space when compared to the proposed project, for a total of 1,158 dwelling units and 205,000 commercial square feet. Additionally, under this alternative, approximately 79 acres of land would remain available for agricultural production due to the reduction in residential and commercial development.

Generally, under Alternative 3, impacts associated with geotechnical and soil resources, hydrology, traffic/access, air quality, noise, biota, cultural/paleontological resources, visual qualities, solid waste services, mineral resources, and floodplain modifications would be reduced when compared to the proposed project. On the other hand, this alternative would have greater impacts associated with water service, water quality, and parks and recreation. However, on balance, Alternative 3 would result in fewer impacts than the proposed project.

The Floodplain Avoidance Alternative does not fully meet or impedes the following project objectives:

- Land Use Planning Objective No. 2 states, "Consistent with the Specific Plan, accommodate projected regional growth in a location that is adjacent to existing and planned infrastructure, urban services, transportation corridors, and major employment centers and that avoids leapfrog development." Because Alternative 3 would significantly reduce housing and commercial uses, and, therefore, reduce accommodations for projected regional growth, this alternative is not consistent with this project objective.
- Land Use Planning Objective No. 4 states, "Provide development and transitional land use patterns that do not conflict with surrounding communities and land uses." Alternative 3 would create a fragmented area of agricultural property adjacent to residential and commercial uses and, therefore, does not meet this project objective.
- Land Use Planning Objective No. 5 states, "Establish land uses that permit a wide range of housing densities, types, styles, prices, and tenancy (for sale and rental)." Alternative 3 is inconsistent with this project objective, as it would result in a substantial reduction in residential units (approximately 20 percent reduction), thereby reducing housing options for the site.
- Land Use Planning Objective No. 7 states: "Create a highly livable, pedestrian-friendly environment that encourages alternative means of transportation to the automobile by incorporating unique site designs and enhanced pedestrian access between land uses, trails, paseos, and streets." Alternative 3 is inconsistent with this project objective because it would eliminate the majority of the commercial floor area on site, commercial uses that are necessary to promote livability of the project and the creation of a pedestrian friendly environment and enhanced pedestrian access between land uses.
- Economic Objective No. 1 states, "Provide a variety of residential homes, which would respond and adjust to changing economic and market conditions." Alternative 3 does not meet this project

objective as the alternative results in a substantial reduction in residential units, thereby accommodating less housing for regional growth projections.

- Economic Objective No. 2 states, "Provide a tax base to support public services and facilities." Alternative 3 is inconsistent with this project objective as it would cause a substantial reduction in residential and commercial land use on site, resulting in a substantial reduction in tax base to support the public facilities and services within the project area.
- Mobility Objective No. 1 states, "Implement the Specific Plan's Mobility Plan, as it relates to the Landmark Village project, including the design of a circulation/mobility system that encourages alternatives to automobile use." Alternative 3 does not meet this project objective because it is inconsistent with the Specific Plan's Mobility Plan and the circulation/mobility system within the Specific Plan. This alternative eliminates the majority of the commercial floor area on site, commercial uses that are necessary to promote livability of the project and the creation of a pedestrian friendly environment and enhanced pedestrian access between land uses.
- Parks, Recreation, and Open Area Objective No. 2 states, "Provide a range of recreational opportunities, including parks, trails and paseos, which are convenient and accessible." Alternative 3 is inconsistent with this project objective because it would result in a substantial reduction in trails and paseos on the project site.
- Parks, Recreation, and Open Area Objective No. 3 states, "Provide pedestrian, bicycle, and hiking trails that are consistent with the Specific Plan's Parks, Recreation, and Open Area Plan." Alternative 3 does not meet this project objective because it would result in a design that is inconsistent with the Specific Plan's Park, Recreation, and Open Area Plan.

A similar alternative was considered and rejected by the County's Board of Supervisors during its evaluation of the Specific Plan, as the alternative failed to achieve many of the basic project objectives.

#### **7.4 ALTERNATIVE 4 - CLUSTER ALTERNATIVE**

The Cluster Alternative retains the overall layout of the proposed project, except this alternative would not result in the development of the westernmost 106 acres of the property, which would remain available for agricultural production. This alternative would reduce development by 507 dwelling units along with 828,000 square feet of commercial space when compared to the proposed project, for a total of 937 dwelling units and 205,000 square feet of commercial space. The Cluster Alternative would retain the 9-acre elementary school, 16-acre community park, and two of the four private recreation areas proposed as part of the Landmark Village project. Bank stabilization would continue to be required along the perimeter of the reduced development footprint fronting the river, the base of the Long Canyon Bridge, and the south side of the utility corridor extending to the Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant site.

Generally, under Alternative 4, impacts associated with geotechnical and soil resources, hydrology, traffic/access, air quality, noise, biota, cultural/paleontological resources, visual qualities, solid waste services, parks and recreation, mineral resources, and floodplain modifications would be reduced when compared to the proposed project. On the other hand, this alternative would have greater impacts associated with water service and water quality. However, on balance, Alternative 4 would result in fewer impacts than the proposed project.

While Alternative 4 is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project, Alternative 4 does not meet many of the basic project objectives. Project objectives not fully met or impeded by Alternative 4 are listed below.

- Land Use Planning Objective No. 2 states, "Consistent with the Specific Plan, accommodate projected regional growth in a location that is adjacent to existing and planned infrastructure, urban services, transportation corridors, and major employment centers and that avoids leapfrog development." Because Alternative 4 would significantly reduce housing and commercial uses, and, therefore, reduce accommodations for projected regional growth, this alternative is not consistent with this project objective.
- Land Use Planning Objective No. 4 states, "Provide development and transitional land use patterns that do not conflict with surrounding communities and land uses." Alternative 4 would create a fragmented area of agricultural property adjacent to residential and commercial uses and, therefore, does not meet this project objective.
- Land Use Planning Objective No. 5 states, "Establish land uses that permit a wide range of housing densities, types, styles, prices, and tenancy (for sale and rental)." Alternative 4 is inconsistent with this project objective because it would result in a substantial reduction in residential units (approximately 35 percent reduction), thereby reducing the housing options for the site.
- Land Use Planning Objective No. 7 states: "Create a highly livable, pedestrian-friendly environment that encourages alternative means of transportation to the automobile by incorporating unique site designs and enhanced pedestrian access between land uses, trails, paseos, and streets." Alternative 4 is inconsistent with this project objective because it would eliminate the majority of the commercial floor area on site, commercial uses that are necessary to promote livability of the project and the creation of a pedestrian friendly environment and enhanced pedestrian access between land uses.
- Economic Objective No. 1 states, "Provide a variety of residential homes, which would respond and adjust to changing economic and market conditions." Alternative 4 does not meet this project objective as the alternative results in a substantial reduction in residential units, thereby accommodating less housing for regional growth projections.
- Economic Objective No. 2 states, "Provide a tax base to support public services and facilities." Alternative 4 is inconsistent with this project objective because it would cause a substantial reduction in residential and commercial land use on site, resulting in a substantial reduction in tax base to support the public facilities and services within the project area.
- Mobility Objective No. 1 states, "Implement the Specific Plan's Mobility Plan, as it relates to the Landmark Village project, including the design of a circulation/mobility system that encourages alternatives to automobile use." Alternative 4 does not meet this project objective because it is inconsistent with the Specific Plan's Mobility Plan and the circulation/mobility system within the Specific Plan. This alternative eliminates the majority of the commercial floor area on site, commercial uses that are necessary to promote livability of the project and the creation of a pedestrian friendly environment and enhanced pedestrian access between land uses.
- Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Objective No. 2 states, "Provide a range of recreational opportunities, including parks, trails and paseos, which are convenient and accessible." Alternative 4 is inconsistent with this project objective because it would result in a substantial reduction in trails and paseos on the project site.
- Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Objective No. 3 states, "Provide pedestrian, bicycle, and hiking trails that are consistent with the Specific Plan's Parks, Recreation, and Open Area Plan." Alternative 4 is inconsistent with this project objective because it would result in a design that is inconsistent with the Specific Plan's Park, Recreation, and Open Area plan.

The County's Board of Supervisors already considered Specific Plan alternatives, one of which clustered development, creating higher housing concentrations in the Low-Medium and other land use designations. The County rejected this alternative as infeasible, in part, because it did not achieve many of the basic objectives of the Specific Plan, including the significant public benefits associated with implementation of such a plan. In addition, the County rejected this alternative because it too narrowly limited the range of housing opportunities provided and did not reflect market conditions and growth in the region.

## **8.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered "acceptable." (CEQA Guidelines §15093, subdivision (a).) CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record. (CEQA Guidelines §15093, subdivision (b).)

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Commission finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, when implemented, will avoid or substantially lessen virtually all of the significant effects identified in the Final EIR for the proposed project. However, certain significant impacts of the project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are related to biota, visual qualities, noise, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources. (*See Sections 2.0 and 5.0, above.*)

The Commission finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR that are within the purview of the County will be implemented with the proposed project, and that the remaining significant unavoidable effects are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, based upon the facts set forth above, the Final EIR, and the record, as follows:

### **8.1 SIGNIFICANT OVERRIDING BENEFITS RESULTING FROM THE SPECIFIC PLAN**

When the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant initially were approved in 1999, the County Board of Supervisors identified thirty (30) benefits of the project that would compensate for the unavoidably significant project-specific and cumulative impacts. While not required to, as no unmitigated environmental effects were identified, the County Board of Supervisors elected to readopt its 1999 Statement of Overriding Considerations upon certification of the Final Additional Analysis for the Specific Plan in 2003. In addition, the County Board of Supervisors identified another significant public benefit of the Specific Plan, namely Newhall's agreement to dedicate 1,517 acres of land in the Salt Creek Watershed, located in Ventura County and adjacent to the boundaries of the Specific Plan.

The Commission finds that the Specific Plan benefits, set forth below, are relevant, as the Landmark Village project is proposed under and pursuant to the Specific Plan. Further, the Commission finds that the enumerated benefits make acceptable the unavoidably significant environmental impacts identified in these findings.

- (1) The project has been designed to preserve over nine square miles of land (6,170 acres, or 51 percent of the site) containing the most significant natural environmental resources, including:

- (a) The High Country, which is a major portion of the County's Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") 20; SEA 20 contains six and one-half square miles (4,184 acres), and the project has modified the SEA boundaries to include more total area and land with more valuable natural resources than were originally designated in the SEA by the General Plan;
  - (b) The Santa Clara River property, which is portion of the County's SEA 23, and which contains approximately 975 acres, has been planned to minimize the necessity of removing sensitive habitat for flood control purposes and provides valuable habitat for federal and state endangered and sensitive wildlife species; and
  - (c) The Open Area, consisting of 1,010 acres, preserves significant oak woodlands and savannas, ridgelines, and major landforms.
- (2) Preservation of the High Country in conjunction with lands already acquired or planned for public acquisition, including the Santa Clarita Woodlands Park, will result in a distance of over ten miles of preserved and protected Santa Susana Mountains for conservation and recreational purposes, stretching from the I-5 freeway to the Los Angeles County/Ventura County border.
- (3) Provisions for the accelerated dedication of the High Country have been added to the revised Specific Plan.

Access to the High Country would generally be provided within 24 months of approval of the Specific Plan by early construction of a trail in the High Country and by the granting of an easement to a joint powers authority for public access and maintenance of that trail.

The Joint Powers Authority would include Los Angeles County, the City of Santa Clarita and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

An open space financing district would also be established under the authority of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, which would provide annual revenues to the Joint Powers Authority for recreation, conservation and related activities in the High Country.

Additionally, the Center for Natural Lands Management would be endowed (\$2,000,000 in 1997 dollars) by the applicant for the perpetual conservation management of the resources in the High Country, as well as the River Corridor and Open Area.

Offers of early dedication in fee title of the High Country - at no cost to the Joint Powers Authority- would take place in three equal phases of approximately 1,400 acres each at the 2,000th, 6,000th and 11,000th residential building permit.



The River Corridor and Open Area (excluding parks which would be dedicated to Los Angeles) would be offered to be dedicated to the Center for Natural Lands Management in phases in accordance the Specific Plan. Los Angeles County would also be granted an access and conservation easement prior to the offset dedication of the River Corridor and Open Area.

- (4) Ultimate removal of commercial grazing from the High Country and from the River Corridor at adoption of the Specific Plan, will enhance the natural resources within those areas.
- (5) A River Corridor has been designed to retain the River's significant riparian vegetation and habitat, and, at the same time, provide flood protection in accordance with Los Angeles County standards.
- (6) Prominent physical features, such as Sawtooth Ridge, river bluffs and Ayers Rock, have been preserved within the Open Area as landmarks for the community.
- (7) Preservation of the High Country will also create a 1/2 mile-wide set back of development along the Los Angeles County/Ventura County line, thereby increasing the width of the Salt Creek movement corridor adjacent to Ventura County.

The 1/2 mile-wide set back of development from the County line results in a wide corridor linking the River Corridor and the High Country SMAs in Los Angeles County.

- (8) The revised Specific Plan also calls for a 1/8th mile-wide set back of development adjacent to Ventura County north of SR-126 to provide a transition between project development on Newhall Ranch and rural/agricultural land uses in Ventura County.
- (9) 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. The affordable housing component for Newhall Ranch is above and beyond the requirements of the County's General Plan and Area Plan.
- (10) The City of Santa Clarita's proposals regarding the use of "buried bank stabilization" techniques and contour grading as well as ridgeline protection have been incorporated into the revised Specific Plan. Such provisions are above and beyond the requirements of the County's General Plan and Area Plan.

The applicant is also voluntarily committing to comply with the City's proposal to participate in a Valley-wide freeway mitigation funding program should such a program be adopted by both Los Angeles County and the City of Santa Clarita -

even though such a program was not determined to be a necessary mitigation requirement of either the Final EIR or revised Specific Plan.

- (11) Provisions have been made for improved parks, libraries and fire stations in accordance with the revised Specific Plan - all of which are above and beyond the mitigation required by CEQA or the Final EIR, or the exactions required of other development.
- (12) The project's single ownership, size and density make possible the planning and financing of a comprehensive resource management plan.
- (13) The Asistencia, the most important historical site in the Santa Clarita Valley, will be preserved and deeded to the Archaeological Conservancy for permanent ownership and management at no expense to the County, state or taxpayers.
- (14) The community has been designed to provide a comprehensive array of land uses for a balanced community of homes, employment, shopping, commercial and public services, cultural facilities, education and recreation. The size and single ownership of the Newhall Ranch site provide opportunities to develop a comprehensive master-plan community in which land uses are properly sited, and infrastructure and public services are planned in advance and coordinated with regional infrastructure and public services.
- (15) The Newhall Ranch design includes "livable community" concepts, including the following:
  - a) The community is divided into five separate villages to provide a small town feel and sense of community among residents;
  - b) The Land Use designations include a Mixed-Use category for the creative combination of commercial, public, recreational and residential uses;
  - c) Shared parking programs are planned in such a way as to reduce the need for large expansive parking lots and encourage Mixed-Use development;
  - d) Over 50 miles of pedestrian and bicycle trails will be constructed, linking the villages and the community to the regional trail system;
  - e) Recreation is not only included for the overall community, but is located within individual neighborhoods;
  - f) Home occupations are permitted, allowing residents to telecommute or operate businesses from their residences, which reduce the need for commuting to central business districts;

- g) Approximately 59 percent of all homes will be constructed within walking distance (one-quarter mile) of village or commercial centers;
  - h) A park-and-ride facility is planned; and
  - i) Bus pull-ins are provided.
- (16) The project's trail system will link the community of Val Verde to the project, thereby allowing that community access to and use of the project's extensive trail system.

The applicant has also entered into an agreement with the Val Verde Civic Association which has been incorporated into the revised Specific Plan. The agreement imposes various requirements upon the applicant which are above and beyond the mitigation requirements of either the Final EIR or the revised Specific Plan.

- (17) A public lake within the Potrero Valley Village will provide regional recreational use and visual enjoyment, as well as community recreation.
- (18) A golf course within the Potrero Valley Village will provide regional recreational benefits.
- (19) The Business Park, Commercial, and Mixed-Use Land Uses designations will provide approximately 18,795 permanent jobs, which will allow employment opportunities for the community and the region and help the County achieve its economic goals.
- (20) Construction of a new Water Reclamation Plant will generate reclaimed water; the construction of a reclaimed water system and use of reclaimed water on-site will reduce the demand for potable water supplies.
- (21) The location and construction of three new fire stations will provide faster and better regional fire protection to Val Verde and other communities in the immediate area, in addition to fire services for the project.
- (22) The project will generate an estimated fiscal surplus between \$251 to \$301 million to the County during construction and \$17 to \$20 million annually thereafter (the range of fiscal surplus depends upon the final outcome of Proposition 218 in court decisions and elections).
- (23) The project will generate an estimated fiscal surplus to the adjacent City of Santa Clarita of \$27.9 million during construction and \$1.8 million annually thereafter.
- (24) An estimated \$140 million from fuel and other tax revenues would be generated for the construction and maintenance of regional and state transportation facilities during construction and \$11 million thereafter.

- (25) Location of the project and design of the community will result in an estimated reduction in vehicle miles traveled as compared to more conventional subdivision design.
- (26) The project design (Villages, clustering, Mixed-Use, variety of transportation modes, on-site employment, and proximity to regional employment) will result in the reduction of air emissions in comparison to a planned community without the project's design features.
- (27) The applicant has voluntarily entered into school mitigation agreements with the Newhall School District, the Castaic Union School District, and the William S. Hart Union High School District. These agreements call for payments that are far in excess of the current development fees required by state law. Based on a review of the agreements, the Board of Supervisors has noted that they represent the most generous school mitigation packages ever seen from an applicant in Los Angeles County.
- (28) The project provides a broad spectrum of housing which will help to meet the long-term housing needs of Los Angeles County, a major goal of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and will satisfy a wide array of economic and social needs, lifestyles. Project housing includes:
  - a) Rental apartments;
  - b) Condominiums;
  - c) Townhomes;
  - d) Attached and clustered single-family homes;
  - e) Detached single-family homes;
  - f) Larger executive and estate homes; and
  - g) Second Units on larger lots to allow for extended families and more affordable housing opportunities.
- (29) The project implements portions of the County Master Plan of Highways by the construction of Commerce Center Drive between SR-126 and Magic Mountain Parkway and Pico Canyon Road within the project.
- (30) The project is estimated to generate significant Congestion Management Plan credits thereby benefiting the County's efforts to continue to qualify for state and federal transportation funds.

**8.2 SIGNIFICANT OVERRIDING BENEFITS RESULTING FROM THE LANDMARK VILLAGE PROJECT**

The proposed Landmark Village project also will result, independently, in noteworthy benefits, identified below, which compensate for and make acceptable the unavoidable significant environmental impacts that would result from project implementation. These benefits include:

- (1) The project will provide a range of quality housing opportunities, including both 308 single family units, 1,080 multi-family units, and approximately 296 affordable housing units, as well as on-site recreation and landscaped areas, that contribute to the projected housing needs in the Santa Clarita Valley and the region.
- (2) The project will provide commercial/retail space to contribute to the commercial space needs in the Santa Clarita Valley and future residents of the project.
- (3) The project will result in the creation of up to 3,500 permanent jobs within its commercial and mixed use areas.
- (4) The project will adhere to a green building performance standard that will ensure that all structures exceed the existing Title 24 requirements by at least 15 percent.
- (5) The project incorporates solar technology into all single family residential structures, public buildings, and the commercial buildings.
- (6) The project will include numerous public facilities, including an elementary school, parks, trails, paseos, and recreation areas. More specifically, the project includes a 16-acre Community Park which can be utilized by all of the residents of the Santa Clarita Valley and Los Angeles County and an over two-mile extension of the Santa Clara River trail.
- (7) The project will create a highly livable, sustainable, pedestrian-friendly environment that encourages alternative means of transportation.
- (8) The project will preserve significant natural resources and open areas.
- (9) The project will provide for the construction of Long Canyon Road Bridge, an important transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance.
- (10) The project will provide off-site roadway and intersection improvements to the arterial highway system and will result in the widening of SR 126, a regionally significant expressway benefiting residents and businesses within the Los Angeles/Ventura County region..
- (11) The project will encourage the use of drought-tolerant, fire-retardant, and native plants in landscaping, and thereby promote water conservation.
- (12) The project's residents and businesses would generate revenue in the form of sales taxes, property taxes, fees, *etc.* that would be available to the County to fund on-site public services.

On balance, the Commission finds that these overriding considerations, as identified in conjunction with environmental review of impacts stemming from the Specific Plan and the Landmark Village project, compensate for the unavoidably significant environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR.

