Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning
Director of Planning James E. Hartl, AICP

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: CUP 02-236

1. DESCRIPTION:

This project is a conditional use permit to request authorization for construction of three water tank farms, three loading stations and associated spring water delivery pipes from several of the natural springs located on the property. Approximately three acres of the lot will be paved and covered by structures and the rest of the 189 acres will be left as open space. A full-time caretaker will inhabit the existing residence on site, which is served by a domestic well and septic system. Water tank farms will provide room for up to eight water storage tanks on a concrete slab foundation measuring approximately 30X60'. Tanks will vary in size from 10,000 to 12,000 gallons each. Up to 40 trucks in a 24-hour period will load and export water from the site. The area will be secured with an 8-foot high chain link fence enclosure. Grading for all three loading areas will move and re-compact approximately 1200 cubic yards of soil.

2. LOCATION:

39439 Gorman Post Road, Gorman, California

3. PROPONENT:

Gorman Post Properties
16461 Sherman Way, Suite 230
Van Nuys, California 91406-3812

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:

BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

5. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:

THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Impact Analysis Section, Department of Regional Planning

DATE: March 3, 2004

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *02-236*
CASES: *CUP*

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *9/3/02* Staff Member: *Nooshin Paidar*

Thomas Guide: *Viii* USGS Quad: *Lebec*

Location: *39439 Gorman Post Road, Gorman*

Description of Project:

This project is a conditional use permit to request authorization for construction of three water tank farms, three loading stations and associated spring water delivery pipes from several of the natural springs located on the property. Approximately three acres of the lot will be paved and covered by structures and the rest of the 189 acres will be left as open space. A full-time caretaker will inhabit the existing residence on site, which is served by a domestic well and septic system. Water tank farms will provide room for up to eight water storage tanks on a concrete slab foundation measuring approximately 30X60'. Tanks will vary in size from 10,000 to 12,000 gallons each. To minimize the risk of rupture due to San Andreas Fault seismic activities, the tanks will be constructed of seamless polyurethane and their height will be restricted to a maximum of 14 feet. Up to 40 trucks in a 24-hour period will load and export water from the site. The area will be secured with an 8-foot high chain link fence enclosure. Grading for all three loading areas will move and re-compact approximately 1200 cubic yards of soil.

Gross Acres: *192 acres*

Environmental Setting:

The property is an undeveloped land located at the northwestern corner of Los Angeles County and approximately one mile east of the community of Gorman, in Peace Valley. The property falls within Tehachapi Foothills Significant Ecological Area (SEA) and San Andreas earthquake fault zone. The lot occupies a transitional undeveloped open space area between the Angeles and Los Padres National Forests. Hungry Valley State Vehicular Recreation Area is situated approximately 0.25 mile south of the site. Interstate 5 runs along the southern portion and Highway 138 is located to the southeast of the property. The site is mountainous with very steep slopes and gullies, with elevations ranging from 3,550 to 4,400 feet. The more level areas are located adjacent to Gorman Post Road at the very southwesterly and southeasterly corners of the property. Several USGS-designated blue line streams are present on the property, with a combined length of approximately 6,375 feet. The site has been extensively grazed by cattle for the past 100+ years. The underlying soil is basically decomposed granite and sandy loam that holds few nutrients. Existing vegetation is varied and is mostly composed of trees, shrubs, annuals and perennials. Of the plant communities present in the area, grasslands and sparse scrub cover the majority of the site. A succession of seeps and springs on the slopes support clusters of shrubs and trees along their attendant drainages, extending downslope toward extensive moist bottomlands of the Rift Zone and Gorman Creek. Several utility easements for pipelines and overhead electricity transmission lines are found on the property. Gorman Power Company substation is located adjacent to the east of the residence. Surrounding Tehachapi foothill properties mostly have the same characteristics as the site and consist of rural open space areas primarily used for rangeland cattle grazing. One small fruit orchard is situated on the east of the site.

Zoning: *Heavy Agriculture (A-2-5)*

General Plan: *Significant Ecological Area (SEA)*

Community/Area wide Plan: *NA*

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
CUP/ZC 99-119	*Equipment sales and display, zone change from A-1-40K to M-1-DP.*

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - ☒ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☒ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☒ CA Dept. of Health Services
- ☒ Dept. of Water Resources
- ☐
- ☐

Trustee Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ State Fish and Game
- ☒ State Parks
- ☒ U.S. Fish & Wildlife

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☒ Cal. State Fullerton
- ☒ Golden Valley Municipal Water District
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
- ☐ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ DPW: *Traffic & Lighting, Waterworks, Geology & Soils, Grading & Drainage, Watershed Management*
- ☒ Health Services Dept.: *Mountain & Rural*
- ☒ Fire Dept.
- ☐
- ☐

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
CATEGORY	**FACTOR**	Pg				Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☒	☐	☐	*San Andreas Fault Zone*
	2. Flood	6	☐	☒	☐	*100-year flood areas*
	3. Fire	7	☒	☐	☐	*Fire Zone 4*
	4. Noise	8	☒	☐	☐	
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	☐	☒	☐	*NPDES permit required*
	2. Air Quality	10	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Biota	11	☐	☒	☐	*Water extraction, infrastructure*
	4. Cultural Resources	12	☐	☒	☐	*Drainage courses*
	5. Mineral Resources	13	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	☐	☒	☐	*Scenic Highway*
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	☐	☒	☐	*Truck traffic*
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Education	18	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Utilities	20	☒	☐	☐	
OTHER	1. General	21	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Land Use	23	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	☐	☒	☐	

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: *Significant Ecological Area (10)*
2. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☒ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: *Hsiao-ching Chen* Date: _____

Approved by: *Daryl Koutnik* Date: 8 MARCH 2004

☐ Determination appealed--see attached sheet.

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? *Project falls within boundaries of San Andreas Fault. Source: LA County General Plan Safety Element Fault Rupture Hazards & Historic Seicmicity map.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? *Several natural springs and seeps occur in the hills within the property, indicating a high water table.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%? *Grading for all three loading areas will move and re-compact approximately 1200 cubic yards of soil.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Geotechnical Evaluation of the Proposed Spring Water Collection in Forman, CA dated 8/9/02 and prepared by Tim Latiolait and Alan Rasplicka of R.T. Frankian & Associates on file. Public Works letter of 2/5/03 stated that Geotechnical and Materials Engineering Division was consulted and the project will not have significant adverse effect.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No Impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *Several blue dashed line streams cross through the property.*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *Project is within boundaries of 100-year flood areas. Source: LA County General Plan Safety Element Flood & Inundation Hazards map*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off? *"Very High" soil erosion potential (Source: North LA County General Plan, Santa Clarita Valley Areawide General Plan)*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
f.	☐	☐	☒	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? *Project involves extraction of water from natural springs on the property.*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW on file

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

Comply with all conditions of drainage concept approval.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No Impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)? *Project is located within Fire Zone 4.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? *Water pressure dependent upon gravity flow*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Regulation No.8

☐ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Fire Department letter of 11/18/02 does not indicate that project will have significant impact on or be impacted by fire hazard factors.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No Impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? *Project is located approximately 600 feet east of Interstate 5.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
b.	☒	☐	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? *A septic system is in operation for the existing caretaker residence.*
	☐	☐	☒	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course? *High water table observed in some project site locations*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? *NPDES analysis is required.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? *NPDES analysis is required.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☒ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

See attached mitigation measures for details.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural? *Project is located within Tehachapi Foothills SEA.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas? *Infrastructure for extraction and export of water may potentially impact biota.*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site? *Several blue dashed line streams cross through the property.*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)? *A riparian/wetland habitat is sited on the property.*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? *The project site contains cottonwood, walnut and junipers.*
f.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? *A Biological Constraints Analysis (Envicom Corp., August 7, 2000) provides a list of sensitive plant and wildlife species at Gorman and Vicinity, which includes San Diego horned lizard, CA horned lizard, rufous-crowned sparrow*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ SEATAC Review on 10/7/02 and 2/2/02 ☐ Oak Tree Permit

Biological Constraints Analysis of August 2002, Biota Report of 11/6/02, Snail Survey of 7/7/02 on file.

See attached mitigation measures for details.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? *A drainage course and several natural springs and seeps are located on the property.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation Report (McKenna et al., July 5, 2002) recommends that a qualified archaeological monitor be present for initial grading or de-vegetation when work associated with tapping the springs (e.g. placement of pipes or clearing of vegetation) is conducted.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed? *Project will be visible from Interstate 5, a second priority scenic highway. Source: LA County General Plan Scenic Highway Element*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features? *The property is an undeveloped land with natural springs and seeps and wild flower fields (known as the best in LA County).*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? *The property is in a undeveloped region of the County.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

A visual rendering from I-5 is required.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (mid-block or intersections)?
b.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions? *Truck traffic caused by up to 40 trucks (which will access the site to load and export water 24 hours a day) might create hazardous traffic conditions on Gorman Post Road.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

DPW Traffic & Lighting Division letter of 2/5/03 on file. Construction-related traffic be limited on adjacent streets during weekday peak hours.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? *The project involves extraction of water from natural springs and public water supply is not available.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

No hazardous waste is generated and found on the site (Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment—TRAK Environmental Group, July 15, 2002).

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	☐	☒	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	☐	☐	☐	Other?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment,** or **recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? *Project could potential threaten to eliminate plant or animal community.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
c.	☐	☐	☒	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? *Extensive water extraction might impact water table.*

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No Impact

PROJECT CHANGES/CONDITIONS
DUE TO ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

PROJECT No. CUP 02-236

The Department of Regional Planning (DRP) staff has determined that the following conditions or changes in the project are necessary in order to assure that there will be no substantial evidence that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment.

The applicant shall deposit the sum of $3,000 with the DRP within 30 days of permit approval in order to defray the cost of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the reports by a Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP).

Flood/Drainage

To mitigate project's potential impact on drainage, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the approved drainage concept to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

Spring Water

To ensure project impact to springs is less than significant, the applicant shall monitor the four springs from which water will be ultimately extracted annually to document the condition and trend of the hydrologic and biotic components. Monitor one "control" spring (T-3) to factor normal background variation in spring size into the annual assessment. If monitoring results indicate a substantial shrinkage in size or quality of one or more of the springs that is attributable to extraction, then extraction rates will be adjusted away from those sources to the other remaining sources. The details of the monitoring are as follows:

1. Prior to any extraction, the applicant shall conduct a baseline monitoring which is to occur in late summer or early fall subsequent to the project approval and prior to water extraction and subsequently on an annual basis for 5 years following the commencement of spring water extraction. The late season annual monitoring date assures that the extent of the wetlands associated with these springs will be the most easily defined by the color of vegetation, and any substantial changes in extend would be the most easily detected.

2. A permanent photographic station shall be established for each spring and control. The locations of these stations shall be marked in the field with a stake or rock cairn according to the Biota Report dated November 6, 2002.

Spring Water (cont.)

3. At each photographic station, an observer shall photograph the spring using the same view and orientation as is established in the base line monitoring effort. Subsequent monitoring photographs shall be taken with a 35mm SLP camera with a lens of focal length of 50mm, using 200 ASA color film, on a relatively clear and sunny day.

4. At each photographic station, the observer shall record the following information:
   - ξ Observers name, date and time of photos, weather conditions, type of camera, lens, and type of film.
   - ξ Dominant plant species and approximate height and condition (vigor)
   - ξ Presence and extent of surface water and saturated soils.
   - ξ Any observed wildlife use.

5. In the first year of monitoring (after the baseline year), and in the subsequent four years following the commencement of extraction, an annual report shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, and copies to other responsible agencies with jurisdiction. The report shall include the following analysis:
   - ξ On the baseline photographs for each spring and control, draw a line (probably using a computer on a digital image) that corresponds to the extent of hydrophytic vegetation (margin with upland vegetation).
   - ξ Do the same for the current year's monitoring photographs. Compare the margins of the wetlands from the two consecutive years and determine whether the margin has contracted, expanded, or remained static.
   - ξ Factor in the observed natural variation in the Control spring (as a percentage of observed areal contraction or expansion) at each of the four springs subject to extraction.
   - ξ Estimate the areal extent of contraction or expansion of the wetland area (factored using control) as a percentage of the previous year's area.
   - ξ In subsequent years, examine the entire data set for all years to date in order to access overall trend.
   - ξ Prepare a text discussion of these findings, and prepare a recommendation after consultation with a hydrologist and biologist for adjustment of the extraction if it appears that any diminishment of spring wetland area has occurred at any one or more of the springs, and which is attributable to the extraction (i.e., after having factored for the control).
   - ξ At the end of five years of extraction and monitoring, the control spring will become available for extraction.

The pipes leading from the well heads to the bottom of the slope and storage tanks shall be placed on the surface of the ground, in order that trenching shall be unnecessary. The pipes shall be secured near or adjacent, but not within the steam channels exiting from the springs. Upon reaching the bottom of the slope, the pipes may be buried.

Spring Water (cont.)

It will be necessary to transport a small, trailer-mounted drilling rig to the springs. Existing and proposed access roads will be utilized to accomplish this. The drilling rig will also need to be placed within the wetland areas of the springs in order to accomplish the drilling. Prior to placement of the drill rig, a stiff padded mattress or other support placed under the trailer shall protect the entire work area estimated at approximately 20 by 30 feet. All drill spoils shall be collected and disposed of outside of wetland or downstream channel areas. The protective blanket/support shall be removed immediately following construction of the well head.

Water Quality

To mitigate project impacts on water quality, the applicant shall comply with all pertinent NPDES requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

The applicant shall provide TMDLs information to the satisfactory of the Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to project operation. A copy of the TMDLs information shall be submitted to the Department of Regional Planning.

Prior to project operation, final approval shall be obtained from the State of California Department of Health Services for the proposed Spring Water Delivery operation to include design, installation and operation.

The existing on-site sewage disposal system is allowed to be utilized on performance basis to accommodate caretaker residence needs and is subject to periodic evaluation to insure adequacy. The existing septic tank shall be serviced by licensed pumper truck company before the operation is commenced and serviced regularly thereafter as frequent as required to maintain an approved sanitary sewage disposal system.

Upgrading of the existing septic system shall be required at the time of any building expansion and modification to the caretaker living quarter arrangements, change in the existing usage status that may result in requiring a system with greater capacity or when deemed necessary by LA County Department of Health Services.

The existing water well shall be dedicated to supply potable water to the caretaker residence and on-site irrigation only to accommodate a typical usage needs and cannot be sold as part of the proposed water operation.

Biota

To allow recovery of natural spring-side vegetation and enhancement of wildlife habitat values, the applicant shall install exclusionary barbed-wire fencing which includes the entire active area of the spring where the well head is to be placed. One spring has already been fenced, and this shall serve as an example for the others.

Biota (cont.)

To ensure the integrity of on-site vegetation during project operation, no invasive alien plants are to be used. Selections of plants used in screening and landscaping based on the existing flora of the site shall be made from the species mentioned in the Biota Report pages 38 and 39 dated November 6, 2002 prepared by Envicom Corporation.

To reduce light impact to wildlife, lighting to service the collection stations shall be the lowest intensity that is practical and allowable. Lights shall not be placed more than 6 feet above the ground, and shall be directed downward and away from open space areas. They shall not be on continuously during nighttime hours, but shall be turned on as demand warrants, by an automatic sensor, or manually on a timer by the operators.

To ensure the sustainability of the wetlands and riparian communities which could be impacted by the project, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with the California State Department of Fish and Game, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code prior to alteration of any streambeds.

Before any dredged or fill material is discharged into waters of the U.S., the applicant may be required to submit a Department of Army Permit Section 404 Clean Water Act to Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District Branch.

Visual

To mitigate project's visual impacts, the water tank storage sites shall be buffered and shielded from view from I-5, as well as Gorman Post Road by landscaped berms. The contouring of the exterior slopes of the berms shall be designed so as to resemble prevailing slope conditions and be landscaped with drought-resistant native vegetation. The trees and shrubs selected for use as visual screening along the access driveways and concrete loading aprons shall consist of native species consistent with the varieties occurring naturally in the vicinity.

Traffic

To mitigate project's impact on the circulation on nearby roadways and intersections during the construction period, construction-related traffic shall be limited on adjacent streets during the weekday peak hours.

Cultural Resources

To mitigate project impacts on cultural resources, a qualified archaeological monitor shall be present for initial grading or de-vegetation when work associated with tapping the springs (e.g. placement of pipes or clearing of vegetation) is conducted. The applicant shall agree to suspend construction in the vicinity of a cultural resource encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the site, and leave the resource in place until appropriate mitigation measures are determined.

Mitigation Compliance

As a means of ensuring compliance of above mitigation measures, the applicant and subsequent owner(s) are responsible for submitting annual mitigation compliance report to the DRP for review, and for replenishing the mitigation monitoring account if necessary until such time as all mitigation measures have been implemented and completed.

As the applicant, I agree to incorporate these changes/conditions into the project, and understand that the public hearing and consideration by the Hearing Officer and/or Regional Planning Commission will be on the project as changed/conditioned.

_____ _____
Applicant Date

No response with 10 days. Environmental Determination requires that these changes/conditions be included in the project.

_____ _____
Staff Date

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM
PROJECT NO. 02-236

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
Flood/Drainage				
To mitigate project's potential impact on drainage, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the approved drainage concept to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.	Compliance with approved drainage concept	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, whichever occurs first	Applicant	Public Works
Spring Water				
To ensure project impact to springs is less than significant, the applicant shall monitor the four springs from which water will be ultimately extracted annually to document the condition and trend of the hydrologic and biotic components. Monitor one "control" spring (T-3) to factor normal background variation in spring size into the annual assessment. If monitoring results indicate a substantial shrinkage in size or quality of one or more of the springs that is attributable to extraction, then extraction rates will be adjusted away from those sources to the other remaining sources. The details of the monitoring are as follows: 1. Prior to any extraction, the applicant shall conduct a baseline monitoring which is to occur in late summer or early fall subsequent to the project approval and prior to water extraction and subsequently on an	Baseline monitoring	In late summer or early fall subsequent to the project approval and prior to water extraction and subsequently on an annual basis for 5 years.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
annual basis for 5 years following the commencement of spring water extraction. The late season annual monitoring date assures that the extent of the wetlands associated with these springs will be the most easily defined by the color of vegetation, and any substantial changes in extend would be the most easily detected.				
2. A permanent photographic station shall be established for each spring and control. The locations of these stations shall be marked in the field with a stake or rock cairn according to the Biota Report dated November 6, 2002.	Establishment of a permanent photographic station for each spring and control	In late summer or early fall subsequent to the project approval and prior to water extraction and subsequently on an annual basis for 5 years.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning
3. At each photographic station, an observer shall photograph the spring using the same view and orientation as is established in the base line monitoring effort. Subsequent monitoring photographs shall be taken with a 35mm SLP camera with a lens of focal length of 50mm, using 200 ASA color film, on	Photography the spring using the same view and orientation as is established in the base line monitoring effort.	In late summer or early fall subsequent to the project approval and prior to water extraction and subsequently on an annual basis for 5 years.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
a relatively clear and sunny day.				
4. At each photographic station, the observer shall record the following information: ξ Observers name, date and time of photos, weather conditions, type of camera, lens, and type of film. ξ Dominant plant species and approximate height and condition (vigor) ξ Presence and extent of surface water and saturated soils. ξ Any observed wildlife use.	Submittal of annual mitigation compliance reports.	In late summer or early fall subsequent to the project approval and prior to water extraction and subsequently on an annual basis for 5 years.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning
5. In the first year of monitoring (after the baseline year), and in the subsequent four years following the commencement of extraction, an annual report shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, and copies to other responsible agencies with jurisdiction. The report shall include the following analysis: ξ On the baseline	Submittal of annual mitigation compliance reports.	In the first year of monitoring (after the baseline year), and in the subsequent four years following the commencement of extraction	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
photographs for each spring and control, draw a line (probably using a computer on a digital image) that corresponds to the extent of hydrophytic vegetation (margin with upland vegetation). ξ Do the same for the current year's monitoring photographs. Compare the margins of the wetlands from the two consecutive years and determine whether the margin has contracted, expanded, or remained static. ξ Factor in the observed natural variation in the Control spring (as a percentage of observed areal contraction or expansion) at each of the four springs subject to extraction. ξ Estimate the areal extent of contraction or expansion of the				

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
wetland area (factored using control) as a percentage of the previous year's area. ξ In subsequent years, examine the entire data set for all years to date in order to access overall trend. ξ Prepare a text discussion of these findings, and prepare a recommendation after consultation with a hydrologist and biologist for adjustment of the extraction if it appears that any diminishment of spring wetland area has occurred at any one or more of the springs, and which is attributable to the extraction (i.e., after having factored for the control). ξ At the end of five years of extraction and monitoring, the control spring will become available for extraction.				
The pipes leading from the well			Applicant	LA County Dept of Public

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
heads to the bottom of the slope and storage tanks shall be placed on the surface of the ground, in order that trenching shall be unnecessary. The pipes shall be secured near or adjacent, but not within the steam channels exiting from the springs. Upon reaching the bottom of the slope, the pipes may be buried.				Works LA County Dept of Regional Planning
It will be necessary to transport a small, trailer-mounted drilling rig to the springs. Existing and proposed access roads will be utilized to accomplish this. The drilling rig will also need to be placed within the wetland areas of the springs in order to accomplish the drilling. Prior to placement of the drill rig, a stiff padded mattress or other support placed under the trailer shall protect the entire work area estimated at approximately 20 by 30 feet. All drill spoils shall be collected and disposed of outside of wetland or downstream channel areas. The protective blanket/support shall be removed immediately following construction of the well head.	1. A stiff padded mattress shall protect the entire work area 2. Removal of protective blanket/support	1. Prior to placement of the drill rig. 2. Immediately following construction of the well head.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning
Water Quality				
To mitigate project impacts on water quality, the applicant shall comply with all pertinent NPDES requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.	Compliance of all pertinent NPDES requirements. A copy to be submitted to DRP.	Prior to issuance of grading permit	Applicant	Regional Water Quality Control Board Public Works

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
The applicant shall provide TMDLs information to the satisfactory of the Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to project operation. A copy of the TMDLs information shall be submitted to the Department of Regional Planning.	Submittal of TMDLs information. A copy to be submitted to DRP.	Prior to issuance of grading permit	Applicant	Regional Water Quality Control Board
Prior to project operation, final approval shall be obtained from the State of California Department of Health Services for the entire proposed Spring Water Delivery operation to include design, installation and operation.	Approval from the CA DHS for the entire proposed Spring Water Delivery operation	Prior to project operation	Applicant	California Department of Health Services
The existing on-site sewage disposal system is allowed to be utilized on performance basis to accommodate caretaker residence needs and is subject to periodic evaluation to insure adequacy. The existing septic tank shall be serviced by licensed pumper truck company before the operation is commenced and serviced regularly thereafter as frequent as required to maintain an approved sanitary sewage disposal system.	Maintenance of an approved sanitary sewage disposal system for the caretaker residence	During project operation.	Applicant	LA County Department of Health Services.
Upgrading of the existing septic system shall be required at the time of any building expansion and modification to the caretaker living quarter arrangements, change in the existing usage status that may result in requiring a system with greater capacity or when deemed necessary by LA County Department of Health	Upgrading of the existing system	At the time of any building expansion and modification to the caretaker living quarter arrangements	Applicant	LA County Department of Health Services

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
Services.				
The existing water well shall be dedicated to supply potable water to the caretaker residence and on-site irrigation only to accommodate a typical usage needs and cannot be sold as part of the proposed water operation.	Existing water well shall be dedicated to supply potable water to the caretaker residence and on-site irrigation only	During project operation	Applicant	LA County Department of Health Services
Biota				
To allow recovery of natural spring-side vegetation and enhancement of wildlife habitat values, the applicant shall install exclusionary barbed-wire fencing which includes the entire active area of the spring where the well head is to be placed. One spring has already been fenced, and this shall serve as an example for the others.	Installation of exclusionary barbed-wire fencing	Prior to issuance of any grading permit.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning
To ensure the integrity of on-site vegetation during project operation, no invasive alien plants are to be used. Selections of plants used in screening and landscaping based on the existing flora of the site shall be made from the species mentioned in the Biota Report pages 38 and 39 dated November 6, 2002 prepared by Envicom Corporation.	Submittal and approval of Landscape Plan.	Prior to issuance of any grading permit.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning
To reduce light impact to wildlife, lighting to service the collection stations shall be the lowest intensity that is practical and allowable. Lights shall not be placed more than 6 feet above the ground, and shall be directed downward and away from open	Submittal and approval of Lighting Plan.	Prior to issuance of any grading permit.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
space areas. They shall not be on continuously during nighttime hours, but shall be turned on as demand warrants, by an automatic sensor, or manually on a timer by the operators.				
To ensure the sustainability of the wetlands and riparian communities which could be impacted by the project, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with the California State Department of Fish and Game, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code prior to alteration of any streambeds.	Approval of DFG Streambed Alteration Agreement. A copy of the SAA shall be submitted to DRP.	Prior to alteration of any streambeds	Applicant	California Department of Fish and Game
Before any dredged or fill material is discharged into waters of the U.S., the applicant may be required to submit a Department of Army Permit Section 404 Clean Water Act to Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District Branch.	Approval of waiver of Section 404 Permit. A copy of the SAA shall be submitted to DRP	Prior to any dredged or fill material is discharged into waters of the U.S.	Applicant	U.S. Department of Army
Visual				
To mitigate project's visual impacts, the water tank storage sites shall be buffered and shielded from view from I-5, as well as Gorman Post Road by landscaped berms. The contouring of the exterior slopes of the berms shall be designed so as to resemble prevailing slope conditions and be landscaped with drought-resistant native vegetation. The trees and shrubs selected for use as visual screening along the access driveways and	Submittal and approval of Landscape Plan.	Prior to issuance of any grading permit.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
concrete loading aprons shall consist of native species consistent with the varieties occurring naturally in the vicinity.				
Traffic				
To mitigate project's impact on the circulation on nearby roadways and intersections during the construction period, construction-related traffic shall be limited on adjacent streets during the weekday peak hours.	During project construction	Routine field inspection	Applicant	~~LA County Dept of Regional Planning~~ LA County Dept Public Works
Cultural Resources				
To mitigate project impacts on cultural resources, a qualified archaeological monitor shall be present for initial grading or de-vegetation when work associated with tapping the springs (e.g. placement of pipes or clearing of vegetation) is conducted. The applicant shall agree to suspend construction in the vicinity of a cultural resource encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the site, and leave the resource in place until appropriate mitigation measures are determined.	1. Grading monitoring; submittal and approval of monitoring report. 2. Suspension of construction.	1. During initial grading or de-vegetation when work associated with tapping the springs (e.g. placement of pipes or clearing of vegetation) is conducted. 2. Upon discovery of cultural resources.	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning
Mitigation Compliance				
As a means of ensuring compliance of all above mitigation measures, the applicant is responsible for submitting annual mitigation compliance report to the DRP for review and responsible for replenishing the mitigation monitoring account, if necessary until such time as all mitigation measures have been	Submittal and approval of annual Mitigation Compliance Report. Replenishment of Mitigation Monitoring account if necessary until such time as all mitigation measures have been implemented and completed.	Annually	Applicant	LA County Dept of Regional Planning

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
implemented and completed.				