7.0 Other Environmental Considerations

7.0 OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires an EIR to describe any significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, including those effects that can be mitigated but not reduced to a less-than-significant level. The following is a summary of the impacts associated with the Project that would be significant and unavoidable. These impacts are also described in detail in **Section 5.0**, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR.

1. Aesthetics, Views, and Light and Glare

As analyzed in **Section 5.1**, Aesthetics, Views, and Light and Glare, both short-term construction and operational impacts related to aesthetics/visual quality would be significant and unavoidable due to changes in the Project Site's visual character. Similarly, cumulative impacts related to aesthetics/visual quality would be significant and unavoidable due to the overall change in visual character associated with the Project together with the related projects. The Project would implement MM ES 5.1-1/RMDP/SCP VR-1 and MM ES 5.1-2/RMDP/SCP VR-2 to reduce visual impacts related to construction of a storm drain outlet along the River bank. Nevertheless, Project-specific and cumulative impacts related to aesthetics/visual quality would remain significant and unavoidable.

2. Air Quality

As analyzed in **Section 5.3**, Air Quality, construction activities would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to regional emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_X) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) during the most intense construction period. Project operations would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts associated with regional VOCs, NO_X, carbon monoxide (CO), respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}), and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$). Cumulative construction and operational air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable for the same respective regional emissions as the Project. Despite implementation of regulatory compliance measures, Project design features (PDFs), and feasible mitigation measures, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

3. Noise

As discussed in **Section 5.13**, Noise, Project construction activities occurring within approximately 1,000 feet of single-family residences located on- or off-site could exceed the 60.0 A-weighted decibel (dBA) stationary equipment long-term construction threshold. Similarly, construction activities occurring within 500 feet of multi-family residences located on- or off-site could exceed the 65.0 dBA threshold. Therefore, the Project could exceed Los Angeles County's (County) Noise Ordinance standards for an extended period of time at on- and off-site residential uses during the construction phase. Although implementation of the PDFs and mitigation measures would reduce construction-related noise impacts to the extent feasible, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Cumulative construction impacts would likewise be significant and unavoidable. Additionally, cumulative off-site traffic volumes would result in significant noise impacts affecting existing and future sensitive receptors along Westridge Parkway (north of Valencia Boulevard). There are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce these impacts.

B. REASONS WHY THE PROJECT IS BEING PROPOSED, NOTWITHSTANDING SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

In addition to identification of the Project's significant unavoidable impacts, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires an explanation of why a project is being proposed, notwithstanding such impacts. While a lead agency must contemplate the implications of adverse environmental impacts, the fundamental purpose of land use planning and development is to supply an array of land uses while optimizing environmental and economic realities. Here, the benefits of the Project would outweigh the few significant and unavoidable environmental impacts remaining after implementation of numerous PDFs and mitigation measures.

As described in detail in **Section 3.0**, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is located in the western Santa Clarita Valley (Valley), a major population and business center in northwestern Los Angeles County. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects substantial growth in the Valley between 2014 and 2035. Within that period, SCAG's adopted growth forecasts project 53,878 more people (a 19.16-percent increase), 22,170 more households (a 24.26 percent increase), and 16,398 more jobs (a 12.77 percent increase) in the Valley. Consequently, a substantial demand is projected to exist for housing, commercial uses to serve those households, and commercial office space in the Project area, which the Project is intended to help meet.

The Project's underlying purpose is to create a mixed-use community that implements infill development interconnected with the surrounding existing and planned communities, conserves on-site sensitive natural resources, and integrates land use, housing, and transportation considerations in furtherance of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), the

Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008. The Project's land uses are designed to be mutually supportive and integrated with surrounding development and infrastructure to create a regional, coordinated destination. The Project also would promote physical compatibility through residential planned development and inclusion of single-family residential clustering, with transitional land use patterns that buffer residential areas from neighboring high-intensity commercial uses.

With respect to growth, the Project would help accommodate the regional growth projected by SCAG in the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area. It would avoid leapfrog development, unnecessary infrastructure extension, and "patchwork" development that utilizes undue open space and natural resources by locating and concentrating development within and adjacent to existing, approved, and planned urbanized areas and regional transportation and transit facilities. The Project would carry out the resource conservation, management, and permitting responsibilities associated with the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan and Spineflower Conservation Plan (RMDP/SCP), including establishment of a Spineflower Conservation Area (Spineflower Preserve). Additionally, the Project would include the development of an elementary school and public neighborhood park to serve the local population, expand the trail network in the Valley, and provide commercial development that serves the needs of the local population, generates employment opportunities, and is located so as to provide a buffer between Six Flags Magic Mountain and proposed residential uses.

The Project would comply with the County's Green Building Standards Code (County Code Title 31), which addresses sustainability via appropriate planning and design, water and energy efficiency and conservation, waste diversion, and tree planting requirements. In order to further minimize water usage, reclaimed water would be used as irrigation and Project landscaping would include drought-tolerant plants and limited turf in compliance with the County's drought-tolerant landscaping requirements (Title 31). Finally, low impact development (LID) measures related to stormwater handling and treatment would be implemented to protect streams, groundwater, surface water quality, and natural drainage characteristics in compliance with the Low Impact Development Standards (County Code Chapter 12.84).

The Project also would implement a variety of sustainable development principles. To minimize and shorten vehicle trips, most homes would be located within walking distance to the community's commercial areas, elementary school, neighborhood park, and trail system. The Project would provide for approximately 2,700 new jobs and would be located a short distance from the Valencia Commerce and Valencia Industrial Centers, two of the largest employment centers in the Valley. The Project would include 101.7 acres of open space area and approximately 33,150 linear feet of trails and paseos with direct connections between the proposed residential uses, commercial uses, the elementary

school, recreational centers, and park uses.[1] In addition, approximately 8,090 linear feet of Class II bike lanes would be provided.

C. SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c), an EIR must evaluate significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by implementation of a project. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c):

> *Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.*

The Project would necessarily consume non-renewable resources, as well as resources that are effectively non-renewable due to their long regeneration time, during both construction and operation. The Project would require a commitment of non-renewable and renewable resources that would include: (1) building materials; (2) water; and (3) energy resources. Specifically, during construction of the proposed buildings, the Project would consume non-renewable resources including the following building materials: certain types of lumber and other forest products; aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt, such as sand, gravel and stone; metals, such as steel, copper, and lead; and petrochemical construction materials, such as plastics. As stated in **Section 5.24**, Utilities and Service Systems—Solid Waste, of this Draft EIR, during construction, the Project would divert at least 65 percent of construction and demolition debris from landfills during Project construction. Thus, the net use of non-renewable building materials, such as lumber, aggregate materials, and plastics, would be reduced. Water, which is a limited, slowly renewable resource, also would be consumed during Project construction. Project water use during construction is addressed in **Section 5.21**, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply, of this Draft EIR. As concluded therein, water consumption during Project construction would result in a less-than-significant impact on water supplies.

---

[1] *Open space acreage refers to lots within the tract map designated as open space. Additional open space areas, such as natural drainage courses, roadway medians, and landscaped parkways adjacent to on-site roadways, in addition to the proposed park, recreation centers, and Spineflower Preserve, bring the total open space area to approximately 153 acres.*

Furthermore, the Project's use of construction vehicles and equipment would require the consumption of non-renewable fossil fuels such as natural gas, oil, gasoline, and diesel fuel. As indicated in **Section 5.23**, Utilities and Service Systems—Energy, of this Draft EIR, the consumption of non-renewable fossil fuels during construction would occur on a temporary basis and would not be significant.

The resources committed during operation of the Project would include water for drinking and washing, and fossil fuels for electricity and transportation. Water consumption is analyzed in **Section 5.21**, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply, of this Draft EIR. While Project operation would result in the irreversible consumption of water, the Project would not result in a significant impact with respect to water supply or infrastructure. During ongoing operations, non-renewable fossil fuels would represent the primary energy source and, thus, the existing finite supplies of these resources would be incrementally reduced. The consumption of non-renewable fossil fuels for energy use is analyzed in **Section 5.23**, Utilities and Service Systems—Energy, of this Draft EIR. As analyzed therein, the Project's estimated demand for electricity and natural gas would be within the anticipated service capabilities of Southern California Edison (SCE) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), while gasoline and diesel fuel consumption would not result in the inefficient use of transportation energy resources, create transportation energy system capacity problems, or result in a significant impact associated with the construction of new or expanded transportation energy facilities. The Project also would comply with the California Green Building Standards Code (CCR, Title 24, Part 6), commonly referred to as the CALGreen Code. The CALGreen Code includes mandatory measures for residential and non-residential development and is designed to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by utilizing design and construction methods that reduce the negative environmental impact of development and encourage sustainable construction practices. Title 31 of the County Code, known as the Green Building Standards Code, adopts the 2013 CALGreen Code by reference.

As discussed in **Section 5.8**, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Draft EIR, the Project would use, handle, store, transport, and dispose of hazardous materials during construction, which can create the potential for hazardous material releases into the environment. Mitigation measures are included as part of the Project to reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. Project operations also would involve the limited use of potentially hazardous materials typical of those used in residential and commercial developments, schools, and parks, including cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, and other materials used for landscaping. However, all hazardous materials within the Project Site would be acquired, handled, used, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and in compliance with all applicable federal, state, regional, and local requirements, and impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the above, Project construction and operation would require the irretrievable commitment of slowly renewable and non-renewable resources, which would limit the availability of these resources as well as the Project Site for future generations or for other uses. However, the consumption of such resources would not be considered substantial and would be consistent with regional and local growth forecasts and development goals for the Project area. The loss of such resources would not be highly accelerated when compared to other development within the surrounding area, and such resources would not be used in a wasteful manner. Therefore, although irreversible environmental changes would result from the Project, such changes are concluded to be less than significant.

D. GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires an EIR to consider the growth-inducing impacts of a project. Growth-inducing impacts are characteristics of a project that could, either directly or indirectly, foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing or development in the surrounding environment. According to the CEQA Guidelines, such projects include those that would remove obstacles to population growth (e.g., a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant). In addition, as set forth in the CEQA Guidelines, increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. The CEQA Guidelines also require a discussion of the characteristics of projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. The CEQA Guidelines also state that it must not be assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

As discussed in **Section 5.14**, Population, Housing, and Employment, of this Draft EIR, the Project would not induce substantial, unexpected population, household, or employment growth in the Project area either directly or indirectly. Future growth within the Project area is planned for and expected, pursuant to the County's General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan: One Valley One Vision 2012 (Area Plan). Moreover, the Project's residential development would help meet SCAG's RHNA allocation for the County's unincorporated areas. Additionally, the Project would not result in a substantial jobs/housing imbalance or substantial increase in vehicle miles travelled (VMT).

With regard to infrastructure-induced population growth, roadway improvements planned as part of the Project or as mitigation are intended to improve access to the Project Site (and, consequently, the adjacent Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (Specific Plan) area, which has been approved for development), reduce vehicle idling and queuing, improve access to public transit, and minimize unnecessary travel throughout the Project Site. These roadway improvements would not open any large undeveloped areas for new

use, aside from those already slated for development (and in any case, several of the on-site roadway improvements are planned as part of other previously approved development projects). Utility and other infrastructure upgrades are also intended to meet Project-related demand. Specifically, the new water, wastewater, electrical, natural gas, and storm drain/flood control infrastructure have been designed to provide for the Project, except where required to be oversized to accommodate nearby planned or approved development, and would not generate substantial capacity that would induce unforeseen growth.

The Project also includes the construction of an elementary school. This Project component is intended to fulfill a requirement of the Project Applicant's School Facilities Funding Agreement with the Saugus Union School District. Construction of the school would mitigate the Project's impacts to the Saugus District and would serve the existing population in the area as well as future residents on the Project Site and within a portion of the Specific Plan area. It is not anticipated that the new school, in and of itself, would induce growth in the area.

In addition, the Project's demand for commercial goods and services would be met by new retail uses, services, and community facilities on-site, as well as by existing retail uses, services, and other resources already located in proximity to the Project site. No new, unforeseen development would be needed specifically to meet the Project's commercial demand. In conclusion, the Project is not expected to indirectly induce population growth or development through the construction of Project uses and infrastructure or the demand for commercial goods or services.

E. CHANGE OF CHARACTER IMPACTS

Change of character impacts relate to changes in land use patterns, scale, or character, or reductions in agricultural land. As discussed in **Section 5.1**, Aesthetics, Views, and Light and Glare, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is almost entirely undeveloped, comprised largely of vacant land with limited agricultural uses, a small plant nursery used by Six Flags Magic Mountain, and abandoned oil wells and associated unpaved access roads scattered throughout the site. The site's overall character is one of disturbed open space, with rolling hills and canyons and areas of scrub and trees. Project implementation would permanently alter the Project Site through landform modification and the introduction of new development and infrastructure. The transition from undeveloped land to framed structures to finished buildings with landscaped areas would occur in phases over the entire Project Site over a period of several years. As structures are constructed and finished, the scale of the Project and changes in the site's visual character would become more evident. Project uses would be constructed on some of the undeveloped hillsides and hilltops on-site, resulting in a loss of open space. As well, portions of the natural drainage courses would be filled in/channelized, a storm drain outlet

would be constructed near the bank of the River, and existing native vegetation, including some oak trees, would be removed.

The Project would be consistent in terms of land use, scale, and general design with surrounding development, including both the existing Westridge community to the south and the approved, but unbuilt, Mission Village community to the west. The Project would feature high quality building materials, pedestrian-scaled buildings designed to activate the public realm, varied architecture to create visual interest, public and private open spaces that offer respite from urban development, and street frontage improvements including substantial landscaping. The layout of Project development would create a logical transition in land use type and intensity, with the majority of commercial uses (and larger and taller buildings) located in the northern portion of Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM) No. 53295, adjacent to Six Flags Magic Mountain; multi-family and park/institutional uses in the central portion of the site; and single-family residential uses (generally smaller, shorter buildings with lower densities) as well as an open space buffer in the southern portion, adjacent to Westridge. Per PDF ES 5.1-1, Design Guidelines would be developed and would address site planning, architecture, walls and fencing, landscape design, lighting, signage, and general design themes in order to ensure a high quality environment. The Project's utility lines would be undergrounded, and utility/service areas would be treated through the use of color, landscaping, screening, etc. to minimize visual impact. In addition, rooftop equipment would be screened from view from public streets. Furthermore, the proposed water tank would be constructed on an existing tank site pad located adjacent to an existing 4.0-million-gallon water tank, and thus would not be out of character with adjacent infrastructure. Project signage would be limited primarily to general ground-level and wayfinding pedestrian/vehicular signage and building identification signage, and would be similar in character to that of other nearby residential communities and commercial districts.

The Project is also designed to respect many of the natural resources and features on-site, with grading that generally follows the natural topographic trends on-site, natural-looking improvements such as debris and water quality basins that incorporate vegetation or water features, and a major canyon (Unnamed Canyon 2) that would be restored as an open, vegetated drainage channel traversing VTTM 53295, thus providing visual relief within the residentially developed portions of the Project Site. Although some oak trees would be removed, an estimated 25 regulation-size oak trees would be preserved, and up to 158 new oak trees of 15-gallon size would be planted per the County's Oak Tree Ordinance and current County practices. New landscaping, including grass/turf yards, small plants and shrubs, street trees, and landscaped parkways and medians, would be introduced, at least 75 percent of which would consist of plants from the County's Drought-Tolerant Plant List. Moreover, large areas of open space, including along the southern site

boundary and in the southeast corner of the Project Site where the Spineflower Preserve is proposed, would remain in their natural condition.

While Project implementation would undeniably change the visual character of the Project Site, the property is surrounded on all sides by urban development, including a major commercial recreation facility (i.e., Six Flags Magic Mountain), the I-5 freeway, and both existing and approved residential communities, and is no longer a remote rural site. To that end, the majority of the Project Site is designated for urban (residential and commercial) uses within both the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan and the County's Zoning Code. Moreover, proposed development would be consistent in terms of land use, scale, and design with surrounding development. Nevertheless, the Project would result in a change of character on the Project Site.

F. POTENTIAL SECONDARY EFFECTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D) requires "[i]f a mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the effects of the mitigation measure shall be discussed but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed." Accordingly, the potential for impacts that could result from implementation of each mitigation measure proposed as part of the Project was reviewed. The following provides a discussion of the potential secondary impacts that could occur as a result of implementation of the Project mitigation measures, listed by environmental issue area.

5.1 Aesthetics, Views, and Light and Glare

MM ES 5.1-1/RMDP/SCP VR-1 and MM ES 5.1-2/RMDP/SCP VR-2 require both grouted and ungrouted riprap to contain materials with colors and textures that are harmonious with the surrounding riverbed and bank materials. Implementation of these mitigation measures would be beneficial to Project aesthetics, and no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

MM ES 5.1-3 requires the installation of temporary green screen construction fencing adjacent to public roadways. Implementation of this mitigation measure would minimize the visual impact of construction activities and thus be beneficial. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.1-4 requires security lighting to be shielded and projected downwards away from adjacent roadways and off-site areas. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce light spillover and glare and thus be beneficial. Therefore, no

adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

5.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

MM ES 5.2-1/RMDP/SCP AG-2 requires the dedication of a permanent agriculture conservation easement off-site to offset the loss of agricultural land on-site. While environmental impacts are typically associated with agriculture, including air quality, hydrology, water quality, and water supply impacts, these impacts already occur on the existing farmland to be conserved, and no new secondary impacts would occur.

5.3 Air Quality

MM ES 5.3-1/RMDP/SCP AQ-1 requires the use of low sulfur diesel fuel as defined by the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Rule 431.2. Implementation of this measure would be beneficial to air quality and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.3-2/RMDP/SCP AQ-2 through MM ES 5.3-8/RMDP/SCP AQ-8 and MM ES 5.3-12/RMDP/SCP AQ-12 are intended to reduce overall emissions during construction. Implementation of these measures would be beneficial to air quality and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.3-9/RMDP/SCP AQ-9 and MM ES 5.3-10/RMDP/SCP AQ-10 are intended to reduce fugitive dust emissions during construction. Implementation of these measures would be beneficial to air quality and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.3-11/RMDP/SCP AQ-11 restricts construction activities that would affect traffic flow to off-peak hours. Implementation of this measure would be beneficial to air quality and traffic conditions and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.3-12a/RMDP/SCP AQ-12a requires construction be planned to minimize heavy construction activity involving the use of diesel fueled equipment within 500 meters of an occupied residence to the extent practical and sets forth requirements for when it is not practical. Implementation of this measure would be beneficial to air quality and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.3-13/RMDP/SCP AQ-13 refers to greenhouse gas emissions mitigation measure MM ES 5.7-1/RMDP/SCP GCC-1. This measure pertains to compliance with Title 24 building efficiency standards and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.3-14/RMDP/SCP AQ-14 requires building efficiency standards to ensure that all commercial and public buildings on the Applicant's land holdings operate at levels 15 percent better than the standards required by the 2008 version of Title 24. Implementation of this measure would be beneficial to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and energy and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

5.4 Biological Resources

MM ES 5.4-1/RMDP/SCP BIO-1 requires detailed riparian/wetland mitigation plans to be developed in accordance with the Comprehensive Mitigation Implementation Plan (CMIP) and contains specific details that must be contained therein. This mitigation measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-2/RMDP/SCP BIO-2 requires that the permanent removal of existing habitats in U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdictional areas in the Santa Clara River (River) and its tributaries be replaced by creating habitats of similar functions and values/services. Implementation of this mitigation measure could result in short-term impacts to air quality, biological resources, noise, hydrology, and water quality. Implementation of this mitigation measure would be subject to oversight by the Corps and/or CDFW, as appropriate, and all applicable mitigation measures contained in this EIR.

MM ES 5.4-3/RMDP/SCP BIO-3 pertains to the location of new vegetation communities and restoration sites. This is a planning measure only and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-4/RMDP/SCP BIO-4 requires replacement vegetation communities to be designed to replace the functions and values of the vegetation communities being removed. This measure would be beneficial to the biological communities on the Project Site and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-5/RMDP/SCP BIO-5 requires average plant spacing to be determined based on the vegetation communities to be replaced and further requires plant spacing specifications to be reviewed and approved by the Corps and CDFW. This mitigation measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-6/RMDP/SCP BIO-6 establishes the criteria for declaring a revegetation site complete. This is an administrative measure which establishes a benchmark for determining the success of other mitigation efforts. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

Prior to Agency approval of the restoration area, MM ES 5.4-7/RMDP/SCP BIO-7 requires the Project Applicant to be responsible for replanting areas damaged in the event of flood, fires, or drought. This is an administrative measure which would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-8/RMDP/SCP BIO-8 requires the installation of temporary irrigation necessary for plant establishment. Installation of temporary irrigation would adhere to all applicable federal, state, and local measures, as well as the requirements of this Draft EIR. Therefore, no secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.4-9/RMDP/SCP BIO-9 requires areas where exotic plant species control is authorized by CDFW to be kept free of exotic plant species for five years after initial treatment. This measure establishes a time period for mitigation to occur which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-10/RMDP/SCP BIO-10 permits certain methods and procedures to be used in the exotics control program and establishes how the program would receive credit for exotic plant removal. This is an administrative measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-11/RMDP/SCP BIO-11 and MM ES 5.4-12/RMDP/SCP BIO-12 require annual mitigation accounting and monitoring reports. These measures are administrative actions that would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-13/RMDP/SCP BIO-15 and MM ES 5.4-14/RMDP/SCP BIO-16 establish criteria for the replacement of native riparian trees and vegetation communities temporarily impacted by construction. These are procedural actions which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-15/RMDP/SCP BIO-17 requires focused surveys for arroyo toad and establishes procedures to be followed in the event toads are found. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-16/RMDP/SCP BIO-20 requires the preservation of approximately 1,900 acres of coastal scrub within certain areas of the Project Site. This measure would set aside land for habitat preservation and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-17/RMDP/SCP BIO-22 requires the Project Applicant to prepare and implement an Oak Resource Management Plan. This measure establishes criteria for the

planting or enhancing oak woodlands, and details mitigation procedures and ratios for impacts to existing oak trees. This is primarily a procedural measure intended to enhance and protect oak woodlands on the Project Site. Therefore, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.4-18/RMDP/SCP BIO-23 requires the adoption and implementation of a Spineflower Conservation Plan (SCP), including the dedication of preserves. MM ES 5.4-19/RMDP/SCP BIO-24 through MM ES 5.4-34/RMDP/SCP BIO-39 pertain to the establishment, maintenance, and management of the spineflower preserves. These measures include, among other requirements, restoration and revegetation with native plant communities, instructions for construction plans, delegation of responsibility in the event of flood, fire, or drought and damage during construction, procedures to control dust and erosion, installation of temporary and permanent fencing, weekly construction monitoring, and construction signage. Implementation of these measures would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations as well as the requirements of this Draft EIR. Therefore, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

MM ES 5.4-35/RMDP/SCP BIO-40 pertains to the preservation of the Slender Mariposa Lily. The measure requires a revised Draft RMDP Slender Mariposa Lily Mitigation and Monitoring Plan to be approved by CDFW and implemented by the Project Applicant, and outlines conservation measures to be included. Implementation of this measure would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations as well as the requirements of this Draft EIR. Therefore, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MS ES 5.4-36/RMDP/SCP BIO-41 requires pre-construction surveys for the American badger and establishes procedures to be followed in the event badgers are found. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-37/RMDP/SCP BIO-42 requires temporary fencing around oak trees that will not be removed during clearing or grading. Installation of temporary fencing would protect oak trees and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-38/RMDP/SCP BIO-49 prohibits water containing mud, silt, or other pollutants from construction activities from entering a flowing stream or placed in locations subject to normal storm flows. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-39/RMDP/SCP BIO-50 requires pre-construction surveys for the southwestern pond turtle and establishes procedures to be followed in the event turtles are found. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-40/RMDP/SCP BIO-52 requires a qualified biologist to conduct a Worker Environmental Awareness Program for all construction/contractor personnel. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-41/RMDP/SCP BIO-53 requires pre-construction surveys for the western spadefoot toad and establishes procedures to be followed in the event toads are found. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-42/RMDP/SCP BIO-54 requires the Project Applicant to develop a relocation plan for coast horned lizard, silvery legless lizard, coastal western whiptail, rosy boa, San Bernardino ringneck snake, and coast patch-nosed snake. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-43/RMDP/SCP BIO-56 requires weekly surveys for nesting birds during construction and establishes procedures to be followed in the event active nests are found. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-44/RMDP/SCP BIO-57 requires pre-construction surveys for the western burrowing owl and establishes procedures to be followed in the event owls are found. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-45/RMDP/SCP BIO-58 requires pre-construction surveys for the San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit and San Diego desert woodrat, and establishes procedures to be followed in the event the species are found. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-46/RMDP/SCP BIO-60 requires pre-construction surveys for mountain lion natal dens and establishes procedures to be followed in the event dens are found. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-47/RMDP/SCP BIO-61 requires pre-construction surveys for roosting bats and establishes procedures to be followed in the event roosts are found. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts. MM ES 5.4-51/ RMDP/SCP BIO-68 further requires any impacted roosts identified during these surveys to be mitigated with the creation of artificial roost sites. Creation of roost sites would comply

with all federal, state, and local regulations as well as the requirements of this Draft EIR. Therefore, no secondary impacts would occur.

MM ES 5.4-48/RMDP/SCP BIO-63 requires each future Home Owners Association to supply educational information to future residents regarding pets, wildlife, and open space areas. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-49/RMDP/SCP BIO-64 requires an integrated pest management plan to be prepared prior to the issuance of building permits. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-50/RMDP/SCP BIO-67 requires flagging of any occupied San Emigdio blue butterfly habitat during construction. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-52/RMDP/SCP BIO-68 requires particular design features and construction notes be included on construction plans. This is an administrative action which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-53/RMDP/SCP BIO-71 requires dust control measures to be implemented and maintained to prevent impacts to biological resources. Like MM ES 5.3-9/RMDP/SCP AQ-9 and MM ES 5.3-10/RMDP/SCP AQ-10, this measure would reduce fugitive dust emissions during construction. Implementation of this measure would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-54/RMDP/SCP BIO-72 requires plant palettes to be reviewed by a qualified restoration specialist and the installation of container plants to be reviewed by the same specialist. The measure further requires that only non-invasive plants be used within 200 feet of native vegetation communities. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-55/RMDP/SCP BIO-78 establishes a cowbird trapping program and sets parameters for the location and timing of traps. This is a procedural measure which would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-56/RMDP/SCP BIO-80 requires the development and implementation of a control program for bullfrog, African clawed frog, and crayfish. The measure further requires monitoring after Project construction. Implementation of this measure would

comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations as well as the requirements of this Draft EIR. Therefore, no adverse secondary impacts would result.

MM ES 5.4-57/RMDP/SCP BIO-85 and MM ES 5.4-58/RMDP/SCP BIO-87 establish a program to control Argentine ants and sets up a monitoring program. The control program does not involve the use of hazardous materials. Therefore, as procedural actions, no adverse secondary impacts would occur.

MM ES 5.4-59/RMDP/SCP BIO-88 requires the replacement of certain southern California black walnut and mainland cherry trees or shrubs at a 2:1 ratio. Implementation of this measure would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-60 requires lighting along the perimeter of natural areas to be downcast with light patterns directed away from natural areas. This measure pertains only to lighting design and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-61 and MM ES 5.4-62 require the preservation of undifferentiated chaparral, California annual grassland, agriculture, and/or disturbed land to be preserved on site. These measures restrict development to certain areas of the Project Site and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-63 requires the installation of fencing and signage along the border of the spineflower preserve. The plans and specifications for the permanent fencing and signage shall be approved by the County and CDFW prior to construction adjacent to the spineflower preserve. Implementation of this measure would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-64 requires the development of a Fire Management Plan to avoid and minimize direct and indirect impacts to the spineflower. This is an administrative measure that would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-65 requires the development of Project-specific design measures to minimize changes in surface water flows to the spineflower preserve. These measures would reduce erosion related impacts on the Project Site and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-66 requires monitoring of grading and fence/utility installation activities adjacent to the spineflower preserve to prevent incidental take. This is a procedural measure that would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-67 establishes guidelines to be followed during any grading activities that take place adjacent to the Santa Clara River Special Management Area/Significant Ecological Area (SMA/SEA). This is a procedural measure that would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-68 requires indirect impacts resulting from changes to hydrology at the interface between the spineflower preserve and planned development be avoided or mitigated below a level of significance consistent with the SCP. This measure is intended to ensure the storm drain system achieves pre-development hydrological conditions and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-69 requires construction activities to be conducted in such a way to facilitate the escape of animals to natural areas. This is a procedural measure that would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-70 requires the fuel modification plan to depict a fuel modification zone consistent with County requirements. This is a regulatory compliance measure that would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-71 requires certain measures be included in the fuel modification plan. This is a procedural measure that would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.4-72 requires waste and recycling receptacles to discourage foraging by wildlife. This is a procedural measure that would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

5.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

MM ES 5.5-1/RMDP/SCP CR-3 through MM ES 5.5-3/RMDP/SCP CR-5 pertain to archaeological resources. MM ES 5.5-1/RMDP/SCP CR-3 requires archeological and Native American monitoring pursuant to the agreement between the Project Applicant and the Tataviam (Tataviam Agreement), and MM ES 5.5-2/RMDP/SCP CR-4 requires buffers around known archaeological sites. MM ES 5.5-3/RMDP/SCP CR-5 and MM ES 5.5-4/ RMDP/SCP CR-6 detail the procedures to be followed in the event previously unknown cultural resources or human remains are uncovered during construction. Implementation of these mitigation measures would be beneficial in reducing impacts to archaeological resources and would ensure compliance with applicable regulations. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

MM ES 5.5-4/RMDP/SCP CR-6 outlines procedures to be followed in the event human remains are discovered. This mitigation measure is a procedural action and would

not result in physical secondary impacts. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

MM ES 5.5-5/RMDP/SCP PR-1 through MM ES 5.5-10/RMDP/SCP PR-7 and MM ES 5.5-11 pertain to paleontological resources. MM ES 5.5-5/RMDP/SCP PR-1 and MM ES 5.5-6/RMDP/SCP PR-2 require the retention of a paleontologist to monitor construction activity, and if necessary, the salvage of significant fossil remains. MM ES 5.5-7/RMDP/SCP PR-3 through MM ES 5.5-10/RMDP/SCP PR-7 require the collection of samples and preparation of a report summarizing the mitigation efforts. Implementation of these mitigation measures would be beneficial in reducing impacts to paleontological resources and would ensure compliance with applicable regulations. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

MM ES 5.5-11 is intended to clarify and supplement the paleontological monitoring to be conducted per MM ES 5.5-5/RMDP/SCP PR-1, specifically implementation of a Paleontological Resource Mitigation Monitoring Implementation Plan (PRMMIP). The PRMMIP specifies the qualifications for the Project paleontologist and outlines procedures for sample collection and cataloging. This mitigation measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

5.6 Geology and Soils

MM ES 5.6-1 through MM ES 5.6-4 implement recommendations provided in the Project's geotechnical reports. These include ground modification; construction of structures to minimize, capture, and manage debris flows; and removal of alluvial soils in order to reduce potential impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure, landslides, slope stability, and hydrocompaction to a less-than-significant level. The measures would be beneficial in reducing impacts, would be implemented while adhering to all other applicable construction-related mitigation measures discussed in the Draft EIR, and no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result.

5.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

MM ES 5.7-1/RMDP/SCP GCC-1 and MM ES 5.7-1/RMDP/SCP GCC-2 require residential, commercial, and public buildings to be designed in compliance with Title 24 standards pertaining to building efficiency. Implementation of these mitigation measures would be beneficial in reducing impacts relative to greenhouse gas emissions, as well as air quality and energy. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

MM ES 5.8-1/RMDP/SCP PH-1 requires the exposure of known abandoned oil wells for examination by California Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) and outlines abandonment/reabandonment procedures in the event reabandonment is required or unknown wells are encountered. Abandonment/reabandonment of wells would comply with all applicable regulations, design features, and mitigation measures discussed throughout this Draft EIR. As a result, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.8-2/RMDP/SCP PH-2 requires buildings within 25 feet of oil or gas wells to be provided with methane gas protection systems and buildings within 300 feet to be evaluated in accordance with DOGGR rules and regulations prior to issuance of building permits. Implementation of this measure would comply with all applicable regulations, design features, and mitigation measures discussed throughout this Draft EIR. As a result, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.8-3/RMDP/SCP PH-4 requires new school sites to be setback from power lines. This measure would be achieved through site selection and regulatory compliance. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.8-4/RMDP/SCP PH-5 requires all ongoing oil and natural gas sites adjacent or in proximity to residential, mixed use, commercial, business park, schools, and local and community parks to be secured by fencing with emergency access maintained. This measure would be achieved through regulatory compliance. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.8-5/RMDP/SCP PH-6 requires all activities associated with pipeline relocation, grading in the vicinity of gas mains, and development within the SoCalGas easements to be conducted in conformance with SoCalGas requirements. This measure would be achieved through regulatory compliance. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.8-6/RMDP/SCP PH-7 requires all development within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site and the Valencia Commerce Center (VCC) and Entrada planning areas to be in compliance with Los Angeles County Code requirements regarding secondary evacuation access. This measure would be achieved through regulatory compliance. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.8-7/RMDP/SCP PH-8 requires two measures pertaining to hazardous materials handling to be included on contract documents and all reserve fuel supplies to be stored within the designated construction area. The measure also requires refueling to occur only within the designated construction area and regular inspections of construction equipment for leaks. The inclusion of text on contract documents is an administrative action that would not result in adverse secondary impacts. Restricting fuel storage and refueling activities, as well as regularly inspecting construction equipment for leaks, would mitigate potential hazardous materials impacts and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.8-8/RMDP/SCP PH-9 requires the Project Applicant to prepare and implement a Spill Prevention Plan prior to all construction-related activities. This mitigation measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.8-9/RMDP/SCP PH-10 requires the Project Applicant to prepare a Chemical Inventory for construction and maintenance of the Project. This mitigation measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.8-10/RMDP/SCP PH-11 requires previously unidentified, obvious, or suspected hazardous materials, contamination, debris, or other features to be handled according to the requirements of the Remedial Action Plan. This mitigation measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.8-11/RMDP/SCP PH-12 requires the development and implementation of a Soil Management Plan for residential and recreational construction areas. This mitigation measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.8-12/RMDP/SCP PH-13 requires all potential buyers or tenants of property in the vicinity of the SoCalGas transmission line on-site to be made aware of the line's presence. This mitigation measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.8-13 requires all Project grading and soil removal to be performed in accordance with the Remedial Action Plan. This mitigation measure is a procedural action intended to reduce impacts and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.8-14 requires areas of visible staining to have visibly impacted soil removed and disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations as well as the Remedial Action Plan. This measure is a procedural action, partially achieved through regulatory compliance. As a result, no adverse secondary impacts would occur.

MM ES 5.8-15 requires areas suspected to be contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons to be tested and remediated in accordance with the Remedial Action Plan to the satisfaction of DOGGR, SCAQMD, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LA Regional Water Board or Regional Board), and/or the County Fire Department, as applicable. This measure is a procedural action, partially achieved through regulatory compliance. As a result, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.8-16 limits the reuse of soils excavated for construction of any unlined water quality control basins and requires potentially contaminated soil to be assessed and remediated in accordance with the Remedial Action Plan. This mitigation measure is a procedural action intended to minimize hazards and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.8-17 requires any areas of the Project Site identified as containing or formerly containing above-ground storage tanks (ASTs), areas used for the storage of hazardous materials such as agricultural pesticides and herbicides, and ponds that may have been used for the treatment or disposal of hazardous wastes where petroleum hydrocarbons, hazardous materials, and/or hazardous wastes are detected shall be remediated in conformance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, as well as the Remedial Action Plan. This measure is a procedural action, partially achieved through regulatory compliance. As a result, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.8-18 requires any septic tanks encountered during grading activities to be removed in accordance with the Remedial Action Plan. This mitigation measure is a procedural action intended to minimize hazards and would not result in physical secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.8-19 requires any on-site oil pipelines to be assessed for leakage if they will continue to be used, or abandoned/reabandoned according to DOGGR requirements if they will not be used. This measure further requires the soil beneath these pipelines to be assessed for petroleum hydrocarbons and if found, remediated in conformance with federal, state, and local laws, to the satisfaction of DOGGR, the Los Angeles County Hazardous Materials Control Program, SCAQMD, and/or the LA Regional Water Board in accordance with the Remedial Action Plan. This measure is a procedural action, partially achieved through regulatory compliance. As a result, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.8-20 through MM ES 5.8-22 require sampling and, if necessary, remediation of lead-based paint, asbestos containing materials, and Polychlorinated

Biphenyls (PCBs). These measures are procedural actions, partially achieved through regulatory compliance. Therefore, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of these mitigation measures.

5.9 Hydrology and Water Quality—Hydrology

MM ES 5.9-1/RMDP/SCP HY-1 through MM ES 5.9-6/RMDP/SCP HY-7 pertain to flood control and protection. These measures would be achieved through regulatory compliance, specifically with the County Department of Public Works' Hydrology Manual. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

MM ES 5.9-7/RMDP/SCP GRR-1 through MM ES 5.9-9/RMDP/SCP GRR-4 pertain to erosion control and hydromodification. These measures would be achieved through regulatory compliance, specifically with the County Department of Public Works' Hydrology Manual and the County's MS4 Permit. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

MM ES 5.9-10/RMDP/SCP GRR-5 and MM ES 5.9-11/RMDP/SCP GRR-6 pertain to sediment and debris control. These measures would be achieved through regulatory compliance, specifically the County Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual. No adverse impacts would occur as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

5.10 Hydrology and Water Quality—Water Quality

MM ES 5.10-1/RMDP/SCP WQ-1 requires the preparation of a final Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). This measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.10-2/RMDP/SCP WQ-2 requires the preparation of a Landscape and Integrated Pest Management Plan. This measure is a procedural action and would not result in physical secondary impacts. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

5.11 Land Use and Planning

Impacts with respect to land use and planning would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

5.12. Mineral Resources

Impacts to mineral resources would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

5.13 Noise

MM ES 5.13-1 through MM ES 5.13-3 pertain to Project construction. MM ES 5.13-1 requires the use of construction equipment equipped with noise shielding and muffling devices. MM ES 5.13-2 and MM ES 5.13-3 are intended to reduce impacts on nearby residences by requiring setbacks for staging areas and noise reducing measures for construction within 500 feet of residences. Implementation of these mitigation measures would be beneficial in reducing noise impacts during construction. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

MM ES 5.13-4 through MM ES 5.13-7 require construction of sound walls along certain lots within Planning Area 5, Planning Area 4, and Planning Area 11. Construction of the sound walls would comply with all applicable regulations, design features, and mitigation measures discussed throughout this Draft EIR. No adverse secondary impacts would result as a result of implementation of these mitigation measures.

MM ES 5.13-8 requires residential setbacks from Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway and the use of sound dampening windows, doors, and insulation. Implementation of this mitigation measure would be beneficial in reducing noise impacts to future residents, and no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.13-9 requires future buyers and renters be notified that periodic fireworks displays may occur at Six Flags Magic Mountain. This measure is procedural in nature. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

5.14 Population, Housing, and Employment

Impacts to population, housing, and employment would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

5.15 Public Services—Fire Protection

MM ES 5.15-1/RMDP/SCP PH-7 requires the Project to comply with Los Angeles County Code Title 21, Chapter 21.24, pertaining to secondary evacuation access. This

mitigation measure is administrative in nature and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

5.16 Public Services—Sheriff Protection

MM ES 5.16-1/RMDP/SCP PS-1 requires payment of the Los Angeles County Law Enforcement Facilities Mitigation Fee. This mitigation measure is administrative in nature and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.16-2 requires the retention of private security to patrol the Project Site during construction. This measure would be beneficial in reducing demand for sheriff protection services during construction. No adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

5.17 Public Services—Schools

Impacts to schools would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

5.18 Public Services—Parks and Recreation

Impacts to parks and recreation would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

5.19 Public Services—Libraries

Impacts on libraries would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

5.20 Transportation

MM ES 5.20-1/RMDP/SCP TR-5 through MM ES 5.20-11/RMDP/SCP TR-18 require the Project Applicant to contribute its fair share of the costs to RMDP/SCP transportation mitigation measures. Potential impacts associated with these improvements were previously evaluated in the RMDP/SCP EIS/EIR. These mitigation measures are procedural actions and would not result in physical secondary impacts. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

MM ES 5.20-12 requires the Project Applicant to construct improvements to Intersection No. 25, The Old Road and Rye Canyon Road. Construction of the intersection improvements would comply with all applicable regulations, design features, and mitigation

measures discussed throughout this Draft EIR. Therefore, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.20-13 requires the Project Applicant to construct improvements to Intersection No. 28, The Old Road and Stevenson Ranch Road. Construction of the intersection improvements would comply with all applicable regulations, design features, and mitigation measures discussed throughout this Draft EIR. Therefore, no adverse secondary impacts would occur as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

MM ES 5.20-14 and MM ES 5.20-15 require participation in the Westside B&T District and payment of applicable transit mitigation fees. These mitigation measures are procedural actions and would not result in physical secondary impacts. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

MM ES 5.20-16 requires the payment of fees to the Westside B&T District for improvements to Intersection No. 10, I-5 Southbound Ramps and Magic Mountain Parkway. In the event the improvements are not completed by the Phasing Analysis threshold milestone, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the Westside B&T District to implement the recommended improvement. Payment of fees is a procedural action and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements consist of lane restriping only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.20-17 requires the payment of fees to the Westside B&T District for improvements to Intersection No. 12, I-5 Southbound Ramps and Valencia Boulevard. In the event the improvements are not completed by the Phasing Analysis threshold milestone, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the Westside B&T District to implement the recommended improvement. Payment of fees is a procedural action and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements consist of lane restriping only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.20-18 requires the Applicant to pay or use existing B&T credits to fund 12 percent of the cost of improvements to Intersection No. 14, I-5 Southbound Ramps and McBean Parkway. Payment of fees is a procedural action and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements consist of lane restriping only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.20-19 requires the payment of fees to the Westside B&T District for improvements to Intersection No. 26, The Old Road and Magic Mountain Parkway. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of lane restriping only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.20-20 requires the payment of fees to the Westside B&T District for improvements to Intersection No. 28, The Old Road and Stevenson Ranch Road. In the event the improvements are not completed by the Phasing Analysis threshold milestone, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the Westside B&T District to implement the recommended improvement. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of lane restriping only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

If requested by the City of Santa Clarita, MM ES 5.20-21 requires the Applicant to complete improvements to Intersection No. 30, Avenue Stanford and Rye Canyon Road. The improvements consist of modification to the traffic signal only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.20-22 requires the Applicant to pay or use existing B&T credits to fund 7 percent of the cost of improvements to Intersection No. 48, McBean Parkway and Newhall Ranch Road. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of lane restriping and widening of a bridge. Bridge widening could result in impacts with respect to aesthetics, air quality, geology, hydrology, water quality, noise, traffic, and potentially other issues depending on site-specific conditions. The improvements are included in the Valencia B&T District program and the City's General Plan and would be subject to environmental review prior to project initiation, as required.

MM ES 5.20-23 requires the Applicant to pay or use existing B&T credits to fund 4 percent of the cost of improvements to Intersection No. 50, McBean Parkway and Copper Hill Drive. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of modification of the traffic signal and widening of a bridge. Bridge widening could result in impacts with respect to aesthetics, air quality, geology, hydrology, water quality, noise, traffic, and potentially other issues depending on site-specific conditions. The improvements are included in the Valencia B&T District program and the City's General Plan and would be subject to environmental review prior to project initiation, as required.

MM ES 5.20-24 requires the Applicant to pay or use existing B&T credits to fund 6 percent of the cost of improvements to Intersection No. 51, Wiley Canyon Road and Lyons Avenue. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of lane restriping and signal modification only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.20-25 requires the Applicant to pay or use existing B&T credits to fund 4 percent of the improvements to Intersection No. 57, Valencia Boulevard and Magic

Mountain Parkway. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of lane restriping only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.20-26 requires the Applicant to pay or use existing B&T credits to fund 5 percent of the improvements to Intersection No. 66, Bouquet Canyon Road and Newhall Ranch Road. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of lane restriping only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.20-27 requires the payment of fees to the Westside B&T District for improvements to Intersection No. 80, Wolcott Way and SR-126. In the event the improvements are not completed by the Phasing Analysis threshold milestone, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the Westside B&T District to implement the recommended improvement. Payment of fees is a procedural action and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of lane restriping and roadway widening. The improvements are included as part of the approved Landmark Village project and thus have been previously or will be subject to environmental review and mitigation, as appropriate.

MM ES 5.20-28 requires the payment of fees to the Westside B&T District for improvements to Intersection No. 107, Westridge Parkway and Magic Mountain Parkway. In the event the improvements are not completed by the Phasing Analysis threshold milestone, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the Westside B&T District to implement the recommended improvement. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of lane restriping and roadway widening. The improvements are included as part of the approved Mission Village project and thus have been previously or will be subject to environmental review and mitigation, as appropriate.

MM ES 5.20-29 requires the payment of fees to the Westside B&T District for improvements to Intersection No. 25, The Old Road and Rye Canyon Road. In the event the improvements are not completed by the Phasing Analysis threshold milestone, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the Westside B&T District to implement the recommended improvement. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection require the widening of each roadway and are part of a County-led project. The improvements would be subject to environmental review prior to project initiation, as required.

If requested by the City of Santa Clarita, MM ES 5.20-30 requires the Project Applicant to pay or utilize existing B&T credits to fund its share of the improvements to

Intersection No. 44, McBean Parkway and Valencia Boulevard. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection require the widening of the north side of Valencia Boulevard along the existing shopping mall frontage. The improvements were included as part of the existing shopping mall and would be subject to environmental review prior to project initiation, as required.

If requested by the City of Santa Clarita, MM ES 5.20-31 requires the Applicant to pay or utilize existing B&T credits to fund its share of improvements to Intersection No. 57, Valencia Boulevard and Magic Mountain Parkway. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection require the widening of Magic Mountain Parkway. Roadway widening could result in impacts with respect to aesthetics, air quality, geology, hydrology, water quality, noise, traffic and potentially other issues depending on site-specific conditions. Roadway widening would be subject to environmental review prior to project initiation.

If requested by the City of Santa Clarita, MM ES 5.20-32 requires the Applicant to pay or utilize existing B&T credits to fund its share of improvements to Intersection No. 65, Bouquet Canyon Road and Soledad Canyon Road. Payment of fees is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection consist of lane restriping only and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

MM ES 5.20-33 requires the payment of fees to the Westside B&T District for improvements to Intersection No. 80, Wolcott Way and SR-126. In the event the improvements are not completed by the Phasing Analysis threshold milestone, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the Westside B&T District to implement the recommended improvement. Payment of fees is a procedural action and no secondary impacts would occur. The improvements at the referenced intersection require the widening of SR-126. The improvements are included as part of the approved Landmark Village project and thus have been previously or will be subject to environmental review and mitigation, as appropriate.

MM ES 5.20-34 requires the Project Applicant to work cooperatively with Caltrans to determine and provide mitigation needed on state highway facilities. The Project Applicant shall construct mitigation improvements or pay an equitable share for mitigation projects to the satisfaction of Caltrans. Payment of fees to mitigate traffic impacts is a procedural action, and no secondary impacts would occur. Based on ongoing coordination between the Project Applicant and Caltrans, a portion of the improvements required by Caltrans are currently underway and have thus been previously subject to environmental review, as required.

5.21 Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Service

Impacts to water supply and service would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

5.22 Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater

Impacts with respect to wastewater would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required. Therefore, no potential secondary impacts would occur.

5.23 Utilities and Service Systems—Energy

No mitigation measures specific to energy were identified. Several of the PDFs and mitigation measures included in **Section 5.3**, Air Quality, and **Section 5.7**, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR would serve to reduce energy consumption. These measures would be beneficial, and no adverse secondary impacts would occur.

5.23 Utilities and Service Systems—Solid Waste

MM ES-5.24-1/RMDP/SCP SWS-1 pertains to the preparation and submission of a Waste Management Plan that includes provisions for the recycling of construction and demolition debris. This mitigation measure is procedural action intended to reduce landfill waste streams and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

G. EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 requires an EIR to contain a brief statement indicating reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and therefore are not discussed in detail in the EIR. An Initial Study was prepared for the Project and is included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. The Initial Study provides a detailed discussion of the potential environmental impact areas and the reasons each topical area is or is not analyzed further in the Draft EIR. Through the Initial Study, the County did not identify any subject areas where impacts would clearly be less than significant. Therefore, all issue areas are discussed in detail in the Draft EIR.