

PROJECT NUMBER: No. 00-210-(05)  
CASES: VTTM No. 53295  
PA No. 201000001  
PA No. 201000002  
ZC No. 00-210  
CUP No. 00-210  
OTP No. 200700018  
PKP No. 200700013



**\*\*\* INITIAL STUDY \*\*\***

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: April 27, 2010 Staff Member: Maral Tashjian

Thomas Guide: pg. 4550 USGS Quad: Newhall

**Location:** The proposed project, “Entrada,” is located west of Interstate 5 and the Old Road, south of Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park, north of the existing community of Westridge, and east of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan boundary. The APN numbers for the project are 2826-008-036, 2826-009-078, 2826-134-028.

**Description of Project:** The project proposes to create 560 lots within the tract map site area, including 1,640 dwelling units including 408 single-family residences and 1,232 multi-family residences, 726,000 square feet of commercial development interchangeable for office or retail development, an elementary school, public facilities, a public park, two private recreation centers, private drives, and natural and manufactured open space areas.

In addition to the tract map site area, the project includes off-site project-related components consisting of road improvements along portions of Magic Mountain Pkwy, Media Center Drive, Commerce Center Drive, and Westridge Parkway. Other project-related improvements consist of a water tank and booster station, sewer improvements, a water quality basin, debris basins, storm drain/flood control improvements, access roads, and off-site grading (borrow site) to the west of the project. The project proposes 8.1 million cubic yards of on-site and off-site grading, with 7.4 million cubic yards to be balanced on site.

A small portion of the project takes access from the Old Road but the majority of the site would take access from Magic Mountain Parkway, which would be extended westerly from its existing terminus, ultimately connecting with Commerce Center Drive. The extension of Westridge Parkway would provide access at the western boundary of Entrada. A network of public streets and a series of private streets and drives would provide for internal circulation and connection to Magic Mountain and Westridge Parkway.

**Gross Acres:** Project acreage is approximately 515 acres including the 382.3-acre tract map site and 132.7 acres of off-site improvements (Project Site) that are located beyond the tract map site, but are part of the project.

**Environmental Setting:** The project site is vacant and undeveloped. Some portions of the project site are crossed by dirt roads constructed for oil rig access. The access roads lead to drill pads of various size and configuration. The oil wells located at these drill pads have been abandoned and there are no active wells on the project site. The pads are generally flat and level, and often consist of areas of cut and areas of fill. Elevations on the project site range from approximately 900 feet above sea level to approximately 1,400 feet above sea level.

Native and naturalized habitats within the Entrada site are representative of those found in this region and provide examples of those plant communities found in the Santa Susana Mountains. California sagebrush scrub, undifferentiated chaparral, and annual grasslands are the major upland plant communities on the site. Ephemeral and intermittent drainages on site provide habitat for alluvial scrubs. Oak trees are present on the project site. The site is bounded by The Old Road to the east, Magic Mountain Theme Park to the north, vacant land to the west and a Southern California Edison overhead power line corridor to the south. Two pending projects “Mission Village,” Vesting Tentative Tract Map 61105 and “Legacy,” Vesting Tentative Tract Map 61996 are located westerly of the project site. Additionally, two existing Southern California Edison power pole easements (pole lines are not active) would be vacated, one Southern California Gas easement (gas line is active) would remain, and other various easements would be vacated. The San Fernando Spineflower has been documented with a portion of the Entrada project near Magic Mountain Parkway and The Old Road.

**DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS REQUESTED**

The project is requesting the following discretionary entitlements:

- a. Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM) No. 53295:** Approval of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map is requested to subdivide the Entrada site into 408 single-family lots, 39 condominium lots for multi-family units, 17 commercial lots, and lots for, among other uses, recreation, park, school site, and open space. The proposed map would subdivide the site into a total of 560 lots.
- b. General Plan Amendment No. 201000001 and 201000002:** An amendment to the Land Use Policy Map of the Countywide General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan is requested to revise land use designations. Amendment to other Countywide General Plan policy maps, including Special Management Area, Conservation and Open Space, Housing Development and Neighborhood Development and General Development Policy may also be required.

**Los Angeles Countywide General Plan:**

Existing

Land Use Designation	Acres
R (Non-Urban)	208.5
1 (Low Density Residential, 1-6 du/ac)	1.5
C (Commercial)	173.2
Total	382.3

Proposed

Land Use Designation	Acres
R (Non-Urban)	0.0
1 (Low Density Residential, 1-6 du/ac)	1.5
3 (Medium Density, 12-22 du/ac)	325.0
C (Commercial)	56.7
Total	382.3

**Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan:**

Existing

Land Use Designation	Acres
HM (Hillside Management)	234.7
N1 (Non-Urban 1, 0.5 du/ac)	41.2
U1 (Urban 1, 1.1-3.3 du/ac)	13.9
C (Commercial)	92.5
Total	382.3

Proposed:

Land Use Designation	Acres
U1 (Urban 1, 1.1-3.3 du/ac)	1.5
U2 (Urban 2, 3.4-6.6 du/ac)	140.8
U3 (Urban 3, 6.7-15 du/ac)	177.9
C (Commercial)	62.1
Total	382.3

**Zone Change No. 00-210** The Zone Change request would change the existing A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture, 5 acre minimum) and C-3 (Unlimited Commercial) zoning to RPD-5,000-4U (Residential Planned Development - 4 dwelling units per acre), RPD-5,000-8U (Residential Planned Development – 8 dwelling units per acre) and C-3-DP (Unlimited Commercial, Development Program)

**Zoning:**

Existing

Zone	Acres
A-2-5	362.0
C-3	18.8
C-R	1.5
Total	382.3

Proposed:

Zone	Acres
RPD-5000-4U	140.8
RPD-5000-8U	177.9
C-3-DP	58.2
C-3	3.9
C-R	1.5
Total	382.3

**Conditional Use Permit No. 00-210** The CUP would (a) authorize on-site and off-site grading in excess of 100,000 cubic yards, and (b) Residential Planned Development (RPD) and Development Program (-DP) zoning.

**Oak Tree Permit No. 200700018** The County Zoning Code contains provisions protecting trees of the oak genus. As a result, the removal or damage of certain "protected" oak trees is unlawful without a permit (Los Angeles County Zoning Code, Section 22.56.2050). An Oak Tree Permit is required for the removal of 65 of the 102 oak trees and encroachment into the protected dripline of 12 oak trees located on the project site.

**Parking Permit No. 200700013** The Parking Permit is requested to authorize shared and reciprocal parking across lot lines.

**Major projects in area:**

PROJECT NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

*Landmark Village (VTTM 53108); Project No. 00-196*

*1,444 residential units; elementary school; community park; and approximately 1,033,000 square feet of commercial building area*

*Mission Village (VTTM 61105); Project No. 04-181*

*4,412 residential units; elementary school; community park; and, approximately 1,555,100 square feet of commercial building area*

*Homestead (VTTM 60678); Project No. TR060678*

*5,777 residential units; 2 elementary school; and, approximately 1,250,000 square feet of commercial building area*

*Legacy (VTTM 61996); Project No. 061996*

*3,457 dwelling units, 859,647 square feet of commercial building area; community park*

*Valencia Commerce Center (PM 180108); Project No. 87150*

*3,602,168 square feet of industrial and commercial business park uses*

*Chiquita Canyon Landfill; Project No. R2004-00559*

*Public sanitary landfill*

*Sterling Industrial Map TM 060030*

*1,350,000 square feet of industrial*

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
- Caltrans
- South Coast Air Quality Management District

**Trustee Agencies**

- None
- State Fish and Game
- State Parks
- U.S. Fish and 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
- Saugus Elementary School District
- Newhall School District
- William S. Hart High School District
- Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
- Valencia Water Company
- Castaic Lake Water Agency
- City of Santa Clarita
- City of Los Angeles

**Regional Significance**

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- State Water Project
- Santa Monica Mtns. Area

**County Reviewing Agencies**

- Subdivision Committee
- DPW: Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division, Watershed Management, Traffic & Lighting, Drainage & grading
- Department of Public Health
- Fire Department
- Sheriff Department

<b><u>IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX</u></b>		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
		Less than Significant Impact/No Impact				
		Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation				
		Potentially Significant Impact				
<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>FACTOR</b>	Pg			Potential Concern	
<b>HAZARDS</b>	1. Geotechnical	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Grading Impacts</i>
	2. Flood	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Mass grading would revise existing on-site drainage patterns</i>
	3. Fire	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Located in Fire Zone 4</i>
	4. Noise	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>I-5, Magic Mountain Theme Park</i>
<b>RESOURCES</b>	1. Water Quality	13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Development impacts associated with water quality</i>
	2. Air Quality	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>The project site is in a region of nonattainment.</i>
	3. Biota	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>San Fernando Spineflower, Oak Trees</i>
	4. Cultural Resources	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Potential exists for cultural resources</i>
	5. Mineral Resources	19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Mineral resources may be contained on the project site</i>
	6. Agriculture Resources	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>There are agricultural resources on the project site</i>
	7. Visual Qualities	21	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Development would occur on primarily vacant land</i>
<b>SERVICES</b>	1. Traffic/Access	22	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Traffic would be generated where there is little to no existing traffic generation</i>
	2. Sewage Disposal	24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Adequate wastewater treatment capacity</i>
	3. Education	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>School Facility Capacity</i>
	4. Fire/Sheriff	26	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>New development would require additional fire and police services to the project sites.</i>
	5. Utilities	27	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>A 610 water assessment report would be required to analyze the availability and supply of water for the project; gas and electrical use would increase from the negligible amount used on the project site presently</i>

<b>IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX</b>		<b>ANALYSIS SUMMARY</b> (See individual pages for details)				
		Less than Significant Impact/No Impact				
		Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation				
		Potentially Significant Impact				
OTHER	1. General	29	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Environmental Safety	30	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Former oil well sites are located on the project site</i>
	3. Land Use	33	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Change from undeveloped use to mixed use development</i>
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	34	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Mixed-use development would create an increase in population, housing, and employment and result in a need for additional recreational facilities.</i>
	5. Mandatory Findings of Significance	35	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>The project has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment wildlife species, cause a wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal The project also has the possibility to create environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable and could create a substantial adverse effect. Potential air quality impacts (including climate change and green house gas) could cause substantial effects.</i>

**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 *California Environmental Quality Act (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, in as much 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 Addendum EIR is required to analyze only the factors changed or not previously addressed.

Reviewed by:  Date: June 29, 2010  
Maral Tashjian

Approved by:  Date: June 29, 2010  
Samuel Dea

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).

Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

\*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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?</p> <p><i>While the project site is not located in any known active or potentially active fault zone, all of Southern California is located in a seismically active geotechnical region. (Source: Geologic/Geotechnical Evaluation for Environmental Impact Report, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53295, Entrada, R.T Frankian &amp; Associates 2010.)</i></p>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?</p> <p><i>The Entrada site contains landslides. The landslides within the grading areas would be removed by the planned cuts and/or would be removed by the recommended remedial removals. (Source: Geologic/Geotechnical Evaluation for Environmental Impact Report, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53295, Entrada, R.T Frankian &amp; Associates 2010.)</i></p>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?</p> <p><i>Portions of the Entrada site plan have high slopes. Geologic materials within the project site include the Saugus Formation and engineered and non-engineered fill. The Saugus Formation underlies the entire site and consists of massive to well bedded, fine to coarse sandstone interbedded with matrix supported coarse sand and gravel conglomerate. Sandy siltstone is encountered locally. The rock is generally weakly cemented with alkaline earth carbonates and is friable. The rock is generally unjointed. Terrace deposits cap the Saugus Formation over several of the project planning areas. Terrace deposits consist of massive to poorly bedded sand, gravel, and silt. Cobbles and boulders are common. The unit is loose and poorly consolidated.</i></p> <p><i>Large masses of artificial fill are located on the project site. These fill masses were placed for access roads and drill pads for oil exploration. It appears that the fill was generated on site by the road cuts. The method of placement and quality of these materials is unknown. They would have to be removed and recompacted during tract grading. Certified Engineered Fill was placed during construction of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway. Surficial slope failures have been mapped on the natural slopes of the project site.</i></p>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?</p> <p><i>Liquefaction could also be experienced at isolated liquefactions prone soils (State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map- Newhall Quad). Groundwater is generally deeper than 40 feet. (Source: Geologic/Geotechnical Evaluation for Environmental Impact Report, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53295, Entrada, R.T Frankian &amp; Associates 2010.)</i></p>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?</p> <p><i>The Entrada project site includes an elementary school located south of Magic Mountain Parkway. Residential uses are also considered sensitive uses, which are proposed by the project.</i></p>
f.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?</p> <p><i>Development of the Entrada project site would require a total of 8.1 million cubic yards</i></p>

*of grading. The project site has 220.7 acres of existing slope of over 25% which is 58% of the total project area of 382.3 acres.*

---

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?

*Given surrounding soil types, it can be expected that portions of the Entrada site may contain expansive claystone beds that have been found to occur within the Saugus Formation.*

---

h.

Other factors?

*There are no other known factors for the project site.*

---

---

### 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

---

---

### 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? <i>Yes, on the northwesterly portion of the project site.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? <i>The project site is designated Zone D by FEMA, meaning it is an area in which flood hazards are undetermined but possible. (Source: FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map panel No. 06037C0815F)</i>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? <i>Given the grades on some portions of the project site there is a potential for high mudflow conditions should a landslide occur during the rainy season.</i>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off? <i>Earthwork during site development would have the potential to increase erosion and deposition during periods of heavy rain.</i>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? <i>The grading effort for the proposed project would substantially change existing drainage patterns on the site.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? <i>The project site is located downstream from Castaic Lake Dam. This dam is designed in conformance with state requirements and failure of the dam is considered extremely unlikely.</i>

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

MITIGATION MEASURES

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size     Project Design

### 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)? <i>The project site is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4).                      (Source: Los Angeles County Fire Department, 2005)</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? <i>Streets would be designed to Fire Department standards.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? <i>At project buildout, no streets within the proposed project would have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access.</i>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? <i>Presently the project site does not have adequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards, as both sites are relatively vacant properties.</i>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? <i>The project site is located adjacent to Magic Mountain Theme Park, which can be assumed to store hazardous materials such as fuels and oils.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? <i>The proposed project does not propose any use that would be considered a potentially dangerous fire hazard.</i>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>There are no other factors on the project site that would create other fire impacts.</i>

### 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

### 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?</p> <p><i>The project is located in close proximity to I-5, and portions of the project site are adjacent to Magic Mountain Parkway and Magic Mountain Entertainment Theme Park, which are high noise sources.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?</p> <p><i>The project site includes an elementary school located south of Magic Mountain Parkway. Residential uses are also considered sensitive uses, which are proposed by the project.</i></p>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>Because the project site is vacant, development of the site would substantially increase existing ambient noise levels. It can be expected that the project would generate normal traffic sounds of residential living, commercial parking lot noise, recreational game noise, and elementary school noises.</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?</p> <p><i>The project may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels.</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>The proposed project would not generate other noise factors not examined above.</i></p>

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

Noise Control (Title 12 – Chapter 8)                       Uniform Building Code (Title 26 - 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?</p> <p><i>The proposed project would discharge stormwater and runoff to Santa Clara River Reach 5. Reach 5 of the Santa Clara River is listed for chloride, coliform, and nitrate-nitrogen plus nitrite-nitrogen. A gauging station is located in the Santa Clara River to test for constituent impacts. (A gauging station is a location used by hydrologists or environmental scientists to monitor and test terrestrial bodies of water. Various hydrometry readings are made at gauging stations such as volumetric flow rate and water quality). The proposed project would not use individual/private water wells.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?</p> <p><i>The proposed project would not use a private sewage disposal system.</i></p>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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 <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?</p>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>Sediments from construction activities could create turbidity issues in stormwater runoff. A Water Quality Technical Report will be prepared for the project.</i></p>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>Post-development activities could potentially degrade the quality of stormwater runoff and contribute pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and receiving water bodies. A Water Quality Technical Report will be prepared for the project.</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to water quality impacts.</i></p>

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

- Industrial Waste Permit
  - Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
  - MITIGATION MEASURES**
  - Lot Size
  - Project Design
  - Compatible Use
  - Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
  - NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)
  - OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**
- 
- 

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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)?</p> <p><i>The project proposes 1,640 dwelling units and 726,000 square feet of commercial development, interchangeable for office or retail development.</i></p>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?</p> <p><i>The project proposes one elementary school, which is considered a sensitive use that would be located in relatively close proximity to I-5. Residential uses are also considered sensitive uses, which are proposed by the project.</i></p>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>Given that the project site is located in an area of non-attainment it can be expected that certain AQMD thresholds of significance would be exceeded.</i></p>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?</p> <p><i>Given the amount of grading proposed to develop the project site (8.1 million cubic yards), the amount of dust generated could be considered excessive.</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p> <p><i>The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.</i></p>
f.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p> <p><i>It is expected that the project would exceed certain air quality standards and would contribute to exceedance of certain air quality standards in the Santa Clarita basin. Please see response "c" above.</i></p>
g.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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)?</p> <p><i>The proposed project would contribute cumulatively to the Santa Clarita basin, which is presently in nonattainment status. The South Coast Air Basin is currently classified by the U.S. EPA as a severe-17 nonattainment area for the 8-hour O<sub>3</sub> standard, and a serious nonattainment area for PM<sub>10</sub>. The Basin is also classified as nonattainment for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The California Air Resources Board has designated the Basin as extreme nonattainment for O<sub>3</sub> with respect to the 1-hour standard, and a nonattainment area for PM<sub>10</sub>.</i></p>
h.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>Green House Gases/Global Climate Change will be addressed in the EIR.</i></p>

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Project Design     Air Quality Report

---

---

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?</p> <p><i>The project site is not located within an SEA. The project site is relatively undisturbed and natural area.</i></p>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?</p> <p><i>Grading and fire clearance would remove substantial amounts of natural habitat areas.</i></p>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is a drainage course located on the project site that is depicted on USGS quad sheets by a dashed blue line or that may contain a bed, channel, or bank of any perennial, intermittent or ephemeral river, stream, or lake?</p> <p><i>An Unnamed channel may touch the northwestern-most property boundary of the project site.</i></p>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?</p> <p><i>Coastal scrub, Chaparral scrub, Alluvial scrub, and Big Sagebrush scrub are present on the project site.</i></p>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?</p> <p><i>An oak tree survey conducted on the project site includes trees within the project boundary, in off-site locations where development associated with the project would occur and within 200 feet of proposed grading activity. An Oak Tree Permit is required for the removal of 65 of the 102 oak trees and encroachment into the protected dripline of 12 oak trees located on the project site.</i></p>

- f.    Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?  
*The project site has the following known sensitive species located on-site or in the project area:*
- *Mainland cherry* (*Prunus ilicifolia ssp. Ilicifolia*)
  - *Parish's sagebrush* (*Artemisia tridentata ssp. Parishii*)
  - *Peirson's morning-glory* (*Calystegia peirsonii*)
  - *Slender mariposa lily* (*Calochortus clavatus var. gracilis*)
  - *Southern California black walnut* (*Juglans californica var. californica*)
  - *San Fernando Valley spineflower*, *Cooper's Hawk* (*Accipiter cooperii*), *Golden Eagle* (*Aquila chrysaetos*)
  - *Loggerhead Shrike* (*Lanius ludovicianus*)
  - *Turkey Vulture* (*Cathartes aura*), *White-Tailed Kite* (*Elanus leucurus*)
  - *Black-Crowned Night-Heron* (*Nycticorax nycticorax*), *Nuttall's Woodpecker* (*Picoides nuttallii*)
  - *Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo* (*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*)
  - *Yellow Warbler* (*Dendroica petechia brewsteri*)
  - *California Horned Lark* (*Eremophila alpestris*)
  - *Allen's Hummingbird* (*Selasphorus sasin*)
  - *Costa's Hummingbird* (*Calypte costae*)
  - *Southern California Rufous-Crowned Sparrow* (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*)
  - *Oak Titmouse* (*Baeolophus inornatus*), *Western Red Bat* (*Lasiurus blossevillii*)
  - *Yuma Myotis* (*Myotis yumanensis*), *Monarch Butterfly* (*Danaus plexippus*)
  - *San Diego Desert Woodrat* (*Neotoma lepida*)
  - *Mule Deer* (*Odocoileus hemionus*)

- g.    Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?  
*Wildlife corridors and open space linkages are limited as a result of existing and proposed development. The Magic Mountain Theme Park, I-5 freeway, and Westridge community exist to the north, east, and south of the project site. The proposed Legacy and Mission Village developments to the northwest and southwest would also impede wildlife movement.*

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size

Project Design

ERB/SEATAC Review

Oak Tree Permit

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>There are oak trees on the project site. Known cultural resources are located within approximately 1.25 miles north of the project site.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? <i>The project site could contain rock formations that might indicate the potential for paleontological resources.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? <i>The project site could contain known historic structures or sites.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? <i>The proposed project could have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5 because there are no known historical or archaeological resources exist on the site.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? <i>The project would not directly or indirectly destroy any known unique paleontological resource, site, or feature.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to archaeological, cultural, and paleontologic impacts.</i>

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size

Project Design

Phase 1 Archaeology Report

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>The project site contains 13 inactive and abandoned oil wells. Abandoned oil wells will be addressed in the Entrada EIR under Hazardous Materials.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>The project site is not identified as a "locally-important mineral resource recovery site" or a "regionally significant construction aggregate resource area" by the County of Los Angeles General Plan, or the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan.</i>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>The project site is located in the MRZ-3 zone, which indicates that mineral deposits are expected to occur in this area, but the extent of such deposits is unknown at this time.</i>

MITIGATION MEASURES

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size

Project Design

---

---

### 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the project site is predominantly categorized as "Grazing Land," with some "Prime Farmland" area to the northwest. There are also some areas categorized "Urban and Built-up Land" and "Other Land."</i></p>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p> <p><i>The project site does not contain a Williamson Act holding. There are no lands covered by the Williamson Act in Los Angeles County. However the site is zoned for agricultural use.</i></p>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>The project site is not located adjacent to any sites that would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>The proposed project could result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use</i></p>

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size

Project Design

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?  <i>The project site is visible from The Old Road and I-5. The section of I-5 adjacent to the site is designated as a First Priority Scenic Route (Proposed for Further Study) by the Los Angeles County General Plan; however, no development restrictions are associated with this designation.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?  <i>The proposed project would not be substantially visible or obstruct views from a regional hiking or riding trail.</i></p>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?  <i>While there are no unique aesthetics features on the project site, the site is undeveloped in a developing area.</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?  <i>Project mix and style, including bulk and height and bulk would not be considered out of scale with projects presently being proposed on the Mission Village project site of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area and the existing Westridge development.</i></p>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?  <i>The transformation of the currently undeveloped site into a residential and commercial center and changes in the night sky over the project site from nighttime illumination may be noticeable to motorists traveling within the I-5 corridor. Direct views of the site, however, would be limited to a few areas on the site and to a non-sensitive (motoring) audience. However, those areas of the project site adjacent to the Magic Mountain Theme Park would create negligible nighttime light and glare sources given the existing light sources at the amusement facility.</i></p>
f.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?  <i>The viewshed would be substantially altered with the movement of 8.1 million cubic yard of earth.</i></p>

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size

Project Design

Visual Report

Compatible Use

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project contain 25 dwelling units or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?</p> <p><i>The proposed project consists of 1,640 dwelling units including 408 single-family residences and 1,232 multi-family apartments/condominiums.</i></p> <hr/>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?</p> <p><i>The proposed project roadway system would be designed to County of Los Angeles roadway standards that when implemented would consequently avoid hazardous traffic conditions.</i></p> <hr/>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?</p> <p><i>Although it is anticipated that parking would be provided to meet or exceed that required by the Los Angeles County Zoning Code to serve all proposed uses, it is expected that not all off-street, required parking would be located on the same lot as the use it is intended to serve. Instead, the parking may be off site, or on an adjacent or nearby lot or private drive, but conveniently accessible. Therefore, a parking permit has been requested to allow for off-site and reciprocal parking between lots.</i></p> <p><i>A shared parking permit has been requested in the event that future uses are found to be able to appropriately share parking due to the nature of the uses or the ability of the employers to provide incentives to limit the number of parking spaces needed. At this time, it is impossible to determine precisely how such a shared parking arrangement would work as specific uses have not been established but at such time as specific uses are determined, a parking plan based on a parking demand study could be prepared and submitted. Such a parking plan would demonstrate the need for less than required parking based on established criteria or alternatively may propose options for adding parking, such as construction of a parking structure or other parking facility.</i></p> <hr/>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?</p> <p><i>The proposed project roadway system would be designed to County of Los Angeles roadway standards that when implemented would consequently provide adequate access during an emergency.</i></p> <hr/>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>Because the project proposes 1,640 dwelling units, and the project is located in a heavily trafficked area, the project may contribute to CMP impacts.</i></p> <hr/>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?</p> <p><i>The proposed project, by its design, would not conflict with adopted policies by plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. Bus stops and bike lanes have been incorporated into the Entrada VTTM.</i></p>

g.    Other factors?  
*There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to traffic/access impacts.*

---

**MITIGATION MEASURES**                       **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**  
 Project Design     Traffic Report                       Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

---

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant? <i>The projected capacity of the Saugus and Valencia Wastewater Reclamation Plant (WRP) is 37.1 million gallons per day (mgd), which would include the combined permitted capacity of 19.1 mgd plus 18.0 mgd of projected future capacity available at the existing plant sites. Analysis in the EIR would be required to determine if there is capacity available.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? <i>There are existing sewer lines in The Old Road and along Magic Mountain Parkway. It is expected that an approximately 24 inch sewer line located in Magic Mountain Parkway would be required to serve the proposed project and other projects.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to sewage disposal impacts. Septic tanks would not be allowed within the project.</i>

### 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? <i>It is unknown if capacity impacts would be experienced at the district level. An elementary school is proposed for the project site. A portion of the site is located in the Newhall School District and a portion is located in the Saugus Union School District and the William S. Hart High School District.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site? <i>An elementary school site is proposed on the project site that would serve not only the project site but surrounding communities as necessary.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create student transportation problems? <i>It is unknown if students from nearby communities would be required to attend these schools and whether transportation for students would be a problem.</i>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? <i>An increased population associated with the proposed project, would consequently generate an increased demand for library services.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to education impacts.</i>

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?</p> <p><i>The project proposed both residential and commercial/office uses. Consequently, traffic would be generated and traffic collisions would most likely occur. The increase in the number of persons at the site would generate the need for medical assistance by fire personnel and for fire suppression emergencies.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?</p> <p><i>There are no known special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the projects or the general area.</i></p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to Fire/Sheriff Services impacts.</i></p>

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Fire Mitigation Fee

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>A will-serve letter has been received from the Valencia Water Company indicating that adequate water is available for the proposed project.</i></p>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?</p> <p><i>The project site is located in an area with a known and adequate water supply. However, since there is no development on the site, there is no existing water pressure on the site to meet fire fighting needs.</i></p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?</p> <p><i>The rate of use of gas and electricity would increase when compared to existing conditions.</i></p>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?</p> <p><i>Solid waste disposal is considered a finite resource in the County of Los Angeles. The proposed project would generate solid waste and contribute to limited capacity of landfills.</i></p>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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)?</p> <p><i>Development of the project site would create a demand for parkland use. See above regarding provision of utilities, roads, fire/police services, schools, libraries, etc.</i></p>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to utilities/other services impacts.</i></p>

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources? <i>The proposed project would be required to be constructed to the latest energy and building standards. Consequently, it is expected that there would not be an inefficient use of energy resources.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community? <i>The project site is currently a vacant parcel. As proposed, the project would change the character of the site. However, the project is located adjacent to existing development. The adjacent areas to the site include both commercial and residential uses—both of which are proposed on the Entrada site. While development of the site would result in major changes, these changes are consistent with the character and scale of the adjacent community (existing and proposed).</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land? <i>The project site is used for grazing and the off-site water quality basin is located on irrigated agricultural land.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to general impacts.</i>

**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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on site?<br><i>A progress report on oil well issues on the project site was prepared on December 8, 2006. Oil wells were located using geophysical and other methods as they were not located under the identified standpipes. After each well was located, the well covers were removed by a certified oil-field welder. The excavations were prepared for Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) leak testing by laying back the slopes and creating a DOGGR compliant access ramp. DOGGR leak tested each well on September 27, 2005. No wells were noted by DOGGR as leaking. Each well head was marked for future access using a sucker rod and identifier plate welded to the well head cover. The excavations were backfilled but not compacted.</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on site?<br><i>The project does not propose to use any pressurized tanks or to store hazardous wastes on site.</i>   |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?<br><i>Residential units would be located within 500 feet of the project boundary.</i>   |

d.

---

Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?

*The quality of the groundwater available from the Alluvial aquifer upstream of the project site has been tested. The wells expected to be used are approved by the State Department of Public Health (DPH) and are located just northeast of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site in the Valencia Commerce Center. Laboratory testing completed in July 2009 indicates that all constituents tested were at acceptable levels for drinking water under Title 22. Tests conducted for perchlorate indicated “non-detect,” meaning no perchlorate was detected. Groundwater monitoring in Alluvial aquifer wells has shown both chloride and nitrate concentrations to be below (better than) the Basin Plan groundwater objectives. The Basin Plan includes groundwater quality objectives for various constituents. These objectives are designed to protect groundwater for municipal drinking water purposes. As to the potential affect that water disinfection would have on the quality of water found in the Santa Clara River and local groundwater supplies, Valencia Water Company disinfects its groundwater supply with calcium hypochlorite (65 percent available chlorine) to an average dosage of not more than 0.5 mg/L. Valencia indicates that the use of calcium hypochlorite to disinfect groundwater would slightly increase the level of chloride found in groundwater and would still be far below the secondary maximum contaminant level (MCL) for chloride of 250 mg/L. Methyl-Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE) has been a concern for the past several years, and on May 17, 2000, DPH adopted a primary MCL for MTBE of 0.013 mg/L. CLWA and the local water purveyors have been testing for MTBE since 1997 and, to date, have not detected it in any of the production wells.*

*Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) are a measure of the dissolved cations and anions, primarily inorganic salts (calcium, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chlorides, and sulfates). High TDS levels can impair agricultural, municipal supply, and groundwater recharge beneficial uses. Results from laboratory testing conducted for the Valencia Water Company wells show that TDS levels range from 890 to 900 milligrams per liter (mg/l), which meets all water quality standards for drinking water, including the secondary standards for TDS.1*

e.

---

Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?

*During the construction phase of the proposed project, there would be petrochemical products used in association with the operation of construction equipment, and various paint products associated finishing operations. It is anticipated that these materials would be used, handled, and stored in compliance with local and state guidelines. These materials would be removed from the project site once construction has been completed. During the operational phase of the project, some types of hazardous materials could be used by the industrial and commercial uses (for example, a dry cleaning establishment would use perchloroethylene). However, these uses would require permits to uses these substances, and it is not anticipated that there would be a substantial volume of hazardous materials used, produced, handled, or stored on the project site.*

---

f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p> <p><i>The proposed project would not permit activities or uses that would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within 0.25 mile of a school.</i></p>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>It is not known if the project site is included on a list of hazardous material sites as compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would as a result, cause a significant hazard to the public or environment.</i></p>
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public or private airport. A private airstrip was located on the Airport Mesa portion of the Mission Village site, which is in the vicinity of the project. The use of the site as an airstrip has been discontinued.</i></p>
i.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p> <p><i>The Entrada project is not designed in such a manner that would impact implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</i></p>
j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to environmental safety impacts.</i></p>

MITIGATION MEASURES

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Toxic Clean-up Plan

## 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?</p> <p><i>Present Los Angeles Countywide General Plan include: R (Non-Urban), C (Commercial); Community/Area Wide: N1 (Non-Urban 1 1-5 du/acre), HM (Hillside Management, U1 (Urban 1 1.-3.3 du/acre) and C (Commercial). The project proposes to change to U2 (Urban 2) 3.3-6.6 du/acre; C (Commercial), and so long as those amendments are approved, the project would be consistent.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?</p> <p><i>Existing zoning designations include: A-2-5 and C-3. Proposed zoning designations include: RPD-5,000-4U; RPD-5,000-8U and C-3-DP. So long as those amendments are approved, the project would be consistent.</i></p>
c.				<p>Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:</p>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Hillside Management Criteria?</p> <p><i>The proposed project is not in conformance with the Hillside Management Criteria, but would be consistent with approval of the zone change request.</i></p>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>SEA Conformance Criteria?</p> <p><i>The project does not encroach into an SEA.</i></p>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other?</p> <p><i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to land use/zoning consistency impacts.</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project physically divide an established community?</p> <p><i>The project site is vacant; therefore the proposed project would not physically divide an established community.</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to land use/zoning consistency impacts.</i></p>

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?</p> <p><i>The proposed project, once developed with residential units, would increase the population of the project area. Further analysis is required to determine if the proposed project would exceed official regional or local populations.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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)?</p> <p><i>All of the vacant undeveloped areas surrounding the project site have been planned for development activities. The proposed project is adjacent to planned or existing development. Given that the project is proposed adjacent to undeveloped land (although previously approved for development); the project does not have the potential to induce substantial direct or indirect growth.</i></p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?</p> <p><i>There is no development on the project site; therefore the project would not displace existing housing.</i></p>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?</p> <p><i>The project proposes both residential and commercial/office uses on the project site, which would provide employment opportunities. The project is in close proximity to the Valencia Commerce Center which is located immediately east of the I-5.</i></p>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?</p> <p><i>Because the proposed project would construct housing units, the need for recreational facilities would be realized. The project proposes a park and two private recreational areas to meet that need.</i></p>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p> <p><i>The project site is vacant and would not displace any persons requiring relocation.</i></p>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>There are no other known factors associated with the project that would contribute to population/housing/employment/recreation impacts.</i></p>

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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?</p> <p><i>There is the potential for the project to substantially degrade wildlife populations and impact the number of rare or endangered species.</i></p>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p> <p><i>The environmental topical areas of traffic, air quality, noise, biology, and water quality have the potential to be individually limited but cumulatively considerable.</i></p>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> <p><i>The project has the potential to create substantial adverse environmental effects as a result of noise, water quality, and air quality on human being, either directly or indirectly.</i></p>

### 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