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1. INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code Section 21081, and the Guidelines for Implementation for the California Environmental Quality Act, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15091 ("State CEQA Guidelines") require that a public agency consider the environmental impacts of a project before a project is approved and make specific findings. Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[].” The same statute provides that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.” Section 21002 goes on to provide that “in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof.”

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 specifically provides as follows:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can or should be adopted by such other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.
(b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) The finding in subdivision (a) (2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

(d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a) (1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

(e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 further provides as follows:

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposal project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

(b) Where the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/ or other information in the record. This statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.” CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: “legal" considerations. (See also Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of
Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565 (Goleta II.). The concept of “feasibility” also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (City of Del Mar); Sierra Club v. County of Napa (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509 [court upholds CEQA findings rejecting alternatives in reliance on applicant’s project objectives]; see also California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 (CNPS) [“an alternative ‘may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives as long as the finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record’"] [quoting Kostka & Zischke, Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act [Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed. 2009] (Kostka), § 17.39, p. 825]; In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166 (Bay-Delta) [“[i]n the CALFED program, feasibility is strongly linked to achievement of each of the primary project objectives”; “a lead agency may structure its EIR alternative analysis around a reasonable definition of underlying purpose and need not study alternatives that cannot achieve that basic goal”].) Moreover, “feasibility’ under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.” (City of Del Mar, supra, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; see also CNPS, supra, 177 Cal.App.4th at p. 1001 [“an alternative that ‘is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint’ may be rejected as infeasible”] [quoting Kostka, supra, § 17.29, p. 824]; San Diego Citizenry Group v. County of San Diego (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 1, 17.)

For purposes of these findings (including the table described below), the term “avoid” refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. Although CEQA Guidelines section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is “avoid[ed] or substantially lessen[ed],” these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been “avoided” (i.e., reduced to a less than significant level).

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a), (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project’s “benefits” rendered “acceptable” its “unavoidable adverse environmental effects.” (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, “[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (Goleta II, supra,
52 Cal.3d at p. 576.) The EIR for the Project concluded the Project would create any significant and unavoidable impacts; thus, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

These findings constitute the County of Los Angeles’ (County’s) best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. To the extent that these findings conclude that various mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the County hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the County adopts a resolution approving the Project.

In addition, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the Project, and is being approved by the Board of Supervisors by the same Resolution that has adopted these findings. The County will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is attached to and incorporated into the environmental document approval resolution and is approved in conjunction with certification of the EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") and the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the Centennial Specific Plan Project (collectively, the “EIR”), State Clearinghouse ("SCH") No. 2004031072, as well as other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles ("County") in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency hereby finds, determines, and declares the following Findings and Facts, in accordance with Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code.

These Findings set forth the environmental basis for the discretionary actions to be undertaken by the County for the development of the Project. These actions include the approval of the following for the Centennial Specific Plan Project:

- Environmental Impact report (County Project No. 02-232)(SCH No. 2004041072)
- Centennial Specific Plan No. 02-232
- General Plan Amendment No. 02-232
- Zone Change No. 02-232
- Conditional Use Permits No. 02-232
- Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 060022
- Development Agreement No. RPPL2016003940

These actions are collectively referred to herein as the Project.
A. Document Format

These Findings have been organized into the following sections:

(1) Section 1 provides an introduction to these Findings.

(2) Section 2 provides a summary of the Project, overview of the discretionary actions required for approval of the Project, and a statement of the Project’s objectives.

(3) Section 3 provides a summary of environmental review related to the Project and a summary of public participation in the environmental review for the Project.

(4) Section 4 sets forth findings regarding the potential impact areas identified in the EIR for which the County has determined that there is no impact or the impact is less than significant. Because there is either no or a less than significant impact, no mitigation is required.

(5) Section 5 sets forth findings regarding potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR that the County has determined can be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures. In order to ensure compliance and implementation, all of the mitigation measures will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) for the Project and adopted as conditions of the Project by the Lead Agency. Where potentially significant impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level through mitigation, these findings specify how those impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level.

(6) Section 6 sets forth findings regarding those significant or potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR that will or may result from the Project and which the County has determined will remain significant and unavoidable, despite the identification and incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures.

(7) Section 7 sets forth findings regarding alternatives to the Project.

(8) Section 8 sets forth findings regarding the growth-inducing impacts of the Project.

(9) Section 9 sets for findings regarding recirculation of the Draft EIR.

(10) Section 10 contains the findings pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.1(c)(3).
B. Custodian and Location of Records

The Centennial Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report for County Project No. 02-232 (SCH No. 2004031072) consists of:

1. Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) And Appendices 2.0-A through 5.20-A, dated May, 2017

2. Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) dated May, 2018

3. Consolidated Final EIR dated November, 2018 (responds to all comments received during the official comment period, and while not required by CEQA, responds in writing to all further correspondence and testimony received by the County after the close of the official comment period but before the Board of Supervisors’ scheduled December 11, 2018 hearing on the Project; provides in one place all clarifications, corrections, and minor revisions to the text, tables, figures, and appendices of the Draft EIR and Final EIR, generated either from responses to comments or independently by the County, including those identified in the Final EIR dated May, 2018, and those identified subsequent to publication of the Final EIR but before the Board of Supervisors’ scheduled December 11, 2018 hearing)

The following findings of fact are based in part on the information contained in the Draft EIR, Final EIR, and Consolidated Final EIR (together, the EIR) for the Project, as well as additional facts found in the complete record of proceedings. The EIR is hereby incorporated by reference and is available for review at the County of Los Angeles, Land Divisions Section, Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, during normal business hours.

For the purposes of CEQA, and the findings herein set forth, the administrative record for the Project consists of those items listed in Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e). The record of proceedings for the County’s decision on the Project consists of the following documents, at a minimum, which are incorporated by reference and made part of the record supporting these findings:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the Project;
- The Draft EIR for the Project and all documents relied upon or incorporated by reference;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the 45-day comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All comments and correspondence submitted to the County during the public comment period on the Draft EIR, in addition to all other timely comments on the Draft EIR;
• The Final EIR for the Project, including the Planning Commission staff report, minutes of the Planning Commission public hearing; Board of Supervisors staff report; minutes of the Board of Supervisors public hearing; comments received on the Draft EIR; the County’s responses to those comments; technical appendices; and all documents relied upon or incorporated by reference;
• The mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) for the Project;
• All findings and resolutions adopted by the County in connection with the Project, and all documents cited or referred to therein;
• All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the County, consultants to the County, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the County’s compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County’s action on the Project;
• All documents submitted to the County by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project, up through the close of the public hearing;
• Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the County in connection with the Project;
• Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the County at such information sessions, public meetings and public hearings;
• All resolutions adopted by the County regarding the Project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;
• The County’s General Plan and applicable Specific Plans and all updates and related environmental analyses;
• Matters of common knowledge to the County, including, but not limited to Federal, State, and local laws and regulations;
• The County’s Zoning Code;
• Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and
• Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record for the County’s actions related to the Project are at the County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The County is the custodian of the Administrative Record for the Project.

The County has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decisions on the proposed Project even if not every document was formally presented to the Board of Supervisors or County Staff as part of the County files generated in connection with the Project. Without exception, any documents set forth above not found in the Project files fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions of which the Board of Supervisors was aware in approving the Project. (See City of Santa Cruz
v. Local Agency Formation Commission (1978) 76 Cal.App.3d 381, 391-391; Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, fn. 6.) Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to County Staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors as final decision makers. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the County's decisions relating to approval of the Project. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21167.6, subd. (e)(10); Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866; Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155.)

2. PROJECT SUMMARY

A. Project Location

The Project is proposed on approximately 12,323 acres (19.3 square miles) of land in the northwestern portion of the Antelope Valley in unincorporated Los Angeles County. The Project site is located approximately 35 miles north of the City of Santa Clarita in Los Angeles County; approximately 50 miles south of the City of Bakersfield in Kern County via State Route (SR) 99 and Interstate (I) 5; and approximately 36 and 43 miles west of the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, respectively, in Los Angeles County via SR-138. SR-138 runs through the southern portion of the Project site, which is located approximately one mile east of I-5, just south of the Kern County/Los Angeles County boundary in the vicinity of Quail Lake. The community of Gorman in Los Angeles County is adjacent to I-5 and is approximately four miles north of the I-5/SR-138 junction. The community of Neenach is located approximately 1.2 miles to the east of the Project boundary. The West Branch of the State Water Project’s (SWP) California Aqueduct bisects the Project.

The Tehachapi Mountains border the northern and western perimeter of the Project site, and the San Gabriel Mountains are located to the south of the Project site. The Project site's topography is comprised largely of low rolling hills, with areas of steeper slopes and higher elevations in the western and northwestern portions of the site. Elevations range from approximately 2,975 feet above mean sea level (msl) to approximately 3,635 feet above msl. The Project site has been primarily used for livestock grazing for more than 150 years. In addition to cattle grazing, the Tejon Ranch Company owns and cultivates approximately 1,000 acres in the eastern portion of the Project site. Existing development is limited to a few paved access roads to the California Aqueduct and through the site to the National Cement Plant, which is located approximately one mile north of the Project site. There are also unpaved ranch roads, fencing, stock ponds, and a few electrical transmission lines.

B. Project Description

The Project site encompasses approximately 12,323 acres and would allow up to 19,333 dwelling units (du) on approximately 4,987 gross acres of land designated for residential uses. Other land uses include approximately 7,363,818 square feet (sf) of Business Park uses (office, research and development, and warehousing or light manufacturing uses) on approximately 597 gross acres and approximately 1,034,550 sf of Commercial uses on
approximately 102 acres. Proposed Institutional/Civic land uses (such as schools for higher education, medical facilities, library, and other civic uses) encompass approximately 1,568,160 sf on approximately 110 acres. Project buildout would be implemented in phases based on future market conditions over an approximate 20-year period through a series of future tract and parcel maps.

The Project includes the development of nine Villages that will each contain a mix of land uses that enable residents to live near schools, shopping, neighborhood businesses and services, civic buildings, medical facilities, and employment centers. The Project includes a mix of housing options within each Village, ranging from apartment homes close to Town Centers to single-family homes in lower-density areas. A full range of light industrial, business, and other commercial uses are planned that are intended to yield a broad range of employment opportunities, from retail services to large corporate employers. The opportunities for employment diversity increase the overall economic sustainability of the Project and the West EOA.

The Project includes approximately 130,680 sf of Recreation/Entertainment Overlay uses (clubhouse, farmers market, childcare facilities, health clubs) on approximately 75 acres. Proposed sites for major Utility facilities that would serve the entire community (e.g., two wastewater reclamation facilities, water treatment facility, water bank, materials recovery facility, maintenance yards for the Public Works and Parks and Recreation Departments, and animal control facility) encompass approximately 191 acres. The School Overlay includes Kindergarten through 12th grade schools located on approximately 146 acres. Approximately 5,624 acres (approximately 45.6 percent) of the 12,323-acre Project site are proposed for Open Space for natural resource protection and greenways, and 163 acres are included in the Park Overlay for active and passive recreational use.

The Project also includes a vehicular and a non-vehicular circulation system. In support of the Antelope Valley Area Plan’s (AVAP’s) goal of reducing single-occupancy vehicle use, the Project includes alternatives to automobile travel (e.g., public transit, bicycle network, and pedestrian system) that would minimize traffic, pollution, and greenhouse gases. Efficient use of land and a balance of uses that result in a jobs/housing balance would reduce single-occupancy automobile travel and vehicle miles traveled. The Project provides for an integrated network of roadways and walking and biking trails to reduce automotive use and facilitate safe and efficient travel. An extensive network of sidewalks, greenway trails (approximately 13 miles), and community trails (approximately 60 miles) would link residential, schools, shopping, and employment areas.

In support of the AVAP’s prioritization for the preservation of natural open space resources, development in areas of significant biological value would be minimized and there would be no disturbance or development within the designated Significant Ecological Area (SEA) on the Project site. Of the 12,323 acres within the Project site, approximately 5,624 acres would be included in the Open Space land use designation. Of the 5,624 acres of designated Open Space, approximately 5,116 acres (42 percent of the total Project site) are intended to (1) remain in their original natural condition; (2) be restored; and/or (3) be enhanced by weed abatement, fencing, and native species planting, among other means. Of this amount,
approximately 3,866 acres are designated as SEA 17 to be preserved in perpetuity within the Project site boundaries. The preservation also protects local wildlife movement on and offsite because these areas are positioned contiguous to off-site open space areas, thereby providing a larger total area of continuous preserved open space for local wildlife to use as habitat and for movement. No Project development would occur within SEA 17. Additionally, approximately 39,213 acres of off-site areas would be set aside for preservation to mitigate Project impacts to biological resources.

C. Discretionary Actions

Implementation of the Project within the County will require several actions by the County, including:

- **Environmental Impact Report (County Project No. 02-232)(SCH No. 2004041072)** Certification of an EIR to evaluate the environmental impacts from the Project, in accordance with the CEQA, as amended (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.);

- **Centennial Specific Plan 02-232** regulates development through the Land Use Plan, the Land Use Matrix (including permitted uses), and the development standards and regulations in conjunction with Titles 21 and 22 of the Los Angeles County Code. The Specific Plan has been prepared in compliance with the AVAP requirement for such a plan for development in the West EOA. The Centennial Specific Plan is a regulatory document that would be considered for adoption by either resolution (as policy) or by ordinance, by the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors. Upon adoption of the Centennial Specific Plan, the development standards and zoning of the Centennial Specific Plan become the zoning for the site. Chapters 1 through 4 of the Centennial Specific Plan would be adopted by ordinance. Several appendices to the Centennial Specific Plan are also requested to be adopted by the County by ordinance or resolution. Appendix 1 to the Centennial Specific Plan includes two appendices that would be adopted by ordinance: Appendix 1-A, Definitions and Appendix 1-D, Standard Centennial Subdivision Map Notes. While it is anticipated that Appendix 1-D will be adopted by ordinance at this time, the County may decide to adopt Appendix 1-D by resolution at the time of Project approval. Appendix 1-B, Green Development Program, and Appendix 2-A and 2-B, would be adopted by Resolution. Under either scenario, the Regional Planning Commission, or the Board of Supervisors if the Regional Planning Commission's decision is appealed, would seek to incorporate the standard subdivision map notes governing development of the Project on each approved tentative map subdividing a portion of the Project Site.

- **Zone Change No. 02-232** from O-S (Open Space) A-1-2 (Light Agricultural – Two Acre Minimum Required Lot Area), RPD (Residential Planned Development), CPD-DP (Commercial Planned Development – Development Program); and MPD-DP (Manufacturing Industrial Planned Development – Development Program), to SP (Specific Plan). Approval of the zone change and concurrent adoption of the
Centennial Specific Plan would establish the Specific Plan’s land use categories as the underlying zoning.

- **General Plan Amendment No. 02-232** to AVAP and County Highway Plan. In compliance with the County’s Specific Plan requirements and State law, the Project Applicant/Developer is requesting a General Plan Amendment to amend the AVAP and County General Plan Highway Plan by adding the major highways, secondary highways, limited secondary highways, parkways, and expressways that are proposed on the Project site to serve the circulation needs of development and that meet the criteria for being included in the AVAP Highway Plan (Map 3.1 of the AVAP) and County General Plan (Figure 7.3 of the County General Plan). This amendment would reflect the location of the project’s internal circulation network of roadways, as provided in the Centennial Specific Plan. This amendment would not change the land use designations, allowable development or open space areas in the AVAP or General Plan.

- **Conditional Use Permit No. 02-232** for exceeding 100,000 cubic yards per Los Angeles County Code Section 22.56.217, and for approval of Project-related infrastructure, including roadway circulation system, gas, telephone, cable and internet and electrical lines within road right-of-way, a water system including domestic and recycled water tanks and pipelines and accessory booster pumps and storage ponds, sewage disposal pipelines and waste water reclamation facilities, water banks, water wells, flood control and drainage facilities, water treatment facilities, wireless communication facilities, green waste composting, solid waste and materials recovery facilities and recycling centers and an electrical substation.

- **Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 060022** for finance and conveyance purposes. Commonly referred to as “Financing Maps”, this form of Parcel Map creates legal parcels that can be used as security to help finance infrastructure and other improvements. A Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (VTPM) does not authorize the creation of residential or commercial lots, nor does it permit construction of new buildings.

- **Development Agreement No. RPPL2016003940**. Under state law, a DA is a voluntary agreement, adopted by ordinance, between the County and the project proponent. Development Agreement No. RPPL2016003940 would be a voluntary agreement between the County, Tejon Ranchcorp, and Centennial Founders LLC. The Agreement provides assurances that the public benefits and the Project identified in the agreement will be achieved and developed in accordance with applicable County rules and the Project Approvals. The Development Agreement terms include: the description of the Project, the Developer’s obligation to provide public benefits, the duration and vesting of the Development Agreement and Project Permits, the termination date of the Development Agreement, and reporting requirements under the Development Agreement. Prior to Project implementation, the following regulatory permits must be approved from the following entities:
Permits and approvals will be required from the following other agencies:

- **US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).** The Project would require a USACE Section 404 permit for impacts to areas determined to be "Waters of the United States."

- **Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).** The Project would require a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW pursuant to Sections 1600 and Sections 2081 of the California Fish and Wildlife Code.

- **Department of Transportation (Caltrans).** Activities located within Caltrans right-of-way (described previously) would require an Encroachment Permit and must be in compliance with the Caltrans Statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit.

- **Department of Water Resources (DWR).** The Project would require an Encroachment Permit from DWR for two bridge crossings of the California Aqueduct ("A" Street and "B" Street), as well as for the crossing of potable and recycled water pipes.

- **State Water Resources Control Board, Water Division of Drinking Water (DDW).** A permit to operate a public water system for the potable water distribution system on the Project site would be required from the SWRCB’s Water Division of Drinking Water (DDW).

- **Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Lahontan RWQCB) and Los Angeles Region (Los Angeles RWQCB).** Lahontan RWQCB and Los Angeles Region RWQCB approvals will be required for the following activities within their respective areas of the Project site:
  - Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for the fill or alteration of “waters of the State” on the Project site located in Lahontan RWQCB’s jurisdiction.
  - WDRs and Wastewater Reclamation Requirements or a Master Reclamation Permit for approval and operation of the two proposed WRFs.
  - Water Quality Certifications under Section 401 of the Federal Clean Water Act.

- **South Coast and Antelope Valley Air Quality Management Districts.** Approximately 85 percent of the Project site lies within the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) while the remaining 15 percent lies in the South Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Air quality conditions in the South Coast Air Basin are under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD while the portion of the site under the jurisdiction of the AVAQMD lies within the Mojave Desert Air Basin. Developers and businesses who plan to install equipment with the potential to emit air pollutants, including toxic and hazardous air pollutants, must obtain permits from the applicable Air Quality Management District prior to construction or operation. Examples of businesses and equipment that require permits are gas stations, dry cleaners, emergency generators, boilers for heating and hot water in large buildings, restaurant cooking equipment, and manufacturing facilities.
Prior to Project implementation, the following additional permits may be necessary from the following entities:

- **Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).** The Project may require the creation of an entity to operate and maintain the water supply, water treatment, and wastewater reclamation facilities, as well as the storm water facilities if annexation of the Project site into the Golden Valley Municipal Water District does not occur. Should a private entity be created to handle the operation and maintenance of these systems and facilities, then issuance of Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and/or Exemption would be necessary. Alternatively, if a public entity (e.g., Community Facilities District, CSD, California Water District, or other agency approved by Los Angeles County [the Maintenance Entity] and agreed to by the Project Applicant/Developer) is created to operate and maintain all water supply, wastewater reclamation facilities, and other necessary water facilities, then CPUC action would not be required. However, some action by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) may be necessary, depending on the public entity selected. Ultimately, the water supply, wastewater reclamation, and storm water agency(ies) providing these services would require the concurrence of the County and the applicable regulatory agencies.

**D. Statement of Project Objectives**

The statement of objectives sought by the Project and set forth in the Final EIR is provided as follows:

1. Implement the Antelope Valley Area Plan (AVAP) by creating an environmentally and economically sustainable master-planned community on the Project site to help accommodate planned regional population and economic growth.

2. Design the Project to maximize efficient utilization of regional infrastructure while preserving hundreds of thousands of acres of contiguous natural open space and important biological resources.

3. Size the Project to include a broad range of employment, residential, institutional, and recreational land uses to encourage walkability and wellness, while reducing off-site employment-related commuter trips.

4. Ensure that all Project site infrastructure and public services are funded by the Project to avoid creating any financial obligations on existing residents and other taxpayers.

5. Integrate a multi-modal transportation network, renewable energy, water conservation, community wellness, and other green development features into the Project’s design, build out, and ongoing operations.
3. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Final EIR dated May 2018 includes the Draft EIR dated May 2017, written comments on the Draft EIR that were received during the public review period, written responses to these comments, clarifications/changes to the Draft EIR, and the MMRP. In conformance with CEQA, the County conducted an extensive environmental review of the Project, as described below:

- Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning issued a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report on March 15, 2004, to federal, State, regional, and local government agencies and interested parties to solicit comments and to inform agencies and the public of the Project during a 30-day public review period that extended from March 15 to April 14, 2004. Copies of the NOP were also made available at the following libraries: Quartz Hill Library, 42018 North 50th Street West, Quartz Hill, California 93536; Lancaster Regional Library, 601 West Lancaster Boulevard, Lancaster, California 93534; Valencia County Library, 23743 West Valencia Boulevard, Santa Clarita, California 91355; Newhall County Library, 22704 West 9th Street, Santa Clarita, California 91321; San Fernando Library, 217 North Maclay Avenue, San Fernando, California 91340.

- The Project, as it was envisioned in 2004, was described in the NOP; potential environmental effects associated with Project approval and implementation were identified; and agencies and the public were invited to review and comment on the Initial Study, NOP, and NOP mailing list. Three scoping meetings (two on March 30, 2004, and one on March 31, 2004) were conducted during this review period to solicit additional suggestions from the public on the content of the EIR. Attendees were provided an opportunity to identify verbally or in writing the issues they felt should be addressed.

- Since the issuance of the 2004 NOP, two land use policy document updates have been approved by the County Board of Supervisors (BOS), including the County of Los Angeles 2035 General Plan (General Plan 2035) on March 24, 2015 and the Antelope Valley Area Plan (AVAP) Update on June 16, 2015. These updates included information and data provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) adopted on April 4, 2012. These updated documents take into account the development proposed within the Project site, and the Project is consistent with and implements the requirements of the AVAP.

- The 2004 NOP set forth a Project boundary that included approximately 11,680 acres. The original proposal requested approval of a three Vesting Tentative Tract Maps (VTTM) and required a General Plan amendment and zone change, among other entitlement actions. Since the issuance of the 2004 NOP, certain modifications to the Project have been made, and the County of Los Angeles subsequently confirmed that the preparation of an EIR is required. The revised Project Description includes 12,323 acres, which includes new property to the east of 300th Street, north of the SR-138. The Project includes a balance of land uses and economic development consistent
with the intent and the land use designations set forth within the AVAP’s West Economic Opportunity Area (EOA), which includes the Project site. As such, many of the land use entitlement actions previously requested in the 2004 NOP are no longer applicable.

- A revised NOP, which included the 2004 NOP and Initial Study as attachments, was prepared and issued in October 2015 to federal, State, regional, and local government agencies and interested parties to solicit comments and to inform agencies and the public of the Project during a 30-day public review period that extended from October 5 to November 4, 2015. Comments on the 2004 NOP were received from agencies and individuals and are provided in Appendix 2.0-B of the Final EIR.

- The County conducted a public scoping meeting for the purpose of soliciting oral and written comments from interested parties as to the appropriate scope and content of the EIR. All interested parties were invited to attend the scoping meeting to assist in identifying issues to be addressed in the EIR. The scoping meeting included a brief presentation of the Project to be addressed in the EIR and provided an opportunity for attendees to give input to the scope of the EIR. The Scoping Meeting was held on October 21, 2015 from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM at the Gorman Elementary School (49847 Gorman School Rd, Lebec, CA 93243).

- The 2015 NOP was made available for public review during regular business hours at the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning website (http://planning.lacounty.gov/case) and the address listed above as well as the following library locations: Lancaster Regional Library, 601 West Lancaster Boulevard, Lancaster, California 93534; Castaic Library, 27971 Sloan Canyon Road, Castaic, California 91384; Valencia Public Library, 23743 West Valencia Boulevard, Santa Clarita, California 91355; Old Town Newhall Library, 24500 Main Street, Santa Clarita, California 91321; Frazier Park Library, 3732 Park Drive, Frazier Park, California 93225; Quartz Hill Library, 42018 50th Street West, Quartz Hill, California 93536; Canyon County JoAnne Darcy Library, 18601 Soledad Canyon Road, Santa Clarita, California 91351; San Fernando Library, 217 North Maclay Avenue, San Fernando, California 91340; Bakersfield Library, Southwest Branch, 8301 Ming Avenue, Bakersfield, California 93311; Stevenson Ranch Library, 25950 The Old Road, Stevenson Ranch, CA 91381. Comments on the 2015 NOP were received from agencies and individuals and are provided in Appendix 2.0-A of the Final EIR.

- Based on the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation, a determination was made that the EIR would contain a comprehensive analysis of all environmental issues, identified in Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. As required by CEQA, the EIR includes appropriate review, analysis, and mitigation measures for the environmental impacts of the proposed project. This Final EIR could be utilized by other permitting agencies in their capacity as Responsible and Trustee agencies under CEQA.
A Draft EIR was prepared and circulated for a 60-day public review period, beginning on May 18, 2017, and ending on July 17, 2017. The Draft EIR was distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding jurisdictions, interested parties, and other parties who requested a copy of the EIR in accordance with California Public Resources Code § 20192. During the initial review period, Staff notified all recipients of the Draft EIR and posted a notice on the Department of Regional Planning website that the review period was extended for an additional 30 days to August 16, 2017. In total, 362 Notices of Availability of the Draft EIR were distributed.

The Draft EIR was available for public review on the Department of Regional Planning’s webpage and, during normal business hours, at the Department’s office located at 320 W. Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90012. Additionally, copies of the EIR were available at the reference desk of the same libraries listed above for the 2015 NOP, with the exception of the Quartz Hill Library (formerly located at 42018 50th Street West, Quartz Hill) which had moved locations in the interim period. Thus, the EIR was available at the following libraries: Lancaster Regional Library, Castaic Library, Valencia Public Library, Old Town Newhall Library, Frazier Park Library, Canyon County JoAnne Darcy Library, San Fernando Library, Bakersfield Library–Southwest Branch, Stevenson Ranch Library, and the new Quartz Hill Library, located at 5040 West Avenue M2, Quartz Hill, California. In addition, a public hearing on the Draft EIR before the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning Hearing Examiner was conducted on June 29, 2017 starting at 6:00 PM at Gorman Elementary School, 4987 Gorman School Road, Gorman CA 93243. The public hearing comments were included in Chapter 2.0 of the Final EIR. A total of 21 public hearing and 91 written comment letters from individuals or agencies/organizations, and 2,204 emailed form letters were received on the Draft EIR during its 90-day public review period. As required by Section 15088 of the State CEQA Guidelines, responses to these comments were prepared and provided to the agencies and interested parties that submitted return addresses. The Response to Comments was provided 10 days before the first Regional Planning Commission hearing.

The Los Angeles Regional Planning Commission considered the EIR and the Project entitlement applications (Specific Plan No. 02-232, General Plan Amendment No. 02-232, Zoning Change No. 03-232, Development Agreement No. RPPL2016003940, Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 060022, Conditional Use Permit No. 02-232, and Environmental Review No. 02-232) at three public hearings. The first was held on June 6, 2018, and it included a presentation of an overview of the Project and the conclusions of the EIR. The Regional Planning Commission received testimony from the community on the Project and the EIR, and asked for further information to be presented at a second hearing. The second hearing was held on July 11, 2018, and it included presentation of minor EIR clarifications and responses to the Regional Planning Commission’s requests, as well as testimony from the community on the Project and the EIR heard by the Regional Planning Commission, and a request for further information to be presented at a third hearing. The final hearing was held on August 29, 2018, during which final EIR clarifications and information were presented to the Regional Planning Commission, and the Regional Planning Commission considered the new material above and made a decision to approve the Project and the EIR.
Commission heard and considered testimony from the community. On August 29, 2018, the Regional Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the requested Project entitlements, certification of the EIR, and adoption of CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations to the Board of Supervisors.

- Following the Regional Planning Commission Hearings, the County prepared a Consolidated Final EIR dated November, 2018. It provides the Board of Supervisors and the public a single document containing responses to all comments received during the official Draft EIR comment period and subsequently, as well as all clarifications, corrections, or minor revisions to the text, tables, figures, and appendices of the Draft EIR and Final EIR. These have been identified from responses to comments or independently by the County, and include those identified in the Final EIR published in May, 2018, and those identified subsequent to publication of the Final EIR but before the scheduled December 11, 2018 Board of Supervisors hearing to consider certification of the EIR and approval of the Project. It was provided 10 days before the Board of Supervisors hearing.

4. **FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS DETERMINED TO HAVE NO IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT, OR HAVE A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT**

(a) **Air Resources:** The Project would not contribute to traffic conditions that would cause a mobile source CO hotspot (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-2). The Project’s off-site roadway, water infrastructure, and utility improvements would not generate criteria air pollutants thus there would be no operational air quality impact from off-site features (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-1). Based on the relatively short exposure time, diesel PM generated by Project construction activities would not exceed applicable Air District thresholds and therefore this potential air quality impact is less than significant (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-2). Similarly, construction of off-site Project features (i.e., roadway improvements, water infrastructure, and utilities connections) would generate short-term diesel particulate matter (PM) TAC emissions, but the duration of construction activities near any sensitive receptor would be small when compared to the exposure durations considered for a potential health risk. Therefore, off-site construction activities would be much less in magnitude and duration than on-site construction and the TAC impact from off-site construction would be less than significant (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-2). There would be no operational TACs from off-site Project features. Toxic Air Contaminant risks from off-site sources (i.e., the National Cement Plant at Lebec) to sensitive receptors on the Project site would be less than the applicable AVAQMD and SCAQMD CEQA significance thresholds and thus this impact would be less than significant (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-2). The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD) as the Project’s associated population and emissions are in current SCAG growth forecasts and will be included in future AQMPs (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-3). Construction activity odors would be temporary and would not be experienced by a substantial number of people and are therefore less than significant (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-4). Likewise, Project operations would not create objectionable odors affecting
a substantial number of people and are therefore less than significant (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-4).

(b) Biological Resources: The Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan as there are no active habitat conservation plans (HCPs) or natural community conservation plans (NCCPs) for the Project site.

(c) Dry Utilities: The Project will result in less than significant cumulative impacts related to electricity demand. The Project’s demand for electricity will not be cumulatively considerable as SCE has stated that it is able to provide service to the Project site and surrounding area into the foreseeable future. The Project will result in less than significant cumulative impacts related to natural gas. The Project’s demand for electricity will not be cumulatively considerable as SoCalGas has indicated that there are adequate natural gas supplies to accommodate the estimated demand of the Project as well as other existing and projected demands. The Project will result in less than significant cumulative impacts related to petroleum supply. The Project’s demand for petroleum will not be cumulatively considerable as features incorporated into the Project design mean that VMT increases will not necessarily result in proportional increases in fuel consumption. The Project will result in less than significant cumulative impacts due to an increase in the demand for telephone lines. The Project’s demand for telephone service will not be cumulatively considerable as AT&T has indicated it has the ability to provide service to the Project site and the surrounding area into the foreseeable future. The Project will result in less than significant cumulative impacts due to an increase in the demand for cable television. The Project’s demand for cable television will not be cumulatively considerable as the CPUC ensures that whichever company chosen to serve the Project site will be able to provide service to the site and surrounding area in the foreseeable future.

(d) Geotechnical: By complying with all applicable geotechnical regulatory standards, building and design requirements, and County subdivision specifications, the Project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace.

By complying with all applicable geotechnical regulatory standards, building and design requirements, and County subdivision specifications, the Project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic groundshaking. By complying with all applicable geotechnical regulatory standards, building and design requirements, and County subdivision specifications the Project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading.

By complying with all applicable geotechnical regulatory standards, building and design requirements, and County subdivision specifications, the Project will not expose people or
structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. By complying with all applicable geotechnical regulatory standards, building and design requirements, and County subdivision specifications, the Project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

By complying with all applicable geotechnical regulatory standards, building and design requirements, and County subdivision specifications, the Project will not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. By complying with all applicable geotechnical regulatory standards, building and design requirements, and County subdivision specifications, the Project will not conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element.

(e) Hazards and Fire Safety: The Project area is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and thus the Project would not result in any related safety hazards for people residing or working in the Project area. The Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area due to the Project area’s proximity a private airstrip because the closest airstrip to the project site has very minimal traffic that is unlikely to increase or be impacted by the Project, and because the airstrip would be permanently closed when the Caltrans-approved SR-138 Northwest Corridor Improvement Project starts its anticipated construction.

(f) Hydrology and Flood: The Project will not cause drainage system capacity problems because the Project includes the construction of storm water drainage facilities that have been sized to meet and exceed all applicable County regulatory requirements and no additional construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities will be required for the Project. There would be no Project housing development constructed in on-site floodplains, and thus Project would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts associated with placing structures within a floodplain.

(g) Land Resources: The Project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract and does not propose development that would conflict with any designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, local land use plans, policies, or zoning designations for agricultural use and therefore the Project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract. The Project site is not used for forest land or timberland resources, and is not considered forest land or timberland by the County or the State, and Project will thus not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code, Section 12220[g]), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code, Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code, Section 51104[g]). For the same reasons, the Project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, and the Project will not involve other changes in the existing environment,
which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest land use.

The Project will not 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 because there are no such known resources on the Project site and the Project does not impact any mineral resources. The Project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan because there are no such resources on the Project site and the Project does not impact any such resources.

Since the Project site is not used for forest land or timberland resources, and is not considered forest land or timberland by the County or the State, the Project will result in less than significant cumulative impacts to forest resources as Project impacts to forest land, timberland, and timberland production will be less than significant and the Project will not conflict with zoning for timberland or a Timberland Production Zone. The Project will not result in cumulative impacts from the loss of availability of known mineral resources because the Project site does not impact any mineral resources.

(h) Land Use, Entitlements, and Planning: The Project will not physically divide an established community because there are no established communities in the Project area that would be divided with implementation of the Project. The Project complies with and will not be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, the Antelope Valley Area Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans for the reasons discussed in EIR Section 5.8, Land Use, Entitlements, and Planning. The Project complies with and will not be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property for the reasons discussed in EIR Section 5.8, Land Use, Entitlements, and Planning. The Project will not conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria for the reasons discussed in EIR Section 5.8, Land Use, Entitlements, and Planning.

The Project will result in less than significant cumulative impacts to land use, entitlements, and planning because the Project will not physically divide an established community and will not be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans, the Project will not conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria and related cumulative projects would be required to comply with the applicable land use plans and regulations or they would not be approved without an amendment of the relevant land use plan or regulation to ensure consistency therewith.

(i) Noise: The Project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels because the project is not located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The Project is within the vicinity of a private airstrip, but will not expose people
residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from residing or working in the Project area because the airstrip has very little traffic, is not expected to increase traffic in the future, and is expected to close once the Caltrans-approved SR-138 Northwest Corridor Improvement Project begins construction.

(j) **Other Public Services:** Implementation of the Project would require County services for the maintenance of public roadways, parks and other public infrastructure such as water, sewer, and flood control facilities. The Project demand for the maintenance of future County-owned facilities and infrastructure will be met by the provision of land for on-site County maintenance yards and an animal care facility, and by the payment of fees and taxes that fund these services and, therefore, with respect to such facilities and services the Project will not result in substantial adverse physical direct, indirect or cumulative 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 such public services. As described in EIR Section 5.17.3, adopted plans and regulations to manage solid waste disposal and recycling efforts generally mandate action by the State, County, and/or local municipality rather than individual projects. The Project would provide a 5 acre minimum Materials Recovery Facility/Transfer Station (the only such facility in northern Los Angeles County, as well as County Smart Gardening Program Learning Center. These facilities would support the County in meeting its statutory waste management goals to the maximum extent feasible. The Project generated hazardous waste would also be disposed of in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws, which wastes would only be a small portion of the total solid waste generated by the Project. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with federal state or local regulations related to solid construction waste and this impact would be less than significant. Hazardous wastes generated by the residential land uses on the Project site such as household cleaners, paints and thinners, batteries, electronic equipment, and motor oil, among others will be limited compared to the total municipal waste stream and are expected to be accommodated by the permitted Class I and Class II landfills currently in operation within California and this is a less than significant impact. The Project’s contribution to impacts on private solid waste collection services will not be cumulatively considerable and this impact is less than significant. The limited proportion of hazardous waste compared to the total municipal waste stream is expected to be accommodated by the permitted Class I and Class II landfills currently in operation in Southern California, and this impact is less than significant. Therefore, the Project’s contribution to landfill space for hazardous waste disposal will not be cumulatively considerable and this impact is less than significant.

(k) **Parks and Recreation:** There are no on-site recreational facilities that would be impacted by Project implementation, and Project will not increase the use of the existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. The physical impacts of constructing and operating the Project’s proposed recreational facilities were considered throughout the EIR as a component of Project development and would not cause any unique significant impacts that otherwise than accounted for under other EIR impact categories. The Project will not interfere with regional open space connectivity because the Project will
provide varied on-site recreational amenities in an area that currently has little local
parkland and will meet and exceed the County’s Parkland Dedication Ordinance
requirements. The Project will not construct or expand any off-site recreational facilities.

(l) **Population, Housing, and Employment:** The Project site is undeveloped with the
exception of one residential unit and a few accessory structures. Therefore, the Project will
not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of
replacement housing elsewhere, nor will the Project displace substantial numbers of people,
necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

(m) **Traffic, Access, and Circulation:** The Quail Lake Skypark Airport, a small, single-
strip, general aviation (i.e., non-jet) private airstrip, is the closest airport to the Project site.
Because the Quail Lake Skypark is privately owned and only has six locally based aircraft,
the number and frequency of flights I expected to be minimal and development of the Project
is not expected to increase flights into or out of the airport. Accordingly, the Project would
not change air traffic patterns; create an increase in air traffic levels; or create substantial
safety risks from air traffic. The Project will promote the use of automobile alternatives and
will comply with all applicable transportation plans, policies and regulations and thus will
not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or
pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

(n) **Visual Resources:** The Project would not substantially damage scenic resources,
including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state
scenic highway because there is no state scenic highways in the Project site vicinity.

(o) **Wastewater Collection:** The Project would construct two new wastewater
collection facilities (WRFs) providing solids handling, biogas reuse, and recycled water
treated to unrestricted reuse standards under Title 22 of the *California Code of Regulations*;
a wastewater collection system; and recycled water system that would be dedicated to serve
the needs of the Project site, to be ensured with implementation of mitigation. The WRFs
would be required to obtain Waste Discharge Requirements and other approvals issued by
the Lahontan RWQCB and would comply with the State Water Resources Control Board’s
Recycled Water Use Policy. Because the Project’s wastewater management system would be
self-contained and would not connect with or otherwise impact any other existing or
planned wastewater systems that may exist in off-site areas in the future, the Project would
not result in any cumulative impacts related to compliance with Waste Discharge
Requirements of either the Lahontan RWQCB or Los Angeles RWQCB, nor would it result in
cumulative impacts to wastewater treatment facilities or capacity in the area.

(p) **Water Resources:** The Project’s use of groundwater and return floes from in-basin
imported water is regulated by the terms and conditions of the adjudication Judgment and
Physical Solution which limits the use of native supplies and imported water return flows to
levels that will allow for the sustainable use of groundwater, and the Project will construct
and maintain 26 storm water infiltration basins to ensure that no loss of groundwater
recharge potential in the basin would occur. Accordingly, the Project will not substantially
deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such
that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).

5. **FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

The following potentially significant impacts were analyzed in the EIR, and the effects of the Project were considered. Because of the environmental analysis of the Project and identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes, and statutes, and the identification and incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the following potentially significant impacts have been determined by the County to be reduced to a level of less than significant; and the County has found – in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and the State Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) – that “Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This is referred to herein as “Finding 1.” Where the County has determined – pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(2) and State Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2) – that “Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency,” the County's finding is referred to herein as “Finding 2.”

A. **Air Resources**

(1) **Potential Impact:** Project operational emissions could violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected ambient air quality violation due to emissions from stationary sources (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-1).

**Finding: 1.** Mitigation measures would reduce Project operational impacts due to violations of ambient air quality standards caused by emissions from stationary sources to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project would involve the use of stationary sources (natural gas-fired boilers, emergency generators, broilers, and small source particulate matter generators) that emit criteria pollutants and have the potential to impact ambient air quality standards. The stationary source limits of MM 11-1 are based on compliance with ambient air quality standards with conservative margins. This impact would thus be less than significant with implementation of MM 11-1 by ensuring that the Project’s plans and specifications require stationary sources to comply with the parameters stated in Stationary Source Types, Size Limits, and Quantity Estimates, which is included as Attachment A to the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and by requiring the Project Applicant/Developer to apply for source-specific permit from the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD)
Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 11-1: The Project’s plans and specifications shall require stationary sources to comply with the parameters stated in Stationary Source Types, Size Limits, and Quantity Estimates, which is included as Attachment A to the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Should there be a need for a stationary source exceeding the prescribed limits, the Project Applicant/Developer shall apply for source-specific permit from the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) or South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), as applicable.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project construction activities and operations could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations due to exposure to Valley Fever (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-2).

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to sensitive receptors due to exposure to Valley Fever to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Valley Fever spores have the potential to be found in soils in the Antelope Valley. Earth disturbing activities, including grading that would be required for site development, would have a more intensive surface disturbance and would increase the risk of Valley Fever exposure if spores are present on the Project site and become airborne in fugitive dust. During construction of the Project, implementation of AVAQMD and SCAQMD Rules for fugitive dust control, and MMs 3-1 and 3-2 would result in a less than significant impact for exposure of construction workers, site occupants, and adjacent off-site persons to Valley Fever by requiring an on-site Dust Control Supervisor with the authority to implement appropriate dust control mitigation measures and by implementing appropriate educational and protective measures to reduce the risk of Valley Fever exposure. Additionally, implementation of PDF 3-1, as implemented through MM 3-3, would result in a less than significant impact to future on-site residents by requiring the Project Applicant/Developer to inform each prospective property purchaser or tenant that the property within Centennial may present a risk of exposure to Valley Fever spores during construction and strategies to reduce such exposure.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 3-1: The Project Applicant/Developer shall employ a Dust-Control Supervisor who will be on the site within 30 minutes of the start of work taking place each morning; will have the authority to
expeditiously employ sufficient dust mitigation measures to ensure compliance with all Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) Rule 403 and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 requirements; and will have completed the SCAQMD Fugitive Dust Control Class and has been issued a valid Certificate of Completion for the class. Contact information for the Project’s Dust Control Supervisor shall be posted on-site to ensure that the public has a means of providing complaints regarding fugitive dust. The Dust Control Supervisor shall be responsible for tracking complaints, conducting corrective action, as necessary, and for maintaining an up-to-date log of complaints and responses for periodic County review.

Mitigation Measure 3-2: To aid in the prevention of Valley Fever among construction crews on the Project site, the following shall be implemented by the Construction Contractor during all construction activities:

- Have Tyvek™ coveralls/suits available in a range of sizes for construction worker use upon request. If used, require the worker to remove the Tyvek™ suit at the work site at the end of the day.
- Hire crews from Los Angeles and/or Kern County populations, or other areas where Valley Fever is endemic, where possible, since it is more likely that they have been previously exposed to the fungus and are therefore immune.
- Prior to Project construction initiation, and for any personnel additions after initial Project construction initiation, the following CDPH materials on Valley Fever (or the most updated materials applicable to Los Angeles County) shall be distributed to worksite supervisors:
- Prior to Project construction initiation, and for any personnel additions after initial Project construction initiation, the following CDPH materials on Valley Fever (or the most updated materials applicable to Los Angeles County) shall be distributed to construction workers:
- During rough grading and construction, the access way into the Project site from adjoining paved roadways shall be paved or treated with environmentally safe dust-control agents.

- Provide evidence to the Department of Public Health that the Project Applicant/Developer has developed a “Valley Fever Training Handout,” training, and schedule of sessions for education to be provided to all construction personnel. All evidence of the training session materials, training handout(s) and training schedule shall be submitted to the Department of Public Health within 24 hours of the first training session. Multiple training sessions may be conducted if different work crews will come to the Project site for different stages of construction; however, all construction personnel shall be provided training prior to beginning work. The evidence submitted to the Department of Public Health regarding the “Valley Fever Training Handout” and training sessions shall include the following:

  - A sign-in sheet (to include the printed employee names, signature, and date) for all employees who attended the training session;
  
  - Distribution of a written flyer or brochure that includes educational information regarding the health effects of exposure to criteria pollutant emissions and Valley Fever (including the CDPH informational materials described in this mitigation measure);
  
  - Training on methods that may help prevent Valley Fever infection; and
  
  - Train employees how to use personal protective equipment, such as respiratory equipment, how to reduce exposure to pollutants, how to recognize symptoms of Valley Fever, and to promptly report any suspected systems to a work supervisor. Training shall also emphasize the benefits of wearing Tyvek suits in relation to Valley Fever exposure and explain that such protective clothing is available upon request. Proof that the demonstration is included in the
training shall be submitted to the Department of Public Health.

- Provide construction workers separate, clean eating areas equipped with hand-washing facilities.
- Require crews to use masks or half-faced respirators equipped with a minimum N-95 protection factor and that are adequate to restrict inhalation of particulates during Project clearing, grading, and excavation operations in accordance with California Division of Occupational Safety and Health regulations. Respirator equipment shall be readily available and shall be provided to employees during work.
- Require employees to be medically evaluated, fit-tested, and properly trained on the use of the required masks or respirators.
- Provide High-Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filters for heavy equipment with factory enclosed cabs capable of accepting the filters. Require contractors utilizing applicable heavy equipment to furnish proof to the Department of Regional Planning of worker training on proper use of applicable heavy equipment cabs, such as turning on air conditioning prior to using the equipment.
- Provide communication methods, such as two-way radios, for use in enclosed heavy equipment cabs.
- Install equipment inspection stations at each construction equipment access/egress point. Examine construction vehicles and equipment or excess soil materials and clean, as necessary before equipment is moved off-site.
- When possible, position construction workers upwind or crosswind when digging a trench or performing other soil-disturbing tasks.
- Prohibit smoking at the worksite outside of designated smoking areas; designated smoking areas will be equipped with hand-washing facilities.
- Post Valley Fever warnings at on-site construction areas and restrict access to such areas by visitors without adequate training and respiratory protection.
- Audit and enforce compliance with applicable California Occupational Safety and Health Administration health and safety standards on the job site.

**Mitigation Measure 3-3:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide to each prospective property purchaser or tenant a notice and statement of acknowledgment that shall be executed (i.e., read and signed) by the
prospective purchaser, lessee, or tenant that the property within Centennial may present a risk of exposure to Valley Fever spores during construction or other earth-moving activities. The form shall include strategies to reduce potential exposure to Valley Fever spores. The form and method of distribution of said notice and statement of acknowledgment shall be as approved by the County.

(3) **Potential Impact:** The Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations due to criteria pollutant emissions from on-site stationary sources (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-2).

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to sensitive receptors due to criteria pollutant emissions from on-site stationary sources to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Stationary source sizes would be limited by MM 11-1 by ensuring that the Project’s plans and specifications require stationary sources to comply with the parameters stated in Stationary Source Types, Size Limits, and Quantity Estimates, which is included as Attachment A to the Project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and by requiring the Project Applicant/Developer to apply for source-specific permit from the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) or South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), as applicable, should there be a need for a stationary source exceeding MM 11-1’s prescribed limits. With implementation of MM 11-1 exposure of sensitive receptors to stationary source criteria pollutants would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measure 11-1 above.

(4) **Potential Impact:** The Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations due to toxic air contaminant emissions from future on-site stationary sources (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-2).

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to sensitive receptors due to toxic air contaminants (TACs) emitted by on-site stationary sources to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The *Centennial Specific Plan*’s limitations on Project TAC-emitting stationary sources would ensure that upper bound risks posed to sensitive receptors are not in excess of the significance thresholds. TAC emissions of 165 generic sources were scaled to the
maximum emissions allowed by the limits in the Project to determine the aggregate cancer risk and non-cancer hazard index at each sensitive receptor. The modeling of composite emissions from all 165 TAC sources confirmed that none of the adjacent sensitive receptors would exceed a cancer risk of 10 in 1 million or have a chronic non-cancer hazard index of 1.0. Mitigation Measure 11-1 also prescribes limits on larger sources and all TAC sources are limited by AVAQMD Rule 1401 and SCAQMD Rule 1401. With implementation of MM 11-7, MM 11-8, and MM 11-9, impacts of these sources would be less than the applicable incremental cancer risk and non-cancer health index thresholds by implementing appropriate setback requirements and requiring confirmation that sensitive receptors within business park areas are not exposed to TAC sources that exceed acceptable cancer risk levels. Accordingly, with mitigation, exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs from on-site stationary sources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure 11-1 above.

Mitigation Measure 11-7: The Project’s plans and specifications for business park or water reclamation facility land uses shall demonstrate that buffer areas adjacent to proposed business parks in compliance with the Air Quality Analysis for Stationary Sources Allowed by the Centennial Specific Plan, (see Appendix 5.11-B of this EIR) have been incorporated into the design plans. The buffer areas shall prohibit uses that are potential sources of toxic air contaminants and shall prohibit uses that include sensitive receptors, except as allowed through written evidence that the sensitive use would not be exposed to Toxic Air Contaminants with pollutant concentrations resulting in a cancer risk greater than or equal to 10 in 1 million for health risks and 1.0 for non-cancer chronic and acute hazard indices (HIs).

Mitigation Measure 11-8: Prior to approval of any tract map that includes an air quality sensitive use (e.g., residence, school, hospital, daycare center) within a designated business park, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide written evidence to the County that the sensitive use would not be exposed to Toxic Air Contaminants with pollutant concentrations resulting in a cancer risk greater than or equal to 10 in 1 million for health risks and 1.0 for non-cancer chronic and acute hazard indices (HIs).

Mitigation Measure 11-9: The Project’s plans and specifications shall demonstrate that all distribution centers are within the business park areas south of State Route (SR) 138 and are located at least 1,000 feet from existing sensitive receptors and lands designated for sensitive land uses. Distribution centers shall not be allowed in other areas within the Project site.
(5) **Potential Impact:** The Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations from toxic contaminants from diesel PM from SR-138 (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-2).

**Finding: 1.** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to on-site sensitive receptors due to emissions diesel PM from SR-138 to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project would include land use areas that could allow sensitive receptors to be located adjacent to SR-138. Vehicles on SR-138 emit diesel PM, which is a TAC. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) publication, *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective* recommends 500-foot buffers between freeways and sensitive receptors, indicating that further analyses may be necessary if the proposed sensitive land use is located within this recommended buffer. The manual states that the highest concentration of pollutants emitted from freeways dissipates rapidly within the first 300 feet. According to CARB, studies also show an approximate 70 percent drop off in particulate pollution levels at 500 feet. The analysis of diesel PM risks from SR-138 to future sensitive receptor areas shows incremental cancer risks for the 70-year exposure duration below 10 in 1 million at locations greater than 150 feet from the travel lanes. The estimated hazard index for all proposed sensitive receptors was less than one. As more stringent vehicular greenhouse gas emission and criteria air pollution standards take effect, the number of diesel powered vehicles on roadways as well as emissions from remaining newer diesel engines will further reduce diesel-related health risks. Therefore, the 250-foot buffer limitation established by MM 11-10 would more than ensure that diesel PM TAC impacts would be less than significant. In addition, MM 11-11 requires that prior to future tract map approvals, if any Project sensitive receptors (e.g. residential, day care, schools, hospitals) would be located more than 250, but less than or equal to 500 feet, from the SR-138, an additional dispersion modeling study must be conducted to estimate diesel PM air concentrations. If the study finds that diesel PM TAC emissions would be significant at the location of a proposed sensitive receptor, then effective construction measures must be implemented into the structures to mitigate for interior air quality, such as MERV13 filters or equivalent protections against TACs from vehicle emissions. With these measures, exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs from SR-138 would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 11-10:** The Project’s plans and specifications shall demonstrate that any land uses involving the public congregation of sensitive receptors (e.g. residential, schools, hospital, daycare center) are not within 250 feet of the near edge of the SR-138 traffic lanes.
**Mitigation Measure 11-11:** Prior to the approval of any tract map that includes an air quality sensitive receptor (e.g. residential, day care, schools, hospital) located more than 250 feet, but less than or equal to 500 feet, of the SR-138 and/or within 500 feet of any “high volume roadway” (i.e., a roadway with an average daily traffic volume that equals or exceeds 50,000 vehicles), the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide to the Air Pollution Control District(s) with jurisdiction over the mapped area a dispersion analysis prepared in accordance with each applicable Air District's methodological requirements to calculate the health risks from vehicle emissions from SR-138 and/or high volume roadway, as relevant. If the study concludes that any sensitive receptor exposure would equal or exceed 20 in 1 million for cancer risk or 1.0 for non-cancer indices (or future more stringent thresholds as may be adopted by the applicable Air District(s) and approved by the County for use on projects subject to the County's lead agency authority under the California Environmental Quality Act)(District TAC Thresholds), then the applicant shall submit a Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) Emission Reduction Plan to the applicable Air District(s) for review and concurrence. Following review and concurrence by the applicable Air District(s), a copy of the TAC Emission Reduction Plan, confirming that no sensitive receptors on the Project site will be exposed to TAC risks in excess of District TAC Thresholds, shall be provided to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, prior to County approval of the tentative tract map. In the TAC Emission Reduction Plan, TAC exposure reduction measures shall be implemented to assure that no sensitive receptors are exposed to TAC-related health impacts that equal or exceed District TAC Thresholds. TAC exposure reduction measures include, but are not limited to, setbacks, vegetative barriers, heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) system filtration technologies, etc., and shall be required as a condition of approval for the tentative tract map, and/or required as a condition prior to issuance of a building permit approval for future sensitive use(s) included in the tentative tract map.

**B. Biological Resources**

(1) **Potential Impact:** The Project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to species to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.
Facts in Support of Finding

Impacts to special status plants, special status wildlife, and nesting birds would result from implementation of the Project. Impacts could occur to the following species:

**Plants:** California androsace, crownscale, round-leaved filaree, Mojave spineflower, sylvan scorzonella, and adobe yampah.

**Wildlife:** western pond turtle, two-striped garter snake, silvery legless lizard, coast horned lizard, Townsend’s big-eared bats, pallid bats, Tehachapi pocket mouse, Southern grasshopper mouse, and American badger

**Birds:** western yellow-billed cuckoo, southwestern willow flycatcher, least Bell’s vireo, California condor, Swainson’s hawk, tricolored blackbird, burrowing owls, golden eagle, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, long-eared owl, yellow warbler, yellow-breasted chat, summer tanager, purple martin, and loggerhead shrikes.

In addition, impacts to nesting birds, including raptors, resulting from Project development are considered significant. The Project’s potentially significant impacts to special status plants, special status wildlife, and nesting birds would be reduced to a level considered less than significant through implementation of the various survey, data collection monitoring, reporting, avoidance, relocation, fencing, creation, enhancement, restoration, preservation, management, and other protective measures required by MM 7-1 to 7-7, 7-9 and 7-23. In addition to the avoidance and buffer requirements described in MM 7-7, the Project design incorporates a buffer of greater than 1,000 feet along the northern shore of Quail Lake to minimize impacts to adjacent foraging grounds. At the east end of the Lake, east of the mouth of the aqueduct, where a small section of shoreline is close to the project impact footprint, land uses include a regional park within a low density development zone so that lands immediately beyond the required 400 foot buffer (if nesting is identified) remain permeable and retain some potential for foraging for this species. At the time of Draft EIR publication, the round-leaved filaree (California macrophylla) was included in the CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, and was ranked 1B.2, or moderately threatened. On December 11, 2017, it was removed from the Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants. (California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program. 2018. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California, online edition, v8-03 0.39, available at: http://www.rareplants.cnps.org [accessed 30 January 2018]) Nonetheless, the Final EIR analyzed potential impacts to this species as if it was moderately threatened, and includes mitigation measures that would reduce potential adverse impacts to this species to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure M 7-1:** Prior to issuance of grading permits in areas of the Project site that may disturb California androsace, crownscale, round-leaved filaree, Mojave spineflower, sylvan scorzonella, or adobe
yampah populations, focused surveys of mitigation lands shall have been completed by a qualified biologist(s) to confirm compliance with the 2:1 mitigation ratio for the California androsace, crownscale, round-leaved filaree, Mojave spineflower, sylvan scorzonella, and adobe yampah. Surveys will be conducted in accordance with current California Native Plant Society (CNPS) protocol and will occur during the appropriate time of year. The Survey Report shall be submitted to the County and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for their review. In addition to rare plant species populations that have previously been found in the Mitigation Preserve, newly detected populations will be preserved and managed for long-term preservation. These populations will provide baseline information for management efforts described below and will provide information to help determine habitat suitability in areas where propagation of rare plants may be considered.

The Project Applicant shall prepare and implement a Special Status Plant Species Restoration Plan covering the California androsace, crownscale, round-leaved filaree, Mojave spineflower, sylvan scorzonella, and adobe yampah that shall specify the following: (1) identification of and suitability analyses for the enhancement area; (2) procedures for the collection and temporary storage of seed (all available seed from every impacted occurrence shall be collected); (3) planting procedures, including soil preparation and irrigation; (4) a schedule and action plan to maintain and monitor enhanced, restored, and/or created populations; (5) methods to control plant densities (of competing plants) to promote the establishment of California androsace, crownscale, round-leaved filaree, Mojave spineflower, sylvan scorzonella, and adobe yampah; (6) a list of County-approved success criteria (e.g., germination rates, growth, plant cover) to compare to the density of existing populations; (7) for creation or enhancement area(s), monitoring to confirm successful implementation of the 2:1 mitigation ratio; and (8) contingency measures to further create or enhance plantings in creation or enhancement areas where monitoring results do not show successful 2:1 mitigation, which shall remain in effect until such time as the 2:1 mitigation ratio has been achieved and maintained for one full growing season. The Project Applicant shall develop the Special Status Plant Species Restoration Plan and the County and CDFW shall approve it prior to any vegetation clearing or grading on the site.

Prior to the commencement of vegetation clearing and/or grading activities, the Project Applicant shall contract a qualified firm to harvest California androsace, crownscale, round-leaved filaree, Mojave spineflower, sylvan scorzonella, and adobe yampah seeds from the impacted populations on the Project site. The seeds shall be collected
in the manner and time described in the Special Status Plant Species Restoration Plan. The harvested seed shall be used for the enhancement, restoration, or creation of these species’ populations to be preserved in open space areas on the Project site. Additionally, prior to implementation of the Plan, a focused survey for the special status species impacted (listed above) shall occur in the preserve areas to document existing populations.

The previously documented populations of California androsace, round-leaved filaree, Mojave spineflower, sylvan scorzonella, and adobe yampah occurring in the designated on-site mitigation areas (north of State Route [SR] 138 and south of SR-138), and Mitigation Areas 1, 2, 3 shall be preserved in perpetuity. These existing areas shall be (in order of priority) preserved, enhanced, expanded, restored, or created in order to compensate at a 2:1 ratio for the thousands of individual special status plants that will be lost due to the Project.

Those portions of the crownscale and Mojave spineflower populations that are located within and along the western edge of the open space polygon located approximately 500 feet east of Cement Plant Road and approximately 650 feet north of the SR-138 shall be protected. No temporary or permanent disturbance (including fuel modification) shall occur in the identified occurrence points or polygons; these occurrence points or polygons shall be flagged by a qualified Biologist prior to the start of Project activities in the area. In addition, the post-construction hydrology that supports these protected populations shall be consistent with the pre-Project hydrologic condition. The supporting area consists of the adjacent slope, which drains to the protected plant populations and consists of approximately 300 feet to the north and north northwest. Additional protective measures are included in MM 7-17.

Planting of California androsace, crownscale, round-leaved filaree, Mojave spineflower, sylvan scorzonella, and adobe yampah shall be performed in accordance with the specifications in the Special Status Plant Species Restoration Plan, which will also indicate the target densities for each of these species so that the new populations will support at least as many individuals of each species as were impacted.

**Mitigation Measure 7-2:** All grubbing/grading within a phase of construction shall be scheduled and implemented to facilitate the voluntary movement of localized wildlife towards intact adjacent habitat. Islands of habitat should not be created during site disturbance unless they are to be retained as un-impacted following the Project buildout.
A pre-construction/grading survey of all areas proposed for construction/grading activities that contain potentially suitable habitat for silvery legless lizard, coast horned lizard, and two-striped garter snake shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist. Surveys will consist of 1 pass-through by a qualified Wildlife Biologist walking 50-meter belt transects across areas to be impacted while visually searching for the species listed above. Surveys will be conducted no more than three days prior to the disturbance of the surveyed area. If any of these species or other wildlife species that can be easily moved are observed within the construction/grading zone, the Biologist (who must have a valid California Scientific Collecting Permit) shall relocate them to a suitable area outside the construction zone. Suitable areas would include appropriate habitats within the proposed open space areas in the northwestern portion of the Project site and would be identified in a Wildlife Relocation Plan (described below) prior to surveys but before construction begins.

Areas adjacent to Quail Lake and on the Project site potentially supporting western pond turtle breeding habitat shall not be disturbed during the breeding season for the turtles (April through August). No Project activities shall occur within 400 feet from the edge of Quail Lake, due to potential for nesting in those areas.

Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, the Project Proponent shall conduct appropriate burrowing owl pre-construction surveys and avoidance and mitigation measures as identified below.

**Burrowing Owl Pre-Construction Surveys**

The project biologist shall conduct pre-construction take-avoidance surveys no more than 30 days prior to ground-disturbing activities within each construction area. Focused burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (March 2012). Breeding season surveys shall include at least four survey passes completed between February 15 and July 15, with at least one visit between February 15 and April 15, and a minimum of three survey visits (at least 3 weeks apart) between April 15 and July 15, including at least one visit after June 15. Non-breeding season surveys shall include at least four visits spread evenly throughout the non-breeding season. The surveys shall be conducted in suitable burrowing owl habitat within 150 meters (492 feet) of the project footprint. Surveys shall be conducted by walking 20-meter transects. Because burrowing owls can recolonize a site after a few days, time lapses between project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys, including, but not limited to an additional survey within 24 hours of ground-disturbing activities.
Once surveys are completed, the project biologist shall prepare a survey report on the survey methods and results.

*Burrowing Owl Avoidance and Mitigation Measures*

Submit for DRP and CDFW approval and subsequently implement a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan, which includes four avoidance and relocation strategy tiers and associated mitigation requirements set forth in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012): Tier 1 – Avoidance Buffers; Tier 2 – Passive Relocation; Tier 3 – Prevention of Recolonization of Development Areas; and Tier 4 – Active Relocation (Optional). Site monitoring shall be required prior to, during, and after exclusions of burrowing owls from their burrows. Excluded burrowing owls shall be monitored and documented using artificial or natural borrows on adjoining Mitigation Preserve lands or other open space.

Avoidance buffers shall be established in accordance with the buffer distances described in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012), which range from 50 to 500 meters, depending on the season and level of disturbance. The buffers may be reduced, but only after consultation with and approval from CDFW.

Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, the Project Proponent shall conduct appropriate Swainson’s hawk pre-construction surveys and avoidance and mitigation measures as identified below.

*Swainson’s hawk pre-construction surveys*

Pre-construction surveys for Swainson’s hawk shall be conducted during the two survey periods prior to construction by the Project Lead Biologist following the survey methods developed by the Swainson’s Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (SWHA TAC 2000). These methods include surveying for active nests within a 0.5-mile radius of all Project activities prior to construction activities.

*Swainson’s hawk avoidance measures*

If active Swainson’s hawk nests (defined as nests used during one or more of the last 5 years) are found during these surveys, the Project Proponent shall utilize the CDFW *Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawks* (*Buteo swainsoni*) in the Central Valley of California for addressing the species as modified below. During initial ground disturbance construction, no intensive disturbances (e.g., heavy equipment operation associated with construction, use of cranes or draglines, new rock-crushing activities) or other Project-related activities that may cause nest abandonment
or forced fledging shall occur within 0.5-mile of an active nest between January 1 and September 15, unless take authorization is obtained and provides otherwise.

The buffer zone may be decreased to 0.25-mile around nests for subsequent construction (i.e., in areas where disturbance—such as heavy equipment operation associated with construction, use of cranes or draglines, new rock-crushing activities—is not a normal occurrence during the nesting season). Active nest trees (where the nest is intact and has been used in the last 5 years) shall not be removed unless there is no practicable way of avoiding them. Encroachment of construction within the 0.5-mile buffer and removal of active nesting trees shall only be undertaken subject to consultation with CDFW and issuance of a California Fish and Game Code Section 2081 Incidental Take Permit, and associated conditions, if any are required. The tree removal period shall be limited to between October 1 and December 31.

_**Swainson’s hawk monitoring during construction**_

If construction or other Project-related activities that may cause nest abandonment or forced fledging are necessary within the buffer zone, prior acquisition of an Incidental Take Permit shall be required. Monitoring of the nest site by the Project Lead Biologist is required to determine whether the nest is abandoned. If the nest is abandoned and if the nestlings are still alive, the master developer shall fund the recovery and hacking (i.e., the controlled release of captive-reared young) of the nestling(s). Existing activities such as agricultural activities, commuter traffic, and routine facility maintenance activities within 0.25-mile of an active nest shall not be prohibited.

The Wildlife Relocation Plan shall describe: (1) all areas potentially suitable for receiving relocated animals and (2) methods that shall be used in the relocation process. Methods shall include appropriate species-specific handling techniques, including adherence to the Amphibian Task Force Fieldwork Code of Practice, to prevent the spread of pathogens. The Plan shall also identify thresholds for the number of individuals of each species that shall be allowed to be placed in any particular area. The Wildlife Relocation Plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and submitted to the CDFW prior to Project implementation for review and comment. The plan shall be approved by the County prior to issuance of the first grading permit. County and CDFW approval of the Plan shall indicate that the performance standards have been met. The Plan shall be implemented prior to grading an area for which the pre-construction survey identified one or more of these species. Although, implementation of the mitigation plan
may have some impact on wildlife, it is expected to be negligible relative to the project as a whole and expected to be a net positive effect as required.

Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, the Project Proponent shall conduct appropriate golden eagle pre-construction surveys and avoidance measures as identified below.

**Golden eagle pre-construction surveys**

Pre-construction surveys for golden eagle shall be conducted prior to construction activities. Surveys for active nests will be conducted by the Project Lead Biologist in all potentially suitable habitat areas within a 0.5-mile radius of all Project activities. Methods employed shall be consistent with standard and appropriate protocols for golden eagle and within the appropriate season of the year prior to construction.

**Golden eagle avoidance measures**

If active golden eagle nests are found during these surveys, no intensive disturbances (e.g., heavy equipment operation associated with construction, use of cranes or draglines, new rock-crushing activities) or other Project-related activities that may cause nest abandonment or forced fledging shall occur during initial ground disturbance construction within 0.50 mile of an active nest between March 1 and September 15. The buffer zone may be decreased to 0.25 mile around nests for subsequent construction (i.e., in areas where disturbance—such as heavy equipment operation associated with construction, use of cranes or draglines, new rock-crushing activities—is not a normal occurrence during the nesting season). Active nest trees (where the nest is intact and has been used in the last year) shall not be removed.

For the American badger specifically, the following pre-construction survey and avoidance measure protocols shall be implemented.

**American Badger Pre-Construction Surveys and Avoidance Conditions**

Pre-construction winter/non-natal surveys for American badger shall be required for any construction activities commencing between November 1 and February 15. Surveys shall be conducted within potentially suitable habitat, within 100 feet of disturbance zones, no more than 14 days prior to construction activities to determine whether American badger winter dens are present within disturbance zone or within 100 feet of the disturbance zone.
boundary. If Project activities are delayed or suspended for more than 14 days, the project-construction surveys shall be repeated.

If an American badger winter or non-natal den is occupied within the disturbance zone or within 100 feet of the disturbance zone, then the den location shall be clearly marked with fencing or flagging, in a manner that does not isolate the badger from intact adjacent habitat or prevent the badger from accessing the den, to avoid inadvertent impacts on the den. The den shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to confirm normal activities during construction. If it is not practicable to avoid the wintering or non-natal den during construction activities, CDFW will be contacted. Construction activities shall be allowed to proceed when the den is vacated.

Pre-construction natal den surveys for American badger shall be required for any construction activities commencing between March 15 and July 31. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted within potentially suitable habitat, within 200 feet of the disturbance zone, by the project biologist, no earlier than 14 days prior to ground-disturbing construction activities to determine whether American badger natal dens are present within the project disturbance zone or within 200 feet of the disturbance zone.

If active natal dens are located within these areas during pre-construction surveys, construction activities shall be postponed. If natal dens are detected during construction, construction activities shall be halted within 200 feet of the natal den. This buffer may be reduced based on the location of the den or type of construction activity, based on the direction of the project biologist and CDFW has agreed in writing. Construction activities shall not preclude the ability of the documented badgers to disperse to on-site open space or off-site habitat when the natal den is vacated (i.e., habitat suitable for dispersal must be maintained until dispersal occurs). Construction will be postponed or halted in these areas until it is determined by the project biologist that the young are no longer dependent on the natal den. To avoid inadvertent impacts during construction and to ensure that construction activities are at least 200 feet from active natal dens, any active natal dens within the survey area shall be clearly marked with fencing or flagging in a manner that does not isolate the badger from sufficient intact adjacent habitat, prevent the badger from accessing the den, or inhibiting normal behavioral activities (e.g., foraging and dispersing from the site) by the mother and pups. Construction activities shall be allowed to proceed when the den is vacated.
Pre-construction surveys for the ring-tailed cat shall be conducted throughout the Project disturbance area in the appropriate season within the year prior to disturbance. If results are negative, Project activities will proceed without further restrictions in regard to this species. If detected, the applicant shall consult with CDFW and modify Project activities at that time to ensure complete avoidance and no take of ring-tailed cat will occur.

**Mitigation Measure 7-3:** For all grading and construction activities, the Project Applicant/Developer shall retain a qualified Biologist (with selection reviewed by the County) to ensure that incidental construction impacts on special status wildlife species are avoided or minimized. The Biologist shall relocate silvery legless lizard, coast horned lizard, two-striped garter snake and any other special status wildlife species that can be moved which would otherwise be destroyed or adversely affected by construction and/or site-preparation activities. Responsibilities of the Construction Biological Monitor shall include:

a. Attendance at the pre-construction meeting to ensure that timing and location of construction activities do not conflict with other mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for nesting birds). The meeting shall be conducted with the Contractor and other key construction personnel to describe the importance of restricting work to designated areas.

b. Discussion with the Contractor of procedures to minimize harm/harassment of wildlife that may be encountered during construction.

c. Review/designation of the construction area with the Contractor in accordance with the Final Grading Plan. Haul roads, access roads, and on-site staging and storage areas shall be sited in grading areas to minimize degradation of habitat adjacent to these areas. If activities outside these limits are necessary, they shall be evaluated by the Biologist to ensure no special status species or habitats will be affected.

d. A field review that is conducted to stake designated construction limits (to be set by the Surveyor). Any construction activity areas immediately adjacent to riparian areas or other special status resources (such as large trees or bird nests) may be flagged or temporarily fenced by the Monitor at his/her discretion.

e. Periodic visits to the site during construction to coordinate and monitor compliance with the above provisions.

f. Submittal of a brief report to the County and CDFW discussing any conflicts or errors resulting in impacts to special status
resources within 48 hours of the incident. At the conclusion of construction of each planning area, submittal of a Final Report discussing the results of the activities and any recommendations for improving the process. Submission of this report shall be the performance standard.

In addition, a Biological Monitor will be on site during all initial vegetation removal and will employ salvage methods to minimize direct impacts to common wildlife species. Where feasible, the biological monitor will attempt to ensure wildlife are out of potential direct impact.

In order to further reduce impacts to special status wildlife, restrictions shall be placed on the Contractor. These restrictions are related to hours of operation and blasting requirements. Responsibilities of the Construction Contractor shall include:

a. All Project-related activities during construction shall be restricted to daylight hours. Night work and associated lighting shall be prohibited throughout the Project site to reduce the potential adverse effect on special status species.

b. Vehicle and equipment access within the Project site shall be restricted to existing roads and overland travel shall be minimized and confined to areas where development will occur to the greatest extent feasible.

c. If blasting is required, applicable federal, State, and local requirements would be observed, and any necessary permits and authorizations would be obtained.

d. Best Management Practices Guidelines developed by the Institute of Makers of Explosives (IME) would be implemented.

e. To avoid impacts to special-status-biological resources, blasting would occur during the rough-grading activities of construction phase of the Project only between the hours of 10:00 am and 4:00 pm.

f. To avoid potential affects to birds, blasting would occur outside the nesting bird season (i.e. blasting shall occur only between September 15 and January 1). No blasting shall occur within 1 mile of the winter perch for bald eagle during the winter season (October 15 to March 15).

g. Prior to blasting, a blasting monitoring team including the Project biologist and one acoustician would be formed. The Project biologist would assess and provide guidance related to the criteria for impact on any nearby noise sensitive species. The acoustician should have a minimum of five years of
acoustical measurement experience and would be responsible for the blast noise and vibration measurements.

h. Blasts should be measured with a calibrated Type 1 sound level meter set to the fast or impulse integration response. If possible, the low frequency cut off should be set as low as possible, ideally 2 Hz or lower. Peak sound levels should be measured at a known distance from blast between the blast site and the noise sensitive species habitat (identified by the Project biologist). If the Project biologist sees fit, the low frequency cut of requirements may be waived or adjusted to address the sensitive species in the area. If measured peak levels exceed the criteria, blasts shall be altered in a way to reduce the impact. Such mitigation efforts may include: Reducing the explosive material, altering the packing and placement of the explosive material, or changing the location of the blasting efforts.

i. The biologist has the authority to stop blasting efforts or advise the blast team on the method of mitigation.

**Mitigation Measure 7-4:** All open space preservation areas adjacent to active construction sites shall be denoted with wildlife-friendly fencing installed and maintained during construction to ensure that construction activities remain within the development footprint. Construction area temporary signage shall not have holes (or holes shall be covered or filled within the top four inches) to prevent raptor talon entanglement. Construction fencing and signage will be overseen by the Project Biologist.

**Mitigation Measure 7-5:** Within the year prior to, and within the appropriate season, focused surveys for the following special status species shall be repeated: arroyo toad, Tehachapi slender salamander, California red-legged frog (concurrent with two-striped garter snake and western pond turtle focused surveys), western spadefoot, mountain plover, southwestern willow flycatcher, western yellow-billed cuckoo, and least Bell’s vireo. Surveys shall be conducted within all areas of potentially suitable habitat and in accordance with the approved CDFW or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Species (USFWS) protocol for that species.

Western spadefoot pre-constructions surveys and avoidance measures shall be implemented as follows:

**Western spadefoot pre-construction surveys**

Prior to approval of a Grading Permit, the applicant shall provide to the County evidence verified by the Project Biologist that the area proposed to be graded, including a 300-foot buffer area, has been
surveyed for suitable western spadefoot breeding habitat. If suitable breeding habitat is identified, the verification shall include a map of the delineated areas, including the 300-foot buffer, which are to be avoided. Surveys shall be conducted within 60 days prior to construction during a time of year when the species can be detected above ground at suitable breeding sites. Suitable breeding habitat is defined as areas of temporarily ponded water, including within creeks and within the valley floor uplands. Suitable breeding sites should support ponded water for at least three weeks. To ensure that diseases are not conveyed between work sites by the Project Biologist or his or her assistants, the fieldwork code of practice developed by the Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force will be followed at all times.

**Western spadefoot avoidance measures**

If western spadefoot is detected within the Project footprint, measure "(i)" shall be implemented with appropriate review and concurrence from CDFW. If western spadefoot is detected outside the Project footprint, but within 300 feet of the Project footprint boundary, measure "(ii)" shall be implemented. Prior to implementation of avoidance measures, the Project Biologist shall confer with CDFW.

If western spadefoot is detected (including egg masses and larvae) in water within the Project footprint and cannot be permanently avoided (e.g., by placing a resource avoidance area over the site), suitable breeding habitat shall be created within suitable natural sites in open space outside of the Project footprint under the direction of the Project Biologist. The amount of occupied breeding habitat to be impacted by the Project shall be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. The habitat creation location shall be in suitable habitat within on-site open space and as far away as feasible from residential and commercial development and roads. The created breeding habitat shall be designed such that it supports standing water for no longer than three months following winter rains so that aquatic predators (e.g., fish, bullfrogs, and crayfish) cannot become established. Terrestrial habitat surrounding the proposed relocation site shall be as similar in type, aspect, and density to the location of the impacted breeding site as feasible. No site preparation or construction activities shall be permitted within 300 feet of the vicinity of the impacted breeding site until the design and construction of the pool habitat in preserved areas of the site have been completed and all detected western spadefoot tadpoles, egg masses, and adults are moved to the created breeding habitat.
The Project Biologist shall monitor the relocation site for a cumulative total of five years in which environmental conditions are conducive for western spadefoots to successfully complete the breeding cycle (i.e., adequate rain for pools to hold water for a sufficient period). Monitoring shall be conducted during and immediately following peak breeding season such that surveys can be conducted for adults as well as for egg masses, larval, and metamorphic western spadefoot. Success criteria for the monitoring program shall include verifiable evidence of western spadefoot reproduction at the relocation site during five years with suitable breeding conditions.

If western spadefoot is detected (including egg masses and larvae) in water within 300 feet of the Project footprint boundary, but not within the Project footprint itself, an exclusion fence shall be constructed along the Project boundary between the construction footprint and the occupied breeding site to prevent western spadefoots from moving into and aestivating within the construction footprint. The exclusion fencing shall consist of 16-inch metal flashing, or an equivalent material, which shall be buried at least 6 inches below the ground surface, extending at least 8 inches above the ground. The fencing shall cover a sufficient length of the boundary to inhibit western spadefoots from entering the Project footprint without entrapping aestivating western spadefoot. The necessary length and appropriate location of the exclusion fence relative to the occupied breeding site shall be determined by the Project Biologist.

No construction activities involving heavy equipment generating noise, ground vibration, and/or dust shall be allowed within 300 feet of occupied breeding sites until western spadefoots have metamorphized and are no longer present in the breeding pool, as determined by the Project Biologist. Acceptable Project activities (e.g., quiet and/or low impact activities) within 300 feet of the occupied breeding site shall be allowed at the discretion of the Project Biologist.

Preconstruction surveys and avoidance measures for the least Bell’s vireo and southwestern willow flycatcher, specifically shall be as follows:

**Least Bell’s vireo and southwestern willow flycatcher pre-construction surveys**

In the season prior to construction, within all potentially suitable habitat within 0.5 mile of proposed construction areas, the Project Biologist shall conduct focused surveys for least Bell’s vireo and
southwestern willow flycatcher. Least Bell’s vireo surveys will follow the currently accepted Least Bell’s Vireo Survey Guidelines (USFWS 2001). Surveys for southwestern willow flycatcher will be conducted using the methods outlined in A Natural History Summary and Survey Protocol for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, issued by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and U.S. Department of the Interior and approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (Sogge et al. 2010). Surveys for least Bell’s vireo and southwestern willow flycatcher will be conducted concurrently.

Least Bell’s vireo and southwestern willow flycatcher avoidance measures

If active nests are found, clearing and construction within 0.5 mile of the nest shall be postponed or halted until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the Project Biologist, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. If no active nests are observed, construction may proceed. If active nests are found, work may proceed provided that construction activity is located at least 0.5 mile from active nests (or as authorized through take permits). This buffer may be adjusted provided noise levels do not exceed 60 dBA hourly $L_{eq}$ at the edge of the nest site as determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with a qualified acoustician.

If the noise meets or exceeds the 60 dBA $L_{eq}$ threshold, or if the biologist determines that the construction activities are disturbing nesting activities, the biologist shall have the authority to halt the construction and shall devise methods to reduce the noise and/or disturbance in the vicinity. This may include methods such as, but not limited to, turning off vehicle engines and other equipment whenever possible to reduce noise, installing a protective noise barrier between the nest site and the construction activities, and working in other areas until the young have fledged. If noise levels still exceed 60 dBA $L_{eq}$ hourly at the edge of nesting territories and/or a no-construction buffer cannot be maintained, construction shall be deferred in that area until the nestlings have fledged. All active nests shall be monitored on a weekly basis until the nestlings fledge. The qualified biologist shall be responsible for documenting the results of the surveys and the ongoing monitoring and for reporting these results to CDFW and USFWS.

Mitigation Measure 7-6: Construction Monitoring - The Project Applicant shall retain a CDFW/USFWS-approved “Authorized Biologist,” to be on-call during all construction activities. If condors are observed foraging or landing in the Project area, the Authorized Biologist shall have the authority to stop all construction activities until appropriate corrective
measures have been implemented. If condors are observed landing in the Project area, the Applicant shall avoid further construction within 500 feet of the sighting until the animals have left the area, or as otherwise authorized by CDFW and USFWS. If the condors are nesting within 0.5-mile of any Project area, no construction activities shall occur within this 0.5-mile buffer until the condors leave, or as otherwise directed by CDFW and USFWS. All condor sightings in the Project area shall be reported to CDFW and USFWS within 24 hours of the sighting.

Cattle Carcass Relocation - The Project Applicant shall remove dead cattle that are found within 1,000 feet of the boundary of a residential or commercial development within 24 hours. The Approved Biologist will select locations a minimum of 1,000 feet from development areas for relocation of carcasses. The proposed locations would be approved by the CDFW and USFWS. A telephone number for reporting dead cattle shall be provided by the Applicant.

Utility Hazards - All surfaces on new antennae and phone/utility towers shall be designed, installed, and operated with anti-perching devices in conformance with Avian Power Line Interaction Committee standards to deter California condors and other raptors from perching. Whenever possible, utility towers and antennae should be self-supporting (i.e. not use guy wires), and be as visible as possible (using solid panel siding or dense/wide lattice work).

Condor Educational Curriculum - The Applicant shall provide a Condor Educational Curriculum that includes the life history of the California condor, how to identify condors, TRC hunting rules and regulations, prohibited behaviors related to condors such as hunting with lead ammunition, and the legal consequences of inadvertently or otherwise illegally shooting or harming California condors. The information will also identify types of microtrash that could be ingested by adult breeding condors and describe measures to eliminate microtrash and provide information on how to report roadkill for removal. In addition, these rules, regulations, and prohibitions shall be listed within CC&Rs.

Microtrash - During construction, the Applicant shall ensure that all Project areas are kept clean of debris including microtrash and litter. Workers will be trained on the issue of microtrash: what constitutes microtrash, its potential effects on California condors, and how to avoid the deposition of microtrash.

In addition, the Applicant will ensure that routine community maintenance activities include regular efforts to eliminate microtrash.
on and near all work sites, recreational events, roads, and adjacent open space areas.

If it is determined that condors are ingesting microtrash in the Project area, the Applicant, CDFW, and USFWS shall evaluate potential remedies to reduce, and, if possible, eliminate microtrash ingestion. Such remedies may include increased education and awareness to residents, guests, staff, and workers regarding the dangers of microtrash, increased monitoring of events and activities that are potential sources of microtrash, and more frequent collection of microtrash.

Condor Deterrent Activities - If the Authorized Biologist deems it necessary, USFWS California condor hazing methods that do not rise to the level of “Take” under the ESA (Service 2014) will be employed. Only the Authorized Biologist, with approval from the USFWS, will conduct hazing and only when such actions are warranted. If the Authorized Biologist is not immediately available, a subset of less aggressive hazing methods, such as yelling, stomping, leashed dog barking or low pressure water spray, may be used when a clear escape route for the condors is identified and upon guidance from USFWS.

Condor Tracking – The Applicant will provide the USFWS with twenty-five (25) GPS satellite tracking transmitters (total cost not to exceed $150,000.00) prior to grading plan approval. This will allow the USFWS to more quickly identify the immediate location of birds that are not moving relative to the ground, which usually indicates that an injury, illness, or death has occurred. The ability to track the movements and locations of individual condors can aid in the monitoring of the overall effectiveness of measures to minimize and mitigate the indirect impact of microtrash by locating possible areas where microtrash was ingested. It can also aide in identifying the location where condors were shot if such an incident were to occur.

**Mitigation Measure 7-7:** The Project shall incorporate avoidance and additional open space buffer features for each of the two known tricolored blackbird nesting areas on and adjacent to the Project site. Permanent impacts will be restricted to a distance of 400 feet from the nesting area excluding small impact areas associated with infrastructure and utilities along SR-138 immediately south of Quail Lake. The nesting area will be delineated by a qualified Ornithologist based on all available data (three years of site-specific data shall be used). Temporary impacts (i.e., construction noise) within a ¼ mile of active nesting areas shall be restricted to the non-breeding season. The breeding season for this species shall be considered April 1 through
July 1. The applicant shall consult with CDFW and may obtain an Incidental Take permit if determined appropriate.

**Mitigation Measure 7-8:** The Project Biologist shall conduct pre-construction nesting bird surveys no earlier than seven days prior to any Project-related construction/ground disturbance activities within each construction area and a 500-foot buffer that occurs during the nesting/breeding season of special-status bird species potentially nesting on the site, with the exception of the special-status bird species addressed under separate subheadings below (including burrowing owl, golden eagle, and Swainson’s hawk). The pre-construction surveys shall be conducted between January 1 and September 15, or as determined by the Project Biologist. If construction activities are delayed for more than 14 consecutive days, the surveys shall be repeated.

The purpose of the pre-construction nesting bird surveys will be to determine whether occupied nests are present in the disturbance zone or within 500 feet of the disturbance zone boundary.

If occupied nests are found, then limits of construction to avoid occupied nests shall be established by the Project Biologist in the field with flagging, fencing, or other appropriate barriers. The following minimum no-disturbance buffers will be required: 250 feet around active non-listed passerine nests and 500 feet around active non-listed raptor nests. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. Project-related activities will not occur within the no-disturbance buffers. The Project Biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities are to occur near active nest areas to avoid inadvertent impacts to these nests. The Project Biologist may adjust the 250-foot or 500-foot setback at his or her discretion depending on the species, the behavioral baseline conditions determined through passive monitoring, and the location of the nest (e.g., if the nest is well-protected in an area buffered by dense vegetation). Once a qualified biologist has determined that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival, construction may proceed in the setback areas. Monitoring reports shall include information regarding active nests and status of nests.

**Mitigation Measure 7-9:** Prior to issuance of grading or building permit, the Project Proponent shall conduct appropriate pre-construction bat surveys for bat roosts for pallid bat, western mastiff bat, western red bat, Townsend’s big-eared bat as identified below.
a) Pre-Construction Surveys: No earlier than one year prior to the commencement of construction activities for each construction area, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by qualified project biologists to establish areas of roosts occupancy of special-status bats (including maternity roosts, non-maternity roosts, and winter hibernacula) are present in the Project disturbance zone and within 300 feet of the Project disturbance zone boundary. The number of required project biologists and number of survey nights will be based on the size of the construction area to assure that the whole of the construction area can be adequately surveyed. The surveys shall consist of:

i. Two spring surveys (April through June) and two winter surveys (November through January);

ii. Each survey consists of one dusk emergence survey (start one hour before sunset and last for three hours), followed by one pre-dawn re-entry survey (start one hour before sunrise and last for two hours), and one daytime visual inspection of all potential roosting habitat in the construction area;

iii. For each survey areas, conduct all three survey types within one 24-hour period;

iv. Construction areas too large to be adequately assessed in one survey, as determined by the Project biologist, shall be divided into multiple smaller survey areas.

iv. Focus visual inspections on the identification of bat sign (i.e., individuals, guano, urine staining, corpses, feeding remains, scratch marks and bats squeaking and chattering); and

v. Use bat detectors, bat call analysis and visual observations during all dusk emergence and pre-dawn re-entry surveys.

Data collection for each survey shall include the following information:

i. Whether bats are, or have been, present at roosts on the Project site;

ii. Assemblage of species using the site for roosting;
iii. Type of roost (i.e., maternity roost, day roost, night roost, feeding perch, mating roost, satellite roost, transitional roost or winter hibernaculum);

iv. Location, ambient temperature, internal dimensions and the aspect and orientation of the roost;

v. Spatial and temporal distribution of bat roosting activity;

vi. Flight paths, exit and entrance points;

vii. Number of bats, time and duration of use observed during roost surveys;

viii. Photographs; and

ix. Identification of any survey constraints.

x. If roosts are detected during pre-construction surveys, the following avoidance measures will be implemented unless relocation and/or take is authorized under California Endangered Species Act (CESA), as required by applicable law.

b) Avoidance Measures Fencing Installation

i. For Maternity Roosts: If an active maternity roost is identified in these areas, the maternity roost will not be directly or indirectly disturbed by prohibiting clearing and grubbing adjacent to the roost site, prohibiting lighting use near the roost site where it would shine on the roost or interfere with bats entering or leaving the roost, prohibiting the bird netting and prohibiting the operation of internal combustion equipment, such as generators, pumps and vehicles within 300 feet of the roost site until the maternity roost is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the project biologist. The rearing season for native bat species in California is approximately April 1 through August 31.

ii. For Hibernacula or Non-Maternity Roosts: If non-breeding bat roosts (hibernacula or non-maternity roosts) are found within the disturbance zone, the following shall be implemented:

a. Avoid direct and indirect impacts to roosting sites by prohibiting all project-related activities within 100 feet of the roost.

b. Additionally, within 300 feet of the roost, prohibit clearing and grubbing adjacent to the roost site and lighting use near the roost site where it would
shine on the roost or interfere with bats entering or leaving the roost. Prohibit the operation of internal combustion equipment, such as generators, pumps and vehicles, and the use of bird netting.

c. If avoidance of roost sites is infeasible, maintain portions of the features that provide naturalized habitat to the greatest extent possible and improve existing roost sites and/or provide new roost sites on buildings or on the Project site. Implement these measures only after consultation with CDFW.

d. New roost sites must be in place prior to the initiation of Project-related activities to allow enough time for bats to relocate.

e. Design and locate new and enhanced roost sites to be compatible with the bats’ search image and habitat requirements (i.e., thermal regulation, interior size, ventilation, etc.). Design new and enhanced roost sites in consultation with CDFW.

f. Exclude bats from directly affected work areas selectively and only to the extent necessary to prevent morbidity or mortality to the colony. Use one-way bat exclusion devices, installed in a bat-safe way, to exclude bats and then use steel wool or other method to block the entrance, after the bats have gone. Exclude bats only after consultation with CDFW, at a time that is compatible with the species’ normal behavior patterns (i.e., breeding, feeding, hibernating, etc.). In general, exclusions shall not occur during the maternity/pup-rearing season or during the hibernation season, as determined by conditions at the Project site.

Mitigation Measure 7-23: Notwithstanding any provision of the Centennial Specific Plan to the contrary, land designated by the Centennial Specific Plan as On-Site Mitigation Preserve, Off-Site Mitigation Preserve, Disturbed Green Space, and Undisturbed Green Space shall only be used in a manner consistent with the following land use restrictions:

On-Site Mitigation Preserve: Uses within the On-site Mitigation Preserve shall be restricted to use and continued maintenance of existing ranch roads and trails for access as well as hiking and biking
for private inholding owners and permitted Ranch guests. Public access and recreational hunting shall be prohibited. Authorized motorized vehicles including but not limited to Tejon Ranch employees, utility maintenance vehicles, that have a Tejon Ranch permit and emergency vehicles shall be restricted to existing ranch roads and all recreational motorized vehicles shall be prohibited. No improvements beyond what is necessary to maintain roads, fences, etcetera, in their current state shall be allowed, with the exception of the placement of two new water towers discussed below. Only habitat enhancement, restoration and creation activities approved by the County and described in the Ranchwide Management Plan shall be permitted. New impacts shall be limited to the placement of two water towers with disturbance impacts of no more than five acres each. Grazing shall be allowed to continue as directed by the Ranchwide Management Plan strictly for resource management values.

Off-Site Mitigation Preserve: Uses within the Off-site Mitigation Preserve shall be restricted to use and continued maintenance of existing ranch roads and trails for access as well as hiking and biking for private inholding owners and permitted Ranch guests. Public access shall be prohibited. Authorized motorized vehicles including but not limited to Tejon Ranch employees, utility maintenance vehicles, that have a Tejon Ranch permit and emergency vehicles shall be restricted to existing ranch roads and all recreational motorized vehicles shall be prohibited. No improvements beyond what is necessary to maintain roads, fences, etcetera, in their current state shall be allowed, Recreational hunting shall be restricted to Ranch authorized individuals and within designated hunting areas only. Only habitat enhancement, restoration and creation activities approved by the County and described in the Ranchwide Management Plan shall be permitted. Grazing shall be allowed to continue as directed by the Ranchwide Management Plan strictly for resource management values.

Disturbed Green Space: Uses within Disturbed Green Space shall be restricted to one or more of the following: golf course, equestrian, natural parks, trails, cultural monuments, water retention basins, open space uses, utilities, grading, crop production, grazing, special events, and mitigation activities.

Undisturbed Green Space: Uses within Undisturbed Green Spaces shall be restricted to one or more of the following: continued maintenance of existing ranch roads and trails for access as well as hiking and biking for private inholding owners and permitted Ranch guests. Public access and recreational hunting shall be prohibited. Authorized motorized vehicles including but not limited to Tejon Ranch employees, utility maintenance vehicles, that have a Tejon Ranch permit and emergency
vehicles shall be restricted to existing ranch roads and all recreational motorized vehicles shall be prohibited. Restricted access signage shall be posted along interface with public areas. Wildlife friendly fencing will be used to demarcate the edge of restricted access green space.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project could have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., grasslands, riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to sensitive natural communities to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Native perennial grasslands and wildflower fields are considered special status vegetation types. Project construction would result in the loss of native perennial grasslands and wildflower fields. Due to the loss of approximately 11 percent of the grasslands in general in the Mojave Desert region, the loss of thousands of acres of grassland at least potentially containing a native perennial component (a special status vegetation type) is significant. Loss of wildflower fields, considered to be a subset vegetation type within the grasslands, is similarly considered a significant impact due to their rarity and status as a special status vegetation type. Implementation of MM 7-10 would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels through preservation of 14,908 acres of on-site and off-site grasslands in perpetuity. The proposed preservation reflects greater than a 2:1 ratio of preservation acreage to impact acreage and is complimented by the existence of native grasslands in the 43,079-acre on-site (unimpacted SEA lands) and off-site preserve areas. This ratio has been applied to all impacted grasslands (undifferentiated) although typically is only applied to native grasslands. In addition to grasslands and wildflower fields, several special status vegetation types on the Project site would be directly impacted by Project implementation, including mixed oak woodland, oak trees, and riparian and wetland vegetation. Due to the status of these special status vegetation types as high priority and the additional protection of oak woodlands afforded by the California Public Resources Code and County ordinance, the loss resulting from Project implementation is considered significant. Implementation of MM 7-11 would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels by requiring implementation of creation, enhancement, restoration, preservation, management, and other protective measures. Implementation of MM 7-23 would also reduce this impact. This measure outlines a plan to preserve, enhance, and restore these community types within the mitigation preserve on and off the site (when it is not feasible on site).

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure 7-23 above.
Mitigation Measure 7-10: The Project Applicant/Developer shall preserve grasslands, including native perennial grassland and associated wildflower field vegetation types, at a minimum 2:1 ratio within the Mitigation Preserve (see Table A). The Project would impact 6,416 acres of grasslands; therefore, a total of 12,832 acres of grassland mitigation acreage is required to bring impacts to a less than significant level.

**TABLE A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Area</th>
<th>Grasslands</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Mitigation Preserve</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>3,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (Total On-Site Mitigation Area)</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>3,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Mitigation Preserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>6,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>2,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>7,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>2,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 7</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>15,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (Total Off-site Mitigation Area)</td>
<td>12,919</td>
<td>39,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mitigation Area</td>
<td>14,908**</td>
<td>43,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2:1 Grassland Mitigation requirement is 12,832 Acres**

Mitigation for loss of those areas modeled as native perennial grassland will provide similar habitat quality as that which was lost. The result shall be native perennial grassland and wildflower field values that are equal to or greater than the overall ecological functions and values of those lost as a result of Project implementation. Preservation shall include dedication and long-term management working towards the goal of a self-sustaining system. Long-term management will include focused major problematic non-native species eradication (e.g., feral pigs) where feasible. Preservation will occur on open space lands on the Project site and on other lands within Tejon Ranch.

As outlined in Table A above, the 14,908 acres of grassland preservation will occur in open space areas on site and in the seven other areas. A full description of these areas is in PDF 7-2. Many of these grassland areas have been part of the expansive grassland studies.
conducted for the Project over the course of several years. Detailed plot analysis and modeling show the high level of similarity between these preserved grasslands and the grasslands within the Project impact area. In addition, the grasslands are contiguous with other preserved open space in the region and support other important biological functions (e.g., drainages and local wildlife movement pathways). As a result, the preserved grassland is part of a more watershed-level preservation allowing for long-term sustainment and a total value that is greater than the sum of its parts.

The preservation phasing through conservation easements shall be based on the percentage of total area of impact per phase of development, regardless of specific resource impacts. The specific location of the acreage to be dedicated within a particular phase will be chosen to maximize the replacement of resource values lost during that phase of construction while maintaining as much contiguous acreage as possible. In order to preserve an adequate quantity of grassland, lands outside the County of Los Angeles, within the County of Kern, would be used for mitigation. As each phase is proposed, a percentage of the mitigation preserve (which is equivalent to the percentage of that phase’s impacts) shall be dedicated concurrent with the entitlement approval of that phase.

Management of the Mitigation Preserve shall be in accordance with the Ranch-wide Management Plan (RWMP), which incorporates Best Management Practices for grazing, including Residual Dry Matter targets, and weed management, including invasive plant mapping and targeted removal actions (see RWMP Vol. II Sections 5.1 and 5.2). The RWMP includes standards for management of the grassland areas that will preserve the grasslands in perpetuity. The RWMP shall include a Figure depicting the Mitigation Preserve lands used to meet this 2:1 preserve ratio.

The Mitigation Preserve, including the grasslands within it, shall be preserved in perpetuity to offset Project impacts on native grasslands and wildflower fields prior to issuance of a grading permit for the Project site. The phasing of mitigation has been previously described. The preservation and management of these grasslands through the RWMP will sufficiently offset and fully mitigate the impacts on native grasslands and wildflower fields associated with the Project.

**Mitigation Measure 7-11:** This measure prescribes mitigation for other special status vegetation types including mixed oak woodland, oak trees, and other riparian and wetland vegetation types. Each of these three vegetation types is discussed separately (native grassland and wildflower fields are addressed in MM 7-10).
Mixed Oak Woodlands

The Project Applicant/Developer shall create mixed oak woodlands to achieve resulting vegetation/habitat values. Since there would be approximately 6.2 acres of oak woodland impacts, mitigation will result in the preservation of a minimum of 6.2 acres of mixed oak woodland and creation of a minimum of 6.2 acres of mixed oak woodland, which will include the establishment\(^1\) of 322 oak trees completed as part of oak tree replacement in accordance with the County of Los Angeles oak tree permit requirements (see Oak Trees Section below). Oak trees established in created oak woodlands will be credited towards both oak woodland and oak tree mitigation requirements. If Project impacts are reduced through a reduction in Project disturbance limits in oak woodland areas, required mitigation acreage will be reduced accordingly.

In accordance with mitigation options outlined in Section 21083.4 of the *California Public Resources Code* (PRC), replacement of oak woodlands shall consist of no greater than ½ of the oak woodland mitigation requirement. Therefore, half of the 6.2 oak woodland impact acreage will be mitigated via the alternate option of preservation. The combined acreage of oak woodland preserved both on site (unimpacted Significant Ecological Area [SEA]) and within the off-site mitigation areas is 3,090 acres and is expected to substantially exceed the required 50 percent of mitigation as preservation.

Mitigation through creation is typically implemented on lands with minimal habitat value (e.g., ruderal vegetation, graded slopes) rather than in areas with a substantial component of existing native vegetation. However, evidence of lack of naturally occurring recruitment on site indicates that the existing woodlands are likely to be eventually replaced by non-woodland vegetation. Based on the lack of naturally occurring replacement trees, it is anticipated that oak woodland planting is necessary to sustain the oak woodlands. Therefore, the goal of oak resource mitigation efforts will be to create and enhance oak woodlands. To maximize potential for success, oak woodlands will be created within and adjacent to the same areas where oak woodlands currently exist. This method will create future generations of oak trees and oak woodland on the site in these areas. Details of the oak woodland mitigation program are described below in items 1–10.

1. To mitigate for impacts to oak woodland and oak trees, site-specific native acorns will be collected. Acorns will be collected

\(^1\) In Biology, “establish”, in this sense, refers to vegetation (including seeds) that has been planted and is becoming a healthy, surviving plant with as much chance to survive as plants that have existed for a long period of time.
within the watershed area of the Project site to ensure that acorns collected are of a similar genetic stock to those existing on the site. Some acorns will be planted and maintained in containers, and others will be stored and planted directly on site within the Oak Mitigation Areas.

2. To maximize oak woodland biological values and the potential for long-term success, some locally collected oak acorns will be planted directly into the ground. These acorns will be planted in appropriate locations in the Oak Mitigation Areas. The locations identified for acorn planting will be reviewed by the County Forester.

3. Container plants will be propagated and maintained from locally collected acorns. In this way, more established container plants will be available for mitigation efforts, and they will contain the most suitable genetic variability appropriate for the region to increase mitigation success. The preferred method of propagation will include the establishment of a temporary nursery on the Project site. The nursery will include partial shade areas to reduce water loss and a constant water supply to supplement planted trees. Using the acorns collected from within the watershed area of the Project site, container plantings will be cultivated at this location. Development of trees on site will ensure that they are acclimated to the typical weather conditions at their eventual permanent location. If necessary, and in consultation with the County Forester, acorns collected from the site may be stored or propagated and maintained under contract with a reputable native plant nursery off site.

4. To provide overstory, midstory, and understory tree/plant coverage, some container plants and oak trees, grown from locally collected acorns, will be installed in addition to the application of native seed mixes. Since studies indicate that the younger the planting is, the more likely the chance is for successful establishment and long term viability, locally collected acorns as well as locally collected, nursery-cultivated young oak trees (one-gallon or five-gallon containers of oaks) would be planted on site. The oak woodland planting and seeding palettes will include a diversity of locally-collected native shrubs, subshrubs, grasses, forbs, and ferns, to provide a beneficial mosaic of understory vegetation.

5. The oak mitigation program will include the extensive salvage (from the impacted oak habitat areas) and placement of coarse woody debris, brush piles, and boulders (as available) to immediately provide (a) suitable micro-habitats for the
establishment of plant species with particular shade and moisture requirements (e.g., ferns) and (b) improved habitat resources (e.g., cover) for wildlife species.

6. Irrigation will be provided to the oak plantings in a manner that simulates natural rain events; i.e., infrequent, deep watering. Irrigation will be suspended during periods of substantial rainfall, and irrigation will be terminated at the earliest possible date (depending on seasonal weather patterns) in coordination with the County Forester, to optimize the drought resiliency and proper root development of the planted oaks. Additionally, all irrigation must be terminated for a minimum of five years before the oak mitigation areas will be eligible for final approval/sign-off.

7. The Project Applicant/Developer will provide an annual report to the County that will include an accounting of each of the following in the mitigation areas: (a) the number of acorns planted; (b) the number of germinated acorns (whether planted or natural) protected; (c) the number of new oak trees planted in mitigation areas, including the species of each tree planted; (d) the caliper of each new tree planted and/or protected; (e) the acreage of woodlands created and/or conserved in the mitigation areas.

8. Creation of structurally diverse oak woodland habitat within and contiguous to existing oak woodlands will be accomplished by planting locally collected oak acorns, plus yearly sowings of additional locally collected acorns, as well as, temporary irrigation, weed abatement, pest deterrence, and/or other maintenance tasks as needed to facilitate oak seedling germination and survival.

9. Prior to Project grading, locally collected acorns will be planted and grown. Once trees reach a diameter of one inch just above ground surface (i.e., basal height) within the Oak Tree/Oak Woodland Mitigation Areas, they will be appropriated as “mitigation trees” to be used for oak woodland and oak tree permit mitigation purposes with approval from the County Forester as part of the oak woodland and oak tree permit mitigation process and will be credited as a mitigation tree if the tree is determined to be healthy by the Los Angeles County Forester at the end of the monitoring period.

10. The required 12.4 acres of mixed oak woodland creation will occur within 473 acres of existing oak woodland (primary area) and 716 acres of adjacent low quality non-native grassland (secondary area, if needed) on the western portion of the
Project site. Additional suitable areas may also be identified within reduced grading footprints following final detailed tract map production to the satisfaction of the County Forester. Mitigation planting areas will be refined within the proposed mitigation areas through a multi-variable query of existing Geographical Information System (GIS) data sets, and intensive field analysis to precisely identify suitable planting locations (e.g., localized soil types, microtopography). Created oak woodlands will have an approximate average density of 80 appropriately sized oak trees per acre at the end of the monitoring period (or other density as directed by the County Forester), while staying within the mitigation areas. The contiguity of the created woodland habitat within or adjacent to existing oak woodlands will be ecologically beneficial, and will also improve the logistics of restoration installation, maintenance, and monitoring, compared to a fragmented habitat creation program. These methods will help to ensure the success of created oak woodlands to replace the existing woodlands over time.

11. In order to implement the creation of habitat on the site and to ensure the persistence of the overall biological functions and values over time, the Project Applicant/Developer shall submit an Oak Woodland Habitat Mitigation Plan to the County for approval prior to the issuance of a grading permit for each tract map or combination of tract maps. The mitigation approach described in the Plan shall comply with Section 21083.4 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC), which was enacted by California Senate Bill (SB) 1334. County approval of the Plan shall be required prior to the initiation of any clearing or grading on the site that affects any oak woodland vegetation. The Oak Woodland Habitat Mitigation Plan shall be developed by a qualified Restoration Specialist, to be retained by the Project Applicant/Developer, and shall be subject to County approval. The objective of the Oak Woodland Habitat Mitigation Plan will be to preserve 6.2 acres of existing oak woodland and to create 6.2 acres of oak woodland. The Oak Woodland Habitat Mitigation Plan serves the purpose of satisfying the conditions of Section 21083.4 of the California Public Resources Code.
12. Implementation of the Oak Woodland Mitigation Plan will be the responsibility of the Project Applicant/Developer or its designated party; the Plan shall specify, the following:

a. **Planting Management Program:** A Planting Management Program shall be prepared for review by the County Forester that will outline three planting seasons and will include (i) the first planting season, year 0, being the acorn and sun tolerant ground covers; (ii) the second planting season occurring at approximately year 5, introducing sun/shade tolerant species; and (iii) the third planting season at year 10 with the introduction of more shade tolerant understory species, including the use of reference sites.

b. **Personnel:** The responsibilities and qualifications of personnel required to implement and supervise the plan will be specified. The responsibilities of the Landowner, County staff, Specialists, and Maintenance Personnel that will supervise and implement the plan will also be included.

c. **Site Selection:** The mitigation site(s) will be determined in coordination with the project applicant/Developer and the County. The site(s) will be located in open space areas that will be managed in perpetuity through a conservation easement, open space dedication, performance bond, management at the Tejon Ranch Conservancy, or other method approved by the County Forester.

d. **Native Species Seed Collection, Site Preparation, and Planting Implementation:** Under the supervision of the County Forester, site preparation will include (i) protection of existing native species; (ii) trash and weed removal; (iii) native species salvage and reuse (i.e., duff); (iv) soil treatments (i.e., imprinting, and/or decompacting); (v) erosion-control measures (i.e., rice or willow wattles); (vi) native seed mix application; and (vii) procedures for native seed collection from the site, including acorns of native oak species.

e. **Schedule:** Restoration/revegetation sites will be established between October 1 and January 30. Seeding and planting of container plants will take place immediately after preparation of the mitigation sites and will take place under the supervision of the County Forester.
f. **Maintenance Plan and Guidelines:** The Maintenance Plan, to be approved by the County, will include (i) weed control; (ii) herbivory control (e.g., feral pigs); (iii) trash removal; (iv) irrigation system maintenance; (v) maintenance training; (vi) replacement planting; and (vii) a vehicle washing program to capture invasive propagules. The Maintenance Plan will also indicate who is responsible for each of these listed tasks.

g. **Monitoring Plan:** The monitoring plan, to be implemented for a 15-year period, and to be approved by the County, will include (i) qualitative monitoring (i.e., photographs and general observations); (ii) yearly quantitative monitoring (i.e., randomly placed transects to assess vegetation type coverage and systematically assess all mitigation oak trees); (iii) performance criteria as approved by the County; and (iv) annual reports that will be submitted to the County for five consecutive years after initial planting (or longer if the County requires) and following plan approval. The Plan shall be prepared by a qualified Restoration Specialist and approved by the County prior to any clearing or grading for any tract map that affects any oak woodland vegetation.

h. **Long-Term Preservation:** Long-term preservation of the mitigation site(s) will be outlined in the Restoration Plan to ensure that they are not impacted by future development. An open space dedication, conservation easement, performance bond, management by the Tejon Ranch Conservancy, or other County-approved method will be used to ensure long-term preservation.

i. **Growth/Vegetation Standards:** Growth/vegetation standards will be developed by a qualified Biologist in accordance with County and regulatory agency requirements.

*Oak Trees*

The mitigation approach for replacing lost oak trees shall comply with the County of Los Angeles Oak Tree Ordinance (CLAOTO) requirements. The goal of this program is to replace impacted oak trees at a ratio of 3:1 for non-heritage oaks and 10:1 for heritage oaks in accordance with the County's oak tree permit requirements. This would result in the establishment of 322 oak trees. However, if Project impacts are reduced through a reduction in Project disturbance limits within oak woodland areas, required tree numbers will be reduced accordingly.
Mitigation trees are typically planted on lands with minimal habitat value (e.g., ruderal vegetation, graded slopes) rather than in areas with a substantial component of existing native vegetation. To maximize potential for success, oak trees will be planted in the same areas where oak woodlands currently exist. This method will create future generations of oak trees and oak woodland on the site in these areas and will be done as described in Numbers 1–10 under the "Mixed Oak Woodlands" portion above. Additionally, quantitative tree monitoring data for all mitigation trees (whether for County of Los Angeles Oak Tree Ordinance [CLAOTO] mitigation or oak woodland mitigation) will be submitted to the County Forester yearly and, for convenience, will be included as an appendix to the annual report required in 10(f)(ii) above.

Other Riparian and Wetland

In addition, the Applicant shall create, enhance, and/or restore all impacted riparian and wetland vegetation types that are not considered jurisdictional by permitting resource agencies (i.e., those not mitigated through regulatory permit conditions) at a 1:1 ratio. This applies to areas mapped as alluvial scrub; riparian herb; rush riparian grassland; southern arroyo willow riparian; southern willow scrub; unvegetated wash; willow riparian forest; willow riparian woodland; alkali meadow; Baltic rush; and seeps and ephemeral ponds. These areas shall be included in the Streambed and Wetland Habitat Creation and Enhancement Plan discussed in MM 7-12, which shall be approved by the County prior to issuance of grading permits.

Consultation with representatives from the Angeles National Forest regarding oak and grasslands mitigation activities in SEA 17 shall occur prior to the commencement of oak tree planting in SEA 17.

(3) Potential Impact: The Project could have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by §404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish and Game code §1600 et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to federally or state protected wetlands or waters of the United States to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Project implementation will result in impacts to the jurisdictional drainages, wetlands, and riparian vegetation in the Project site. Impacts to waters of the state
consist of permanent impacts to 0.04 acres on-site and 0.01 acres off-site. Impacts to CDFW-regulated streambeds and riparian areas consist of permanent impacts to 48.7 acres on-site and 0.3 acres off-site, and temporary impacts to 8.0 acres on-site. Impacts to RWQCB-regulated waters total permanent impacts to 47.6 acres on-site and 0.3 acres off-site, and temporary impacts to 8.0 acres on-site. Implementation of MM 7-12 would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels by managing biological resources in any golf courses; by replacing all lost functional values; by obtaining appropriate regulatory agency permits and/or agreements; and by complying with the mitigation measures stipulated in those permits/agreements.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measure 7-6 above.

**Mitigation Measure 7-12:** Prior to any fill of or alteration to drainage tributaries, wetlands, and/or riparian vegetation on the Project site, the Project Applicant/Developer shall obtain the appropriate regulatory agency permits and/or agreements from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with all construction mitigation measures specified in the EIR, regulatory agency permits, and/or agreements. Pursuant to the permit requirements, the Project Applicant/Developer will develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that incorporates Best Management Practices (BMPs) for reducing or eliminating construction-related pollutants in the site runoff.

The Project is subject to the following Mitigation Performance Standards: As anticipated to be required by USACE, CDFW, and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulatory permits, the Project Applicant/Developer shall create, enhance, and/or restore acreage to ensure that net habitat values are at least equal to those lost from Project implementation. Mitigation ratios are typically specified in the regulatory permits. However, if mitigation is conducted prior to impacts taking place, mitigation ratios can be pro-rated; this type of mitigation pro-rating allows time to evaluate if created, enhanced, and/or restored habitat values are at least equal to those that will eventually be lost from Project implementation. Under this scenario, it can be verified that the restoration/creation goals have been accomplished or are proceeding satisfactorily.

The extent of drainages and wetlands that would be preserved under the Project will provide opportunities to expand and enhance the drainages, wetlands, and riparian vegetation throughout the Mitigation Preserve.
As discussed previously, a wetland functional assessment of the drainages and other aquatic features in the Project site was conducted by Glenn Lukos Associates in 2006 and 2009 in order to characterize and evaluate the functions of the site’s drainages and riparian habitats (GLA 2009a). An update to that functional assessment was conducted in 2015 (BonTerra Psomas 2015a). Overall, aquatic resources on the site were evaluated in terms of Functional Capacity Units (FCU), which indicate more specifically the mitigation level necessary to restore riparian functions after Project implementation by providing a measure of the ability of a wetland area to perform typical wetland functions.

The purpose of the mitigation is to replace lost habitat value, as measured in FCU (or other acceptable functional value units) rather than based on a standard acreage ratio. Alternatively, a more traditional mitigation ratio approach may be employed using following rates:

a. Wetland Waters: 2:1, including 1:1 restoration and 1:1 enhancement, of wetland waters.

b. Streams:
   i. 1:1 preservation of ephemeral and/or intermittent streams for permanent impacts to ephemeral non-wetland waters of the state (non-riparian)
   ii. 1:1 preservation of intermittent streams for permanent impacts to intermittent non-wetland waters of the state (non-riparian)
   iii. 1:1 restoration of intermittent streams for temporary impacts to intermittent non-wetland waters of the state (non-riparian)

c. Riparian Vegetation: 2:1, including 1:1 restoration and 1:1 enhancement of riparian vegetation.

Mitigation will include a combination of on-site and off-site preservation of jurisdictional resources; on-site and off-site enhancement/restoration of preserved jurisdictional resources in order to increase overall functional capacity; and the creation (expansion) of riparian/wetland habitats along degraded drainages, including Oso Creek and two of its tributaries in addition to the three other drainages (including the main drainage located along and immediately north of State Route [SR] 138).

The direct and indirect loss in on-site functional units will be mitigated through passive enhancement of open space areas, active enhancement
of 6.5 acres of wetland, and creation of approximately 78.4 acres of wetland/riparian habitat (GLA 2009a). Following implementation of mitigation, the Project provides approximately 4,748.5 FCUs. Therefore, the proposed mitigation will result in a functional gain of 327.5 FCUs, thereby ensuring a net increase in functionality in the post-Project condition (GLA 2009a). In summary, implementation of the proposed jurisdictional resource mitigation will actually result in a net gain in the measurable functional capacity and therefore, the habitat values, of the on-site and off-site drainages and other aquatic features.  

To implement the creation/restoration/enhancement of streambed/wetland habitats on the site, the Project Applicant/Developer shall develop a Streambed and Wetland Habitat Creation and Enhancement Plan commensurate with regulatory agency permits and/or agreements. The purpose of this plan is to demonstrate the feasibility of creating the required mitigation acreage and to ensure that the overall biological functions and values are increased. The plan shall be developed by a qualified Restoration Specialist and shall be submitted and approved by the County and CDFW, and RWQCB prior to grading that would impact jurisdictional waters or wetlands. The Streambed and Wetland Habitat Creation and Enhancement Plan shall specify the following for each tentative tract map area:

- **Statement of Impacts:** A statement of impacts and avoidance shall be prepared, including temporary and permanent impacts.

- **Personnel:** Responsibilities and qualifications of the personnel required to implement and supervise the plan will be specified. The responsibilities of the Landowner, Specialists, and Maintenance Personnel that will supervise and implement the plan will also be included.

- **Site Selection:** Identification of preservation, enhancement and/or creation sites on Mitigation Preserve shall be included. A summary of location of preserved wetlands and/or waters required to achieve applicable preservation performance standards shall also be included. The sites for mitigation will be determined through coordination between the project applicant/Developer, the USACE, the CDFW, the applicable RWQCB, and the County.

- **Site Preparation and Planting Implementation:** Site preparation will include: (1) protection of existing native species; (2) trash and weed removal; (3) native species salvage and reuse (i.e., duff); (4) soil treatments (i.e., imprinting and/or

---

2 For information about the functional values of the impacted jurisdictional resources and proposed mitigation areas, see GLA 2009b in Appendix 5.7-B.
decompacting); (5) fencing, grading and contouring to improve topographic heterogeneity and floodplain benching, erosion-control measures (i.e., rice or willow wattles); (6) seed mix application and quantities; and (7) procedures for seed collection from existing habitat on the site. Implementation procedures such as mulching will also be included.

- **Schedule:** Establishment of restoration/revegetation sites will be conducted between October 1 and January 30. Seeding and planting of container plants will take place immediately after preparation of the restoration sites.

- **Maintenance Plan/Guidelines:** The maintenance plan will include (1) weed control; (2) herbivory control; (3) trash removal; (4) irrigation system maintenance; (5) maintenance training; (6) replacement planting; (7) vehicle washing program to capture invasive propagules; and (8) pest management.

- **Monitoring Plan:** The monitoring plan will include (1) qualitative monitoring (i.e., photographs and general observations); (2) quantitative monitoring (i.e., randomly placed transects); (3) vegetation performance success criteria, as approved by the USACE, the CDFW, and the applicable RWQCB [including success for species richness: (≥10), native vegetative cover (≥70 percent) and invasive species (≤5 percent)]; (4) biannual reports (i.e., two reports the first year) for the first year will be submitted to the USACE, the CDFW, the applicable RWQCB; and (5) annual reports, which will be submitted to all three agencies and the County for an additional four years after initial planting. The monitoring is planned for five years, but may be shorter or longer depending upon the performance of the mitigation sites.

- **Long-Term Preservation:** Long-term preservation of the mitigation sites will be outlined in the mitigation plan to ensure that they are not impacted by future development. An open space dedication, conservation easement, performance bond, management by the Tejon Ranch Conservancy, or other County-approved method will be used to ensure long-term preservation.

- **Performance Standards:** A statement of mitigation performance standard being met (functional value or acreage ratio) shall be included. These will be developed by conducting a biological functions and values assessment (using an accepted method such as Hydrogeomorphic Modeling [HGM]) to establish a baseline for the overall biological value of the
affected streambeds and riparian areas on the site. Revegetation will be considered successful at five years if the percent cover and species diversity of the restored and/or created habitat areas are similar to percent cover and species diversity of adjacent existing habitats, as determined by quantitative testing of existing, restored, and created habitat areas [for species richness (≥10), native vegetative cover (≥70 percent) and invasive species (≤5 percent)]. Contingency measures shall also be described in the event that mitigation efforts are not successful.

- **Temporary Impacts**: standards for minimizing and restoring temporary impacts, which include recontouring and erosion control for intermittent channels and reseeding requirements for riparian vegetation areas.

- **Cattle Exclusion Methods**: Measures to exclude cattle from habitat creation areas and enhancement areas (where applicable) shall be identified and described.

- **Funding**: The funding source(s) for all proposed mitigation actions shall be identified.

The Streambed and Wetland Habitat Creation and Enhancement Plan shall be subject to approval by the County, the USACE, the CDFW, and the applicable RWQCB for impacts within the respective jurisdictional areas of these agencies. If pro-rated mitigation ratios are used, it shall be demonstrated that the mitigation performance standards have been accomplished. The accomplishment shall be verified by the USACE, the CDFW, and the applicable RWQCB based on the performance standards established above prior to the County’s issuance of a grading permit. Implementation of these mitigation measures may serve the dual purpose of satisfying the conditions (or a portion of the conditions) of the agreements/permits of the USACE, the CDFW, and the applicable RWQCB.

(4) **Potential Impact**: The Project could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

**Finding**: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to species or native residents to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.
Facts in Support of Finding

Typically, landscape linkages facilitate wildlife movement between large areas of similar terrain, vegetation types, or habitats. Because of the unique adaptations required of wildlife species that inhabit the low elevations of the San Joaquin Valley to the north of the Tehachapi Mountains and the Antelope Valley and adjacent Mojave Desert to the south of the mountain range, most species that occupy these geographically separate and distinct ecosystems do not venture south or north, into or over, the Tehachapi Mountains. Wildlife species within the mountains surrounding the Project site are expected to move freely within the mountains to satisfy their life history requirements. Accordingly, most wildlife movement in the mountains probably occurs within large landscape areas in upland portions of the Tehachapi range, and to the south of the Centennial property within the western extent of the San Gabriel Mountains much more than between these areas. The same can be expected of movement on the valley floor and surrounding low foothills, where the proposed Project is located.

Two regional conservation plans, which although not providing mitigation for Centennial, would act in concert with the Project mitigation preserves to help sustain the functionality of the regional landscape linkage for future wildlife populations. These plans offer elements for long-term sustainability and management of a Tehachapi Mountains landscape linkage: the Tejon Ranch Conservation and Land Use Agreement (Ranch-Wide Agreement [TRCRWA]) and the Tehachapi Upland Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (TUMSHCP).

Under the TRCRWA, the Tejon Ranch Conservancy will adopt, update, monitor and enforce implementation of the Ranch-wide Management Plan (RWMP) on dedicated conservation areas and option areas subject to conservation, preservation, mitigation, and enhancement measures, as required under applicable law or imposed by federal, State or local agencies as part of any permit or approval for the Ranch or projects within the Ranch. The TRCRWA also provides that the Conservancy, or an alternate conservation entity as identified in the TRCRWA, will manage long-term mitigation obligations for open space lands used for mitigation to comply with federal and state agency permit requirements imposed in relation to the development activities allowed in the TRCRWA, including development of the Project. While the TRCRWA is not itself an agency-imposed mitigation measure for the Project or other Tejon Ranch activities, the TRCRWA does provide the overarching legal, management, and funding framework for the open space lands used as mitigation lands in local, state, and federal land use entitlements and permits. It also voluntarily conserves 170,000 contiguous acres of open space Ranch lands, even if preservation of such lands is not required by agency mitigation measures. Resource agency support of the TRCRWA is included in an appendix to the TRCRWA. Maintenance of the open space or conserved lands will be the responsibility of the Conservancy, funded in large part by a fee based on a portion of the purchase price for each residential parcel on Tejon Ranch. Since Centennial constitutes over 75 percent of the currently planned residential units on the Ranch, it will bear the substantial costs of funding the
Conservancy and maintaining wildlife movement corridor areas through the Ranch. As mentioned in EIR Section 5.7.2, Relevant Plans, Policies and Regulations, no public agency is a party to the TRCRWA, although the federal and State agencies responsible for administering biological protection laws and regulations confirmed that lands under the RWMP continue to be eligible mitigation lands.

In addition, the TUMSHCP ensures the persistence of covered species, including sustaining viable populations of those species, providing for (within property dispersal) and protecting current opportunities for wildlife movement beyond the Ranch by preserving existing landscape linkages. Lands to be conserved as part of the TUMSHCP are adjacent to other lands within Tejon Ranch ownership and are also slated to be protected as part of the TRCRWA. The sum of these interconnected open space commitments, development restrictions, and mitigation measures is a conservation commitment that is, by design, consistent with conservation biology principles calling for large, interconnected blocks of habitat that support the life history requirements of Covered Species and other resident wildlife. The TUMSHCP, if fully implemented, will sustain crucial landscape linkages in the Project region.

The TUMSHCP will be a major contributor to ensuring the viability of the Tehachapi Landscape linkage into the future. Through the various conditions and measures stipulated by the TUMSHCP for the various covered species, habitat for these and many additional species will be preserved and enhanced, which will promote healthy plant and wildlife communities throughout the region. Although the focus of the TUMSHCP is on the California condor and other species of the montane upland communities, many of the same species occur in the foothills and lowland areas as well, including the Project site. These species will benefit from the TUMSHCP in addition to the Centennial Mitigation Preserve program described in this document.

The wildlife movement impact analysis beginning on page 5.7-164 of the Draft EIR concludes that development of the Project site will result in some losses of areas that may be used for foraging and/or breeding for these species. However, these sorts of impacts are not expected to destabilize the regional population dynamics of these species, especially given the substantial amount of similar terrain in the northwestern Antelope Valley area. Multi-generational gene flow among wildlife populations in the region is expected to be sustained in the open spaces on and off the site that will remain following Project implementation. The direct impacts of Project development, therefore, are considered less than significant.

The area of the Project site that provides the greatest cover and is nearest to the regional wildlife corridor, located on the western edge of the Project site, is largely included in permanent open space and is not grassland. Although large areas of open space occur in and adjacent to the vicinity of the Project site, the California Aqueduct and I-5 substantially limit the site’s ability to contribute to regional wildlife movement. The direct impacts of Project development on regional movement, therefore, are considered less than significant. However, Project implementation could result in potentially significant indirect impacts on local wildlife movement. In
addition, development of the Project would substantially increase the number of nighttime light and glare sources on the site, which can potentially alter breeding cycles and nesting behavior. Urban development also tends to attract wildlife species that are better adapted to urban settings and cause native species to decrease or be eliminated. Landscaping and restoration efforts can introduce pathogens and pests into an ecosystem and cause plant diseases. Finally, increased human presence can impact native wildlife and plants. These impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of MMs 7-13 through 7-19 by ensuring that Project waste receptacles, buffer areas, water control features, lighting and landscaping are implemented and managed in a biologically appropriate manner, by providing a highway underpass to facilitate wildlife movement and by incorporating public awareness programs concerning multiple urban interface issues. This impact will also be reduced by implementation of the preservation requirements of MM 7-23. With implementation of the identified MMs, impacts to wildlife species and native residents would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure 7-23 above.

Mitigation Measure 7-13: The Project Applicant/Developer shall develop a Landscaping Plan for review and approval by the County Biologist. The Landscaping Plan shall be (1) prepared by a qualified biologist; (2) submitted to the County for approval with each tentative map; (3) provided to builders; (4) provided to future project occupants as described in the Specific Plan; and (5) includes a plant palette composed of non-invasive species that are adapted to the conditions found on the Project site and do not require high irrigation rates. The Landscaping Plan will also include a list of invasive plant species prohibited from being planted on the Project site. In addition, retail sales of these invasive plant species will be prohibited at any businesses (nurseries) located within the Project site. Landscape plans shall encourage planting of local natives typical of native vegetation within ten miles of the Project site.

The Homeowners Association shall supply future residents of the Project site with the list of invasive plant species from the Landscaping Plan that will be prohibited from being planted on the Project site and educational materials that emphasize the importance of adhering to the list. The prohibition shall be clearly described and distributed to home buyers through their home purchase contacts and CC&Rs. A list of local native plants and educational materials shall be provided to homeowners and shall be posted on the community intranet.

Mitigation Measure 7-14: The designated SR-138 underpass shall be located where the highway crosses the Project’s western border near the current
intersection with Cement Plant Road. The width of the underpass shall be 100 feet as it passes under SR-138 and shall flare out on both sides of the highway as it moves away from SR-138 to a 150-foot width in the Project open space adjacent to the highway. These specifications are expected to allow some local wildlife to safely pass between open space areas on opposite sides of the highway.

In addition, a 50-foot open space buffer will be incorporated on the eastern and western sides of Cement Plant Road; this buffer shall be from the southern side of the bridge that spans the California Aqueduct to the nearest open space polygon that meets the property edge. The undeveloped 50-foot buffer shall run parallel with the Aqueduct along its southern bank. This buffer may be temporarily disturbed during construction, but shall be retained as greenspace to increase connectivity for local wildlife between open space areas and potential Aqueduct crossing locations.

**Mitigation Measure 7-15:** Waste and recycling receptacles that discourage foraging by wildlife species adapted to urban environments shall be installed by the Project Applicant/Developer in common areas (i.e., any area where public trash receptacles would be placed, such as parks, sidewalks, community centers, and walking trails) throughout the Project site. Common, residential, and commercial areas will all be served with wildlife resistant trash receptacles. Documentation of the completion of this measure shall be submitted to the County prior to occupation of housing units.

The Homeowners Association shall post the information on the community intranet and shall supply an educational pamphlet to future residents of the Project site regarding: the importance of not feeding wildlife; information stating that trash (containing food) and microtrash that could potentially attract condors should not be accessible to wildlife; the necessity of keeping the ground free of fallen fruit from trees; and instructions about not leaving pet food outside. Additionally, in order to minimize impacts on native wildlife, the use of rodenticides on the Project site shall be prohibited. The prohibition shall be clearly described and distributed to home buyers through their home purchase contracts and CC&Rs.

All vertical open pipes used for fence posts, property line stakes, signs, roof veneration, chimneys, vault toilets, and similar structures and metal fence stakes used on the Project site shall be capped. Capping can be accomplished using bolts or other materials to avoid raptor talons becoming entrapped within the bolt holes of metal fence stakes.
Mitigation Measure 7-16: All landscaping materials (including organic mulches) for common/public areas (i.e., parks and intervening unpaved areas which are not a part of any homeowner’s parcel) shall be inspected and certified by landscape suppliers as being “free” of Argentine ants prior to planting. Additionally, container plants and other landscaping materials to be installed within common/public areas within 200 feet of the open space areas shall be inspected by a qualified restoration specialist for the presence of Argentine ants. Plants or other materials with Argentine ants shall be rejected.

Upon initiating landscaping within a development area, quarterly monitoring shall be initiated for Argentine ants along the development/construction–open space interface at sentinel locations where invasions could occur (e.g., where moist microhabitats that attract Argentine ants may be created). A qualified biologist shall determine the monitoring locations. Ant pitfall traps will be placed in these sentinel locations and operated on a quarterly basis to detect invasion by Argentine ants. If Argentine ants are detected during monitoring, direct control measures will be implemented immediately to help prevent the invasion from worsening.

These direct controls may include but are not limited to nest/mound insecticide treatment, or available natural control methods being developed. A general reconnaissance of the infested area would also be conducted to identify and correct the possible source of the invasion, such as uncontrolled urban runoff, leaking pipes, or collected water. Each site visit shall be followed up with a summary monitoring report sent electronically to Applicant indicating the status of the site. Monthly monitoring reports, as needed, shall be submitted to CDFG and the County of Los Angeles. Monitoring reports shall include remedial recommendations and issue resolution discussions when necessary. Monitoring and control of Argentine ants would occur for a 5-year period. After the first 5 years, the Homeowners Association or other entity will be responsible for controlling Argentine ants. Additionally, to further guard against Argentine ants, the Homeowners Association shall discourage irrigated landscape planting through distribution of educational information and other feasible methods to reduce the potential for importing Argentine ants.

Additionally, to further guard against Argentine ants, the Homeowners Association shall discourage irrigated landscape planting through distribution of educational information and other feasible methods to reduce the potential for importing Argentine ants.

To preclude the invasion of Argentine ants into preserved populations of round leaved filaree and crownscale and their associated buffers,
controls will be implemented using an integrated pest management (IPM) approach. The controls include (1) Providing "dry zones" between development and round leaved filaree and crownscale populations, where typical soil moistures are maintained at levels below about 10% soil saturation, which will deter the establishment of nesting colonies of ants; and providing dry zone buffers of sufficient width to reduce the potential for Argentine ant activity within core habitat areas; (2) Where feasible, and/or appropriate, dry areas such as parking lots and roadways shall be built adjacent to the boundaries of these populations; (3) designing adjacent areas to slope away from the preserved populations to avoid runoff entering the area; (4) Pedestrian pathways placed next to preserve populations shall consist of decomposed granite or other gravel to minimize the holding of moisture, thereby preventing establishment of suitable habitat for Argentine ant colonies; (5) Ensuring that all landscape container plants are ant free prior to installation to reduce the chance of colonies establishing in areas close to the preserved populations; (6) Maintaining natural hydrological conditions in the preserved populations areas, including the buffers, through project design features for roadways, French drains, irrigation systems, underground utilities, drainage pipes and fencing, storm drains, and any other BMP measures that apply to surface water entering the preserved populations areas; (7) Using drought resistant plants in fuel modification zones and minimizing irrigation to the extent feasible.

Similarly, to preclude the invasion of Argentine ants into Mitigation Preserve lands, "dry zones" of a minimum of 350 feet shall be established between development and the Mitigation Preserve. Soil moistures shall be maintained at levels below about 10 percent soil saturation within dry zones to deter the establishment of nesting colonies of ants. All landscaping materials to be used in these zones shall be inspected and certified as “free” of Argentine ants prior to planting. Additionally, these materials shall be inspected by a qualified restoration specialist for the presence of Argentine ants. Plants or other materials with Argentine ants shall be rejected.

To prevent the establishment of invasive aquatic wildlife such as the American bullfrog (*Lithobates catesbeianus*) and the African clawed frog (*Xenopus laevis*), all Project flood control and other water retention features shall be monitored seasonally and following rain fall events to confirm pooling does not persist for more than 15 days. If such pooling beyond 15 days is detected, including, for example, in artificially created fishing/casting ponds which can only be constructed following issuance of a conditional use permit and further environmental review, the constructed pond location shall be checked routinely for presence of aquatic invasive wildlife by a qualified biologist until the unexpected
pooling no longer persists. If detected, eradication measures to remove all invasive aquatic wildlife shall be implemented by the qualified biologist and may include one or more techniques, including trapping, pithing, and pellet shooting.

**Mitigation Measure 7-17:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall implement a public awareness program (prior to the first occupancy permit) in an effort to restrict public access to the riparian and open space areas on the Project site to designated trails and to prevent unleashed domestic animals from entering these areas. The program’s educational materials shall discuss the presence of native animals (e.g., coyote, bobcat, and mountain lion), indicate that those native animals could prey on pets, indicate that no actions shall be taken against native animals should they prey on pets allowed outdoors, and indicate that pets must be leashed while using the designated trail system and/or in any areas within or adjacent to open space. The educational materials shall also discuss the impacts pets can have on native birds. Control of stray and feral cats and dogs will be conducted in open space areas on an as-needed basis. Feral cats and dogs may be trapped and deposited with the local Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals or the Los Angeles County Department of Animal Control. This program shall include signs that identify the boundaries of ecologically sensitive areas (including the avoided special status plant populations described in MM 7-1); the use of temporary, wildlife-friendly fencing around sensitive areas that appear to be receiving a high level of disturbance until the disturbance is reversed; and promotion of public education and awareness of such areas. In addition to signage being located along the boundaries of the Mitigation Preserve, signage denoting the boundaries of ecologically sensitive areas and other pertinent information shall be included along the Pacific Crest Trail where it overlaps the Mitigation Preserve. The Project Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for the initial development of the public awareness program and installation of interpretive signs and wildlife-friendly fencing. The Homeowners Association, the Project Applicant/Developer, or an acceptable Land Manager/Agency (as approved by the County) shall be responsible for maintaining this program, including signs and wildlife-friendly fencing.

Only passive recreational activities shall be permitted within the designated natural open space areas and shall be restricted to trails. Some areas may allow slightly greater impacts if designated as picnic and/or camping areas.

Domestic cats shall be prohibited from free-roaming (i.e., be allowed outdoors), and shall be required to have a microchip. All dogs shall be required to be leashed while in the designated natural open space
areas, and bags for removing pet excrement will be provided at trail entrances and other appropriate locations. In addition, all dogs and cats shall be required to be neutered or spayed; all dogs shall be required to have a microchip; and potential owners shall show evidence prior to entry into the Centennial Development, as required by Los Angeles County Code (Section 10.20.350). These restrictions/features and their purpose will be described within educational material and distributed to new homeowners, shall be posted on the community intranet, made available to all homeowners as needed, and shall be clearly described and distributed to home buyers through their home purchase contracts and CC&Rs.

Mitigation Measure 7-18: Common area landscaping and restoration methods shall follow protocols to reduce the potential for the introduction of pathogens and pests into the Project site and to reduce the spread of pathogens and pests outside the Project site (should they inadvertently be introduced). Protocols for reducing the potential for introduction of pathogens and pests into the site via plant foliage/soil from nurseries supplying the material shall include the following anti-contamination procedures: sanitizing all containers, tools, and footwear (boots, pots, clippers, soil scoops, shovels) in soil potting areas; sanitizing all transplanting and prep tables; sanitizing plant storage locations (e.g., benches); sanitizing plant transportation devices (e.g., carts); sanitizing floor surfaces where plants are stored on a regular basis; and using anti-splash watering methods for particularly susceptible plant species. Field installation crews shall sanitize all tools and footwear during landscaping and restoration activities prior to using them or entering the site and shall install plants in a way that minimizes conditions that support pathogens and pests (e.g., minimizing standing water). All plant materials brought onto the site will be inspected by landscape/restoration personnel familiar with signs of pathogen and pest infestation. Should pathogens or pests be detected, the infected material shall be bagged, secured, and disposed of off-site to a contained location. Long-term control methods shall include monitoring to examine vegetation and surrounding areas for pests to evaluate trends and to identify when controls are needed; establishing action thresholds that trigger control actions; and implementing pest control methods—cultural, mechanical, environmental, and biological—and appropriate pesticides.

Mitigation Measure 7-19: Prior to vegetation clearing or grading, additional surveys shall be performed to confirm that all oak trees within the impact and buffer areas are recorded. The Project Applicant/Developer will be required to comply with all mitigation measures stipulated in the County-issued Oak Tree Permit pursuant to the County of Los Angeles Oak Tree Ordinance (CLAOTO) and the County of Los Angeles Oak
Woodlands Conservation Management Plan (OWCMP). Trees would be planted pursuant to the Oak Woodland Restoration Plan discussed in MM 7-11.

(5) Potential Impact: The Project could convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10 percent canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inches in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.) and could conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, §22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6).

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to oak woodlands, native trees, and reduce potential Project conflicts with policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site contains an estimated 181,070 oak trees of all sizes; of these, an estimated 33,861 oaks under the jurisdiction of County of Los Angeles Oak Tree Ordinance are present on the site; an estimated 91 regulated oaks would be directly impacted by the Project. Of the oaks to be impacted, 7 qualify as “heritage” oaks. Oak impacts are generally limited to two areas. The first area is located north of SR-138, directly west of Quail Lake, and occurs in Mixed Oak Woodland. The second area occurs south of the SR-138 and in the western portion of the Project site, also in Mixed Oak Woodland. In addition, the San Andreas Significant Ecological Area (SEA 17) incorporates two former SEAs in the Project region; those resources, which were previously within SEAs 58 and 59 continue as designated resources within SEA 17. The SEA would remain intact, and the Project would not result in any fragmentation of this area. Approximately 3,865 acres of on-site lands are located within the boundaries of SEA 17 and would be preserved as potential on-site mitigation lands.

Implementation of MM 7-11, MM 7-19, MM 7-20, MM 7-21 and MM 7-22 would reduce the Project’s potential adverse impacts to oak trees and SEA 17 to a less than significant level by ensuring that the Project complies with the mitigation requirements stipulated by the County’s Oak Tree Ordinance, by ensuring that the Project implements additional oak surveys and oak avoidance measures, by creating, enhancing, and/or restoring oak habitats, by ensuring that fuel modification zones are contained within the current Project impact boundary and would not intrude into the adjacent SEA 17, by ensuring that fuel modification zones are contained within the current Project impact boundary and would not intrude into the adjacent SEA 17, by prohibiting use of vegetation clearance within SEA 17 or mitigation preserve areas,
and by ensuring that any golf course developed as part of the Project implements ecologically sound design and management measures consistent with the Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary Program for Golf Courses.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 7-11 and 7-19 above.

Mitigation Measure 7-20: All oak tree driplines within 50 feet of land clearing (including brush clearing) or areas to be graded shall be enclosed with temporary fencing for the duration of the clearing or grading activities. Fencing shall extend to the root protection zone (RPZ) (that area at least 15 feet from the trunk or half again as large as the distance from the trunk to the dripline, whichever is greater). No parking or storage of equipment, solvents, or chemicals that could adversely affect the trees shall be allowed within 25 feet of the trunk at any time. Fence removal shall occur only after the Project Biologist confirms the health of preserved trees.

All upslope grading and drainage shall be engineered to minimize resultant erosion, soil compaction, or drainage into preserved oak tree areas. Whenever possible, utilities shall be designed to avoid crossing under the canopies of preserved trees unless the utilities are installed by drilling under the root zones (where feasible) in order to avoid impacts associated with cutting roots. Feasibility of drilling under trees will be based on soil conditions. Utilities will be clustered whenever possible to lessen impacts to oak RPZs.

Mitigation Measure 7-21: In order to ensure that no direct impacts to Significant Ecological Area (SEA) 17 occur, brush clearance zones shall be contained within the current Project impact boundary and no overlap with the adjacent SEA 17 shall occur. Vegetation management for fire abatement purposes is not authorized in SEA areas. An Implementation Plan, including fire risk abatement measures (including but not limited to vegetation management) required to comply with State and County fire prevention and response legal requirements, shall be submitted as part of the tentative tract map for portions of the Project site that border an SEA or mitigation preserve area. The Plan shall include: (a) a summary of applicable State and County fire risk abatement requirements; (b) a prohibition on the use of vegetation clearance within SEA 17 or mitigation preserve areas. The Plan shall be submitted to the County for approval with the first tentative map, and shall be updated to include new or modified State or County fire risk abatement requirements as part of each subsequent tentative tract map submittal.
Mitigation Measure 7-22: If a golf course is developed as part of Project implementation, the Project Applicant/Developer shall prepare a Golf Course Management Plan that requires any golf course developed on the site to incorporate the design and management measures consistent with the Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary Program for Golf Courses (or equivalent), which is a cooperative effort between the United States Golf Association and Audubon International that is designed to promote ecologically sound land management and to conserve natural resources (see Final EIR Appendix 5.7-F). The Plan shall be submitted to the County for approval with any tentative map that includes a golf course.

(6) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to cause significant cumulative impacts to special status plant and wildlife species.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to biological resources, including special status plant, wildlife species, and certain sensitive vegetation types, including oak woodlands wildfire fields to less than significant levels, with the exception of the cumulative impacts to native grasslands and wildlife movement. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant (with the exception of cumulative impacts to native grasslands and wildlife movement).

Facts in Support of Finding

The combined impacts of the Project and other projects in the region would result in substantial direct and indirect impacts on biological resources. Two projects in particular, Gorman Post Ranch and Tejon Mountain Village, would impact similar biological resources, such as native grasslands, oak woodlands, special status plant and wildlife species, drainages, and wildlife movement. Other general impacts include direct impacts related to habitat removal and loss of open space as well as indirect impacts including increases in disturbances such as noise, night lighting, exotic species introduction, vehicular traffic, and human interaction. While it is not possible to predict precisely where development associated with regional growth would occur, it is likely that such future development would also result in the conversion of natural open space areas. The Project would result in impacts on special status plant and wildlife species. These impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. Development of the Project would result in impacts on several sensitive vegetation types including oak woodlands, native grasslands, and wildflower fields. Implementation of the Project’s mitigation measures would enhance, restore, and create these vegetation types within the proposed open space preserve and would therefore reduce impacts to less than significant levels for all vegetation types except native grasslands.
It is likely that most identified related projects, especially Gorman Post Ranch and Tejon Mountain Village, also have impacts on special status species. These impacts would be less than significant for the four following reasons:

- Highly sensitive species, such as those that are federally or State-listed, are uncommon in the region and therefore less likely to be impacted by one of the future projects.
- The California condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*), a highly sensitive species from the region, does not occupy the low lying valley floor areas that are likely to incur the greatest level of disturbance from future development. In addition, the Tehachapi Upland Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (TUMSHCP) provides for the long-term preservation of essential condor areas and considers development of the Tejon Mountain Village project.
- The open space preserve proposed as part of the Project, the resource protection provided in the nearby National Forest lands, and the Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas in the area together encompass a large portion of the region and provide a valuable haven for species as other parts of the region are developed.
- Related projects would mitigate Project-specific impacts related to biological resources, thus reducing the cumulative impacts.

With the exception of impacts related to native grasslands and wildlife movement, the Project would not cause a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a substantial adverse cumulative effect on biological resources, including special status plant, wildlife species, and certain sensitive vegetation types, including oak woodlands and wildfire fields, because the Project’s impact on such resources would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of MMs 7-1 through MM 7-23, as discussed above, and because related impacts caused by cumulative projects are likely to be reduced to less than significant levels through compliance with applicable law and resource agency permit conditions, and through implementation of required mitigation tailored to each such project. However, as discussed in Section 6(B), the Project’s incremental contribution to impacts on native grasslands and wildlife movement would be cumulatively considerable.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 7-1 to 7-23 above.

**Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to cause significant cumulative impacts to wetland resources and State or federally protected waters.

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to wetland resources and State or federally protected waters to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.
**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project’s impacts on federally protected wetland resources and on State-protected wetlands and their associated habitat are reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of MM 7-12. Specifically, a Wetland Habitat Creation and Enhancement Plan would be developed and would further reduce related impacts. Other mitigation requires permits and/or agreements to be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the CDFW, and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), as well as the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that incorporates BMPs for reducing or eliminating construction-related pollutants in the site runoff. Although these are Project-specific measures, they would serve to reduce cumulative impacts and, as such, cumulative impacts on riparian habitat and other sensitive vegetation types would be less than significant. The region is not expected to incur substantial losses of State or federally protected wetlands, their associated riparian habitat, or other jurisdictional waters as related projects are likely to reduce such impacts to less than significant through adherence to federal and State regulations.

The Project would not cause a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a substantial adverse cumulative effect on protected wetland resources because the Project’s impact on such resources would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of MM 7-12, as discussed above, and because related impacts by cumulative projects are likely to be reduced to less than significant levels though compliance with applicable law and resource agency permit conditions, and through implementation of required mitigation tailored to each such project.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 7-12 above.

(8) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to cause significant cumulative impacts to oak trees.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to oak trees and oak woodlands to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project would not cause a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a substantial adverse cumulative effect on oak tree and oak woodland resources because the Project’s impact on such resources would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of MMs 7-11 and 7-21 through 7-22, as discussed above, and because related impacts by cumulative projects are likely to be reduced to less than significant levels though compliance with applicable law and resource agency permit conditions, and through implementation of required mitigation tailored to each such project.
Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 7-11 to and 7-21 through 7-22 above.

C. Cultural and Tribal Resources

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of (1) a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, (2) an archeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, (3) a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or (4) a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to historical, archeological, or tribal resources to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact is less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

A combination cultural resources survey/evaluation was undertaken on the Project site. The survey was comprehensive, covering the entirety of the Project area. The surveys resulted in identification of 57 archeological sites, 26 within the development footprint and 3 which are eligible for CRHR listing (CA-LAN-3201, CA-LAN-3240 and CA-LAN-3242). These sites had archeological deposits that extend to about 20 cm in depth including flake tools, waste flakes, petroglyphs, and obsidian flakes. There are 30 prehistoric archeological sites within open space areas (i.e., areas outside the grading footprint). Of these, the eligibility of 18 sites has been determined and 1 of those has been determined eligible (CA-LAN-3206). The 12 remaining sites are considered eligible unless an evaluation proves otherwise. Because these 12 sites (CA-LAN-3195, CA-LAN-3196, CA-LAN-3197, CA-LAN-3198, CA-LAN-3200, CA-LAN-3203, CA-LA-3207, CA-LAN-3208, CA-LAN-3210, CA-LAN-3214, and CA-LAN-3217) are outside the development footprint, direct impacts during grading and other construction activities are not expected. However, sites CA-LAN-3217 and CA-LAN-3227 are immediately adjacent to the development footprint. Because of proximity, these sites could suffer damage during grading activities. In addition, long-term operation of the Project would result in potential indirect impacts to the 12 sites with unknown eligibility and the 1 site located in the open space areas that is known to be eligible (CA-LAN-3206) due to increased access by residents and visitors to these areas of the site compared to existing conditions. No known significant cultural resources are associated with off-site activities. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects. The
following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level through avoidance, training, and by ensuring qualified archaeological monitoring of construction activities in accordance with a qualified monitoring plan, data collection, and appropriate treatment of unanticipated archaeological discoveries.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 6-1: The Project Applicant/Developer shall retain a qualified Archaeologist who shall oversee archaeological monitoring of topsoil grading and removals (including clearing, grubbing, and trenching) in the immediate vicinity of the following 25 archaeological sites that are within the grading footprint and 2 sites in the open space area that are immediately adjacent to the development impact area: CA-LAN-3201, CA-LAN-3202H, CA-LAN-3217, CA-LAN-3219H, CA-LAN-3227, CA-LAN-3230, CA-LAN-3232, CA-LAN-3233, CA-LAN-3234, CA-LAN-3236, CA-LAN-3237, CA-LAN-3238, CA-LAN-3239, CA-LAN-3240, CA-LAN-3241, CA-LAN-3242, CA-LAN-3243, CA-LAN-3244, CA-LAN-3245, CA-LAN-3246, CA-LAN-3247, CA-LAN-3248, CA-LAN-3250, CA-LAN-3251, CA-LAN-3252, CA-LAN-3253, and CA-LAN-3985H. CA-LAN-3217 and CA-LAN-3227 are immediately adjacent to the grading footprint. Additionally, a Native American monitor representing the Tejon Indian Tribe shall be present during topsoil grading and removals in the vicinity of the 27 above-listed archaeological sites.

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide written evidence to the County that a qualified Archaeologist has been retained to carry out all mitigation measures related to archeological and historical resources. A qualified Archaeologist is defined as an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for professional archaeology. The qualified Archaeologist shall: be present at the pre-grading meeting; establish procedures for archaeological resource surveillance, including coordination with representatives of the Tejon Indian Tribe on the location and schedule of Native American monitoring; and establish (in cooperation with the Project Applicant/Developer and/or County as well as the Tejon Indian Tribe) procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of any artifacts found, as appropriate.

The qualified Archaeologist shall develop and submit an Archaeological Resource Monitoring Plan to the County for sites in development areas. The qualified Archaeologist and a Native American monitor representing the Tejon Indian Tribe shall be retained to attend pre-grade meetings and to monitor earth-moving activities, including clearing, grubbing and trenching, in the vicinity (i.e., the area of a site...
reasonably expected to contain archaeological resources plus a buffer of at least 10 meters [33 feet]) of any and/or all cultural resource sites. For implementation of each tract map, if no subsurface Native American or archaeological remains are identified in the vicinity of an archaeological resources site during that initial grading, continuous monitoring will no longer be required but the Project Archaeologist and Native American monitor shall spot-check all additional subsurface excavations in the vicinity of an archaeological resources site at least once a week for the duration of grading and excavation activities or until the monitor deems site clear. The Project Archaeologist shall be responsible for coordinating the location and schedule of Native American monitors.

The Archaeologist and Native American monitor shall carefully inspect these areas to assess the potential for significant prehistoric or historic remains. If potentially significant archaeological resources are uncovered, the qualified Archaeologist and Native American monitor shall halt or redirect ground-disturbing activities away from the vicinity, and a subsurface test and/or evaluation shall be performed to assess the discovery. Further subsurface investigation or data recovery shall be undertaken if the resource is determined by the Project Archaeologist to be unique or historically significant (i.e., important for its prehistoric or historic information) and therefore eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

The archaeological procedures required by the Archaeological Resource Monitoring Plan shall be incorporated as a note on the Grading Plan cover sheet. If additional or unexpected archaeological features are discovered, the qualified Archaeologist shall report such findings in writing to the County and/or the Tejon Indian Tribe. If archaeological resources are found to be of possible significance, the qualified Archaeologist shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with the County and the Tejon Indian Tribe, for further exploration and/or salvage in accordance with this mitigation measure.

The Archaeologist shall submit a Follow-up Report to the County. The Follow-up Report shall include: the period of inspection; an analysis of any artifacts found; and the present repository of the artifacts. Recovered finds shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles and the Tejon Indian Tribe on a first refusal basis. If the artifacts are refused, the Project Applicant/Developer may retain said finds if written assurance is provided that they will be properly preserved in Los Angeles County, unless (1) said finds are of special significance or (2) a museum in the County of Los Angeles indicates a desire to study and/or display them, in which case the items shall be donated to the County or its designee. If the Project Applicant/Developer provides no such
assurance, the County shall retain the artifacts and shall be subject to the same stipulations set forth in this mitigation measure for disposition of artifacts. These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources, shall be subject to the approval of the County.

The Project Archaeologist will perform a Phase II subsurface test-level investigation and surface collection for archaeological resource sites of undetermined CRHR eligibility discovered during monitoring. A Phase II Test-level Report shall be completed that evaluates the sites; includes a discussion of the sites’ significance (depth, nature, condition, and extent of the resources); and contains recommendations for final mitigation and cost estimates (if required) to fully mitigate significant impacts. Should the Phase II subsurface test-level investigation and surface collection determine the presence of significant archaeological resources that are eligible for CRHR listing, then potential Project impacts to the eligible archaeological resources site shall be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of one of the mitigation options discussed below:

a. Relocation of grading boundaries and fuel modification zones to completely avoid disturbance to the site(s) of eligible archaeological resources. If it is determined that the relocation of grading boundaries and fuel modification zones in accordance with this subsection (a) is not feasible, then a qualified Archaeologist shall be present in the vicinity of eligible archaeological resources sites during grading and fuel modification brush clearance. (NOTE: confidential archaeological mapping is on file at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and the South Central Coastal Information Center [SCCIC] at California State University, Fullerton. Review of this material is restricted to qualified individuals and project proponents on a need to know basis.) Fencing shall be erected outside the eligible archaeological resources sites to visually depict the areas to be avoided during construction. All eligible archaeological resources sites avoided in accordance with this subsection (a) shall be subject to the preservation requirements of MM 6-4.

b. Per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(A), grading boundary redesign and preservation in accordance with subsection (a) shall be the preferred means to avoid impacts to eligible archaeological resources. However, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(b)(3)(C), if it is determined that avoidance and/or preservation of any eligible archaeological resources sites in accordance with subsection (a) are not feasible, then prior to
grading in the vicinity of such eligible archaeological resources sites, Phase III data recovery (salvage excavations) shall be conducted for such eligible archaeological sites or any other eligible sites within the potential impact area of development that cannot be avoided. (NOTE: confidential archaeological mapping is on file at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and the SCCIC. Review of this material is restricted to qualified individuals and project proponents on a need to know basis.) When Phase III data recovery is undertaken, a data recovery plan, which makes provision for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the eligible archaeological resource, shall be prepared by a qualified Archaeologist prior to any excavation being undertaken. The Phase III work shall provide sufficient scientific information to fully mitigate the impacts of development on these sites to a level considered less than significant and shall be performed in accordance with the standards of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

Excavated assemblages shall be offered to the County and/or the Tejon Indian Tribe on a first refusal basis. If the artifacts are refused, the Project Applicant/Developer may retain said finds if written assurance is provided that they will be properly preserved in Los Angeles County, unless (1) said finds are of special significance or (2) a museum in the County of Los Angeles indicates a desire to study and/or display them, in which case the items shall be donated to the County or its designee. If the Project Applicant/Developer provides no such assurance, the County shall retain the artifacts and shall be subject to the same stipulations set forth in this mitigation measure for disposition of artifacts. Final mitigation shall be carried out based upon the recommendations in the Phase II Test-Level Report, and the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County shall make a determination as to the site’s disposition based on the recommendations of the qualified Archaeologist. Possible determinations include, but are not limited to, preservation, salvage, partial salvage, or no mitigation necessary.

**Mitigation Measure 6-2:** Prior to ground disturbing activities, archaeological sites CA-LAN-3201, CA-LAN-3206, CA-LAN-3217, CA-LAN-3227, CA-LAN-3240, and CA-LAN-3242 shall be surrounded with high visibility construction fencing with a buffer of approximately 50 feet around each site to ensure that the archaeological sites are completely avoided during construction-related activities. A qualified Archaeologist shall work with surveying teams and the Construction Supervisor to fence the area to be avoided prior to the commencement of grading.

**Mitigation Measure 6-3:** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide written evidence to the County that
a qualified Archaeologist has been retained to carry out all mitigation measures related to eligible archaeological sites within the development impact area. A qualified Archaeologist is defined as an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for professional archaeology. A qualified Archaeologist and a Native American monitor representing the Tejon Indian Tribe shall be present during ground-disturbing activities (i.e., topsoil grading and removals) in the vicinity of the following three eligible archaeological sites: CA-LAN-3201; CA-LAN-3240; CA-LAN-3242. Impacts to these three eligible sites shall be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of one of the mitigation options described below:

a. Relocation of grading boundaries and fuel modification zones to completely avoid disturbance to the site(s). If it is determined that the relocation of grading boundaries and fuel modification zones in accordance with this subsection (a) is not feasible with respect to eligible archaeological resources sites CA-LAN-3201, CA-LAN-3240 and/or CA-LAN-3242, then a qualified Archaeologist and a Native American monitor representing the Tejon Indian Tribe shall be present in the vicinity of any such eligible archaeological resources site during grading and fuel modification brush clearance to monitor all activities and ensure that archaeological resources are not impacted. (NOTE: confidential archaeological mapping is on file at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and the SCCIC. Review of this material is restricted to qualified individuals and project proponents on a need to know basis.) Temporary construction fencing shall be erected outside any such eligible archaeological resources site to visually depict the areas to be avoided during construction, in accordance with MM 6-2. Any temporary fencing materials (i.e., plastic web, chain link, etc.) placed during construction should not become permanent. Any permanent fencing erected in accordance with MM 6-4 to protect the sites should be visually pleasing and consistent with the overall aesthetic experience of the community of Centennial. All eligible archaeological resources sites avoided in accordance within this subsection (a) shall be subject to the preservation requirements of MM 6-4.

b. Per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(A), grading boundary redesign and preservation in place in accordance with subsection (a) shall be the preferred means to avoid impacts to eligible archaeological resources. However, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), if it is determined that avoidance and/or preservation of any eligible archaeological resources sites in
accordance with subsection (a) is not feasible, then prior to grading in the vicinity of such archaeological resources sites, Phase III data recovery (salvage excavations) shall be conducted for such archaeological resources sites or any other eligible sites within the potential impact area of development that cannot be avoided. (NOTE: confidential archaeological mapping is on file at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and the SCCIC. Review of this material is restricted to qualified individuals and project proponents on a need to know basis.) When Phase III data recovery is undertaken, a data recovery plan, which makes provision for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the eligible archaeological resource, shall be prepared by a qualified Archaeologist prior to any excavation being undertaken. The Phase III work shall provide sufficient scientific information to fully mitigate the impacts of development on these sites and shall be performed in accordance with the standards of the SHPO.

Excavated finds shall be offered to the County and/or the Tejon Indian Tribe on a first refusal basis. If the artifacts are refused, the Project Applicant/Developer may retain said finds if written assurance is provided that they will be properly preserved in Los Angeles County, unless (1) said finds are of special significance or (2) a museum in the County of Los Angeles indicates a desire to study and/or display them, in which case the items shall be donated to the County or its designee. If the Project Applicant/Developer provides no such assurance, the County shall retain the artifacts and shall be subject to the same stipulations set forth in this mitigation measure for disposition of artifacts. Final mitigation shall be carried out based upon the recommendations in the Phase II Test-Level Report, and the County shall make a determination as to the site’s disposition based on the recommendations of the qualified Archaeologist and the Native American monitor representing the Tejon Indian Tribe. Possible determinations include, but are not limited to, preservation, salvage, partial salvage, or no mitigation necessary.

Mitigation Measure 6-4: A qualified Archaeologist meeting the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for professional archaeology shall develop and implement an Archaeological Resources Site-Protection Program aimed to protect and preserve identified CRHR-eligible archaeological resources avoided in accordance with subsection (a) of MM 6-1 and/or MM 6-3, as well as any identified archaeological resources site located within the Project site’s open space areas that is of known eligibility for CRHR listing and which are vulnerable to disturbance during Project construction and/or operation. Identified archaeological resources sites located within the Project site’s open
space that are of unknown eligibility for CRHR listing and which are vulnerable to disturbance shall also be protected under the Archaeological Resources Site-Protection Program in accordance with this MM 6-4, provided that no such site shall be subject to this MM 6-4 if a Phase II archaeological investigation performed by a qualified Archaeologist in accordance with Secretary of the Interior Standards determines that such site is not unique and is thus ineligible for CRHR listing. The Archaeological Resources Site-Protection Program shall be prepared by the qualified monitoring Archaeologist familiar with the resources present within the Project boundaries, shall be approved by the County, and shall include implementation of one or more of the following:

a. Fencing and/or other access-restriction methods shall be placed around the archaeologically sensitive areas of the Project site to inhibit human access. This subsection (a) shall be applicable to sites CA-LAN-3217 and CA-LAN-3227, unless the qualified Archaeologist determines that such sites are more appropriately protected in accordance with subsections (b) or (c) of this MM 6-4; or

b. Non-invasive plant species with thorns (e.g., prickly pear cactus [*Opuntia* spp.]) or other deterrent characteristics shall be planted in areas close to known resources in order to discourage human presence; this is generally applicable to the majority of sites to be preserved in areas of native vegetation; or

c. Known eligible resources shall be capped with a layer of chemically inactive soil/sediment, in consultation with a qualified Archaeologist. This subsection (c) shall be applicable to sites CA-LAN-3201, CA-LAN-3240, and CA-LAN-3242, to the extent such sites are avoided in accordance with subsection (a) of MM 6-3, unless the qualified Archaeologist determines that any such site is more appropriately protected in accordance with subsections (a) or (b) of this MM 6-4. This subsection (c) shall be applicable to site CA-LAN-3206, unless, pursuant to the County-approved Archaeological Resources Site-Protection Program required by this MM 6-4, it is determined that such site is not vulnerable to disturbance.

This MM 6-4 shall be implemented prior to the completion of construction activities and shall be overseen by the County and/or the Tejon Indian Tribe. The qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a written statement documenting appropriate site-protection measures for submittal to the County. Additionally, a Native American monitor representing the Tejon Indian Tribe shall be present during all initial
surface grubbing, initial ground surface grading, and any excavation greater than one-half foot in depth.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features, or rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact is less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project site is underlain by four sedimentary units that potentially contain fossil resources: Older and Younger Quaternary Alluvium, the Quail Lake Formation, and the Oso Canyon Formation. The presence of fossil localities and sedimentary units known to contain fossil materials indicates that there is a potential for unidentified, significant, non-renewable paleontological resources. Direct evidence indicates the presence of paleontological resources in the Project area, and geologic evidence from adjacent areas with similar sedimentary formations indicates a high likelihood of encountering additional resources during Project development. While there are no known paleontological resources at the locations of proposed off-site intersections with SR-138, utility connections, and California Aqueduct crossings, the potential for these resources to be present exists, as it does throughout much of the Project site. Construction of the proposed wells would involve rotary drilling into native soils, which would have the potential to impact unknown paleontological resources if such resources were directly beneath the well site. Also, installation of the proposed off-site pipeline would involve shallow trenching to depths of approximately five feet. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level through avoidance, training, and by ensuring qualified paleontological monitoring of construction activities in accordance with a qualified monitoring plan, data collection, and appropriate treatment of unanticipated paleontological discoveries.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 6-5: For the exposed paleontological resources discovered during the Paleo Environmental Associates (PEA) 2009 study (as detailed in the document entitled Paleontologic Resource Inventory and Impact Assessment Technical Report prepared in support of Centennial Specific Plan, western Antelope Valley, northern Los Angeles County, California) and any paleontological resources uncovered during grading or excavation activities in or out of the presence of a Monitor, grading activities will be stopped and diverted to a part of the site reasonably away from the find (highly dependent on the size and complexity of the resource), and a qualified Paleontologist shall
(1) ascertain the significance of the resources; (2) establish protocol with the Project Applicant/Developer to protect (or mitigate impacts to) such resources; (3) ascertain the presence of additional resources; and (4) provide additional monitoring of the site, if the Monitor deems it appropriate.

**Mitigation Measure 6-6:** A Paleontological Treatment and Monitoring Plan (PTMP) shall be developed by a qualified Paleontologist retained by the Project Applicant/Developer. The PTMP shall be reviewed and approved by the County. This plan shall include a protocol for examining, evaluating, and (if necessary) salvaging known fossil localities identified during the PEA (2009) study (as detailed in the document entitled *Paleontologic Resource Inventory and Impact Assessment Technical Report prepared in support of Centennial Specific Plan, western Antelope Valley, northern Los Angeles County, California*); a grading observation schedule shall be maintained when grading occurs within sedimentary rock units so that the Paleontologist may identify and evaluate fossil resources within the Project site. This qualified Paleontologist shall be retained to attend pre-grade meetings and to monitor deep earth-moving activities (including grading, cutting, and trenching) at the site. Paleontological monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified Paleontologist during grading and other excavation work. Recommended hours for monitoring activities shall be established by the qualified Paleontologist and shall be outlined in the PTMP. It shall be the responsibility of the qualified Paleontologist to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the County, the appropriate level of monitoring necessary based on the tentative map-level grading plans. The qualified Paleontologist shall carefully inspect PTMP-identified areas in order to assess the potential for significant fossil remains. If potential paleontological resources are uncovered, a subsurface evaluation will be performed to assess the discovery. Further subsurface investigation will be undertaken if the resource is determined unique or important for its paleontological information. Because of the potential for producing small fragments of vertebrate microfossils, the Paleontologist shall conduct reasonable, periodic screening of sands from cuts in these units. Such material may be removed in bulk and screened off site for further analysis.

**Mitigation Measure 6-7:** The qualified Paleontologist retained by the Project Applicant/Developer shall coordinate with appropriate construction contractor personnel to provide information concerning the protection of paleontological resources. Contractor personnel shall be informed that unauthorized fossil collecting is prohibited. The contractor’s heavy equipment operators shall be briefed on procedures to be followed in the event that fossil remains and a fossil site are encountered during earth-moving activities (grading or blasting). The briefing shall be
presented to new contractor personnel as necessary. Names and telephone numbers of the Monitor and other appropriate mitigation program personnel shall be provided to appropriate contractor personnel and to the County.

**Mitigation Measure 6-8:** The qualified Paleontologist shall initiate and coordinate recovery operations with the Project Applicant/Developer, and the County of Los Angeles for any significant fossil localities identified in the Paleo Environmental Associates 2009 document entitled *Paleontologic Resource Inventory and Impact Assessment Technical Report prepared in support of Centennial Specific Plan, western Antelope Valley, northern Los Angeles County, California* as well as if significant fossils are exposed during any Project-related grading pursuant to the PTMP. To initiate recovery operations, the Paleontologist shall be allowed to divert or direct grading in the area of exposure to facilitate evaluation and, if identified as potentially significant, to recover significant fossils. The qualified Paleontologist shall notify the Construction Foreman of the discovery of fossil resources and shall discuss recovery methods and the timeline needed to evaluate the find. If a fossil discovery occurs during grading operations when the Paleontologist is not present, grading shall be diverted a reasonable distance away from the area until the qualified Paleontologist can survey the area, conduct recovery operations, and make an assessment on the significance of the find.

**Mitigation Measure 6-9:** A formal museum storage agreement shall be developed between the Project Paleontologist and an accredited institution. Any fossils and their contextual stratigraphic data that are collected during development shall be prepared and identified by a qualified Paleontologist. Excavated significant fossil finds shall be donated with funding for stabilization, identification, and curation on a first right-of-refusal basis to an appropriate, accredited institution that has a retrievable collection system and an educational and research interest in the materials (e.g., the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County). A final report prepared by the qualified Paleontologist that details the discovery, recovery, laboratory analysis, and findings and disposition of specimens shall be submitted to the County.

(3) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to disturbing human remains to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact is less than significant.
Facts in Support of Finding

No direct evidence of human remains has been found as a result of archaeological surveys and evaluation of identified archeological sites. Based on these data, no disturbance of human remains is anticipated as a result of the Project. However, the presence of prehistoric archeological sites within the Project site, especially those with buried deposits, increases the likelihood that burials may be present. There are no known burial grounds or evidence of them at the locations of proposed off-site Project features, including intersections with SR-138, utility connections, water wells, and California Aqueduct crossings. However, there is always the potential to encounter unknown remains. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by ensuring appropriate treatment of unanticipated discoveries of human remains.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 6-10: In accordance with California Code of Regulations (Title 14, Section 15064.5[e]), in the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the Los Angeles County Coroner must be notified of the discovery (California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5) and all activities in the immediate area of the find or in any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains must cease until appropriate and lawful measures have been implemented. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not recent, but rather of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 24 hours to permit the NAHC to determine the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The designated MLD may make recommendations to the Project Applicant/Developer or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or reassignment of the human remains and any associated grave goods with appropriate dignity, as provided in California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98. If any of the following occurs, the Project Applicant/Developer shall rebury the Native American remains and the associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance: (1) the NAHC is unable to identify an MLD; (2) the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours of being notified of the discovery; or (3) the Project Applicant/Developer rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide acceptable measures.
Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to cause significant cumulative impacts to cultural resources.

Finding: Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to cumulative cultural resources to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact is less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Cultural resources (historic built environment, archaeology, tribal cultural resources, and paleontology) are non-renewable and irreplaceable. Projects undertaken in the region have the potential to cause direct and cumulative impacts to these resources through land development. On the Project site, no historic built environment resources are located within the Project’s Area of Potential Effects (APE), so the Project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts to these resources.

Three prehistoric archaeological sites that meet the definition of a “historical resource” have been identified within the development footprint (CA-LAN-3201, CA-LAN-3240 and CA-LAN-3242). In addition, two sites within the open space areas (CA-LAN-3206 and CA-LAN-3227) would be treated as eligible and protected from secondary impacts as they are immediately adjacent to the development footprint. Mitigation measures would ensure the identification, protection, and/or evaluation of these sites, including those that may be tribal cultural resources as defined under CEQA, and would reduce related impacts to a less than significant level. Specifically, data recovered from a site, combined with data from other sites in the region, would enhance the ability to examine and fully appreciate the diversity of human activities in the region. As a result, development of the Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources.

Development of the Project site, in combination with other projects in the region where a parcel is underlain by the Quail Lake or Oso Canyon Formations, could lead to the progressive loss of fossil-bearing strata in either a rock unit that could be prospected for fossil remains or in unrecorded fossil sites. However, mitigation measures would require the identification, evaluation, recovery, and curation of any significant fossils discovered during construction of the Project. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with similar mitigation associated with each related project developed in the cumulative study area. Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code mandate processes to be followed in the event of a discovery of any human remains. Implementation of these processes would be ensured by implementation of mitigation and would ensure that the Project’s incremental contribution to cultural resources is not cumulatively considerable. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 6-1 to 6-10 above.

D. Dry Utilities

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to create electrical system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts from the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Findings

The Project would place new demands on electrical service and would result in an increase in the amount of electricity consumed on the site, and create a need for new delivery infrastructure. At buildout, the Project is expected to generate a peak electricity demand of approximately 165 MW. Project implementation would require the relocation and/or removal of existing Southern California Edison (SCE) facilities along portions of SR-138 and Gorman Post Road, as well as within the Project site. Existing 66-kV lines that extend from Bailey Substation and run northwest throughout the Project site may also be relocated or placed underground. Existing SCE easements for facilities within and surrounding the Project site will be affected by Project development. The development of the Project area will dictate that existing facilities be removed or relocated. Full Project buildout will also require a new substation, located in the vicinity of 300th to 310th Street West either north or south of SR-138. Approximately 4.5 acres will be required for this substation. Buildout of the western portion of the Project site will also require the addition or one or more transformers at the Gorman Substation within the footprint of the SCE-owned parcel and reconstruction of the existing overhead power lines along Gorman Post Road within the SCE-owned easement from the substation to the Project site. In addition to the expansion or upgrade of existing facilities and construction of a future substation, an electrical distribution system will be developed on the Project site to supplement, and in some cases, sell power back to the regional electricity grid. Based on the potential to cause significant environmental effects due to construction of new energy facilities and expansion of existing facilities, this impact is considered significant. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s significant environmental effects due to the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by requiring the Project to with electricity providers to coordinate the design and implementation of adequate electrical service infrastructure to serve the Project.
Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 20.2-1: The Project Applicant/Developer shall coordinate with Southern California Edison (SCE) to ensure that there are no prolonged disruptions to the existing transmission lines that extend through the Project study area and to coordinate in the design and implementation of future electrical service and facilities (e.g., transmission lines, access road) in the Project study area. This will ensure that: (1) no prolonged service disruptions during the extension and upgrading of these services would arise; (2) the nature, design, and timing of electrical system improvements are in accordance with all SCE requirements; and (3) the improvements are adequate to serve the proposed land uses and are available for the first occupied land uses.

Mitigation Measure 20.2-2: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the County with plans and specifications that demonstrate a future substation shall be constructed in the eastern half of the Project site to serve Project development in the easterly portion of the Project site. To provide adequate capacity for electrical services for the Project, SCE would select one or both of the following two options to implement: (1) reconfigure the Bailey Substation or (2) upgrade the Gorman Substation and retrofit the existing overhead power lines. An electrical infrastructure shall be constructed as part of the main utility corridors for dry utilities. The timing of construction, as well as specific facility location and sizing, shall be coordinated with SCE.

Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities due to natural gas service and facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, and result in potentially significant impacts due to petroleum consumption.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts from the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project will increase demand for SoCalGas-provided natural gas services and facilities. It is estimated that the Project at full buildout will require approximately 30 million cubic feet per month of natural gas. Either additional feeds from the existing distribution system in the Project vicinity or a new system will be necessary to serve the Project’s projected demand. This could include the extension of an additional main from the 33-inch transmission main which would parallel the existing medium-pressure main that exists within the right of way of Gorman Post Road and SR-138. This tap would require an additional pressure regulation station on an easement
space (75 feet by 30 feet). In addition, an underground extension of gas facilities will need to be constructed east along Gorman Post Road from the proposed regulator station to the Project’s westerly entrance. The main could also be extended along the SR-138 roadway, just outside the road right-of-way, easterly to the initial construction phases of the Project. It may also be necessary to extend a high pressure line to and within the Project site for the placement of a series of future regulator stations. The initial distribution gas source is proposed to come from connecting, or “tapping” into an existing high pressure main west of the southwest corner of the site near Gorman Post Road, placing a regulator station (potential easement space needed of approximately 75 feet by 30 feet), and running distribution medium pressure and/or transmission high pressure to and through the Project site. Due to Project-related roadway improvements, portions of the utilities within current easements may be required to be adjusted or relocated. All new and upgraded on-site facilities and infrastructure, including regulators and distribution facilities, would be implemented as part of site development and would be constructed within public rights-of-way. However, based on the potential to cause significant environmental effects due to construction of new energy facilities and expansion of existing facilities, this impact is considered significant.

The Project will also result in the consumption of petroleum, primarily for transportation energy (i.e., gasoline and diesel). Petroleum fuel consumed is a function of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a result of Project construction and operations. However, as a result of anticipated fuel efficiency improvements and Project features, increased VMT will not necessarily result in a proportional increase in fuel consumption. The Project incorporates features to reduce energy use from motor vehicles, including the multi-modal circulation systems, efficient site planning and building design, transportation improvements, and other vehicle trip reducing design features. For this reason, transportation energy impacts from implementation of the Project would be less than significant. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s significant environmental effects due to the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities for natural gas service and due to increased petroleum consumption. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by requiring the Project to coordinate with natural gas providers to coordinate the design and implementation of adequate natural gas infrastructure to serve the Project.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 20.3-1: The Project Applicant/Developer shall coordinate with the Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) in the design and implementation of future natural gas service and facilities in the Project study area to ensure that (1) no prolonged service disruptions during the extension and upgrade of these services would arise; (2) the nature, design, and timing of natural gas system improvements are in accordance with SoCalGas requirements; and (3) the improvements
are adequate to serve the Project, to be in place for the first occupied land uses.

**Mitigation Measure 20.3-2:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall install, bond for, or otherwise provide on-site natural gas facilities in coordination with SoCalGas.

**Mitigation Measure 20.3-3:** An additional regulator station shall be constructed by SoCalGas to loop the distribution system for increased reliability. The timing for development of this station shall be determined by SoCalGas through an assessment of the system’s operational needs. The timing for construction of this facility, as well as the specific location and sizing, shall be coordinated with SoCalGas.

**Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to create telephone service system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts from the construction of telephone facilities or expansion of existing facilities to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project will result in an increased demand for the number of telephone lines and will create the need for new telephone service infrastructure provided by AT&T. To extend telephone service to the Project, telephone fiber or cabling would be provided in the proposed utility corridors. The initial extension (overhead and/or underground) of telephone facilities will be constructed along Gorman Post Road or continuing overhead along the pole line along SR-138. To support the development of the Project as “full fiber”, additional fiber from existing AT&T facilities would either be placed overhead on the existing pole line along SR-138 or on a temporary overhead/underground location within the Project limits line along the north side of Quail Lake. Several telephone fiber pedestals would be placed throughout the Project site, allowing for a complete fiber system to be constructed. Existing AT&T facilities within and outside of the Project site may also be affected by Project development. As a result, these facilities could require relocation or removal. Based on the potential to cause significant environmental effects due to construction of new facilities and expansion of existing facilities for telephone service, this impact is considered significant. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s significant environmental effects due to the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities for telephone service. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by requiring the Project to coordinate with telephone
service providers to coordinate the design and implementation of adequate telephone service infrastructure to serve the Project.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 20.4-1:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall coordinate with AT&T in the design and implementation of future telecommunications service and facilities within the Project study area to ensure that: (1) no prolonged service disruptions during the extension and upgrading of these services would arise; (2) the nature, design, and timing of telecommunications system improvements are in accordance with AT&T requirements; and (3) the improvements are adequate to serve the proposed land uses.

(4) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to create cable service system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

**Finding 1:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts from the construction of new cable facilities or expansion of existing facilities to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project will result in an increased demand for both the number of CATV lines and the need for new CATV service infrastructure. Cabling for CATV services would be provided as part of the on-site main utility corridors for dry utilities. The extension of CATV lines would proceed from the nearest location of service from whichever provider is chosen. Development of the Project could also impact off-site CATV lines near the Service Provider’s plant or distribution facilities and may require an upgrade of existing systems. Based on the potential to cause significant environmental effects due to construction of these new facilities and expansion of existing facilities for cable service, this impact is considered significant. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s significant environmental effects due to the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities for cable service. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by requiring the Project to coordinate with cable providers to coordinate the design and implementation of adequate cable service infrastructure to serve the Project.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 20.5-1:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall coordinate with the Cable Television Service Provider in the design and implementation of future communication service and facilities within the Project study
area to ensure that (1) no prolonged service disruptions during the extension and upgrading of these services would arise; (2) the nature, design, and timing of cable system improvements are in accordance with the Cable Service Provider’s requirements; and (3) the improvements are adequate to serve the proposed land uses. The cable service connections shall be available at the property lines.

E. Education

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for any of the public services: schools.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to school services to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Implementation of the Project would increase the population and would result in the generation of new students to be served by the respective school districts in the area. At buildout the Project site would include as many as 14,098 single-family detached units, 2,643 single-family attached units, and 2,592 multi-family units. This could result in approximately 4,708 new students in the Gorman District and approximately 2,551 new students in the WUSD. The Project includes generalized locations for a one K-5 school and five K-8 schools for a total elementary school capacity for approximately 7,740 students. The Project will also result in the generation of approximately 2,885 new high school students to be served by the AVUHSD. The Project has included a generalized location for one high school. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects related to constructing new government facilities to maintain acceptable performance objectives for school services. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by requiring the Project to provide adequate school sites to serve the Project, by requiring the Project Applicant/Developer to provide evidence that it has entered into appropriate funding agreements with affected school districts, and by ensuring implementation of a Project-specific Safe Routes to Schools program.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 15-1: The Project Applicant/Developer shall designate one K-5 and five K–8 school sites in the Project area in accordance with the conceptual land use plan or alternate location(s) that shall be agreed upon by the authorized school districts.
Mitigation Measure 15-2: The Project Applicant/Developer shall demonstrate to the County that they have an executed agreement with all school districts that operate within the boundaries of the Project site. The Transportation Management Association shall coordinate with local schools and school districts to establish and maintain a Safe Routes to School program to facilitate students walking and biking to schools.

Mitigation Measure 15-3: The Project Applicant/Developer shall designate one high school site in the Project area in accordance with the conceptual land use plan or alternate location(s) that shall be agreed upon by the authorized school district.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to result in significant cumulative substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for any of the public services: schools.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to school services to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Although the Project will create housing that will increase the student population in the area, the Project includes development sites for one Kindergarten (K) through 5th grade school, five K–8th grade schools, and one high school, which would be ensured by implementation of MM 15-1 through MM 15-3, described above. In addition, the Project Applicant has signed agreements with the school districts for a contribution to facilitate the financing, construction, and operation of new school facilities in the Project area. In addition, each future project with residential and commercial/industrial development would be required to either pay developer’s fees in compliance with Senate Bill (SB) 50 (i.e., the Leroy Greene School Facilities Act) or seek an alternate resolution or agreement with affected school districts to offset the cost of public school construction. As the Project would provide on-site school facilities and would implement agreements with the three affected school districts, the Project’s contribution to increased demand for schools would not be cumulatively considerable, and there would be a less than significant cumulative impact.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 15-1 to 15-3 above.
F. Fire and Law Enforcement Services

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental fire protection facilities, need of new or physical altered governmental fire protection 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.

Finding: Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to fire protection services to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project would result in the development of a maximum of 19,333 residential units, generating approximately 57,150 residents, and over 10.0 million square feet of non-residential development that would create approximately 23,675 jobs. This anticipated Project-related growth in population and employment would result in an increase in demand for fire services on the Project site. Despite the fact that the Project includes conceptual site locations for up to four new fire stations on the Project site, this impact is considered significant. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s impacts on fire services. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by ensuring that the Project provides sufficient fire protection facilities, and related funding, as needed to ensure adequate fire protection services and response times.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 16-1: At buildout, the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) fire stations shall be located such that response times to the Project site shall be 5 minutes or less for fire service responses and 8 minutes or less for the advanced life support (paramedic) unit responses within the Project site.

Mitigation Measure 16-2: The Project Applicant/Developer shall pay developer fees in effect at the time of construction permit approval, in accordance with the LACFD Developer Fee Program until such time the Project Applicant/Developer has conveyed an approved, operational fire station to the LACFD. As an alternative to fee payment, the Developer Fee Program allows the LACFD and the Project Applicant/Developer to agree on a program whereby the Project Applicant/Developer would provide land and would construct and equip the fire stations required for the Project in exchange for a credit towards the Project’s fee payments.
**Mitigation Measure 16-3:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide land, convey title, and shall construct and equip, to the specifications and requirements of the LACFD, for up to four new Fire Stations to the LACFD. The approved final plans and specifications for the Project shall identify locations of the fire stations. The LACFD shall have final approval over the fire station site locations. The timing for the construction of the on-site fire stations shall be established by the LACFD dependent upon the phasing of development, with the first on-site fire station operational no later than the time the 1,000th dwelling unit is built on site.

1. **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental sheriff protection facilities, need of new or physical altered governmental sheriff protection 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.

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to sheriff protection services to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project would result in the development of a maximum of 19,333 residential units, generating approximately 57,150 residents, and over 10.0 million square feet of non-residential development that would create approximately 23,675 jobs. This anticipated Project-related growth in population and employment would result in an increase in demand for law enforcement services, including those provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (Sheriff’s Department or LASD) and the California Highway Patrol (CHP). The Project includes the construction of a Sheriff’s station on the Project site, nonetheless, this impact is considered significant. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects related to LASD protection and law enforcement services. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by ensuring that the Project provides sufficient sheriff protection facilities, and related funding, as needed to ensure adequate sheriff protection services and response times.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 16-4:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall pay Law Enforcement Facilities Mitigation Fee (LEFMF) to the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD) pursuant to the requirements established in County Ordinance No. 2008-0033. The amount of fees to be paid will be determined based on the established fee in Section
22.74.030 of the County Code. The Project incorporates a temporary “store front” sub-station, followed by construction of a permanent LASD Station included on the Project site, in lieu of a portion of the LEFMF, as allowed under Section 22.74.090 (Consideration in Lieu of Fee) of the County Code. Costs associated with the construction of the temporary “store front” sub-station and permanent LASD Station would be credited against the LEFMF.

Prior to completion of the permanent LASD Station, the “store front” sub-station may be located on site in Village 1 on the north side of the SR-138. This temporary sub-station shall be properly outfitted in accordance with applicable occupancy requirements of the LASD for such “store front” facilities and shall be operational prior to the approval of the first certificate of occupancy for the first phase of Project development.

The Centennial Land Use Plan identifies a conceptual location for one LASD Station in the Business Park area on the Project site north of the SR-138. The permanent LASD Station shall be constructed immediately following completion of the first phase of development. The LASD shall have final approval over the temporary sub-station and permanent LASD Station site locations.

(3) **Potential Impact:** The Project, in combination with other development, would contribute to significant cumulative increased demand for fire protection services.

**Finding: 1.** Mitigation measures would reduce potential cumulative impacts to fire protection services to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project, in combination with other development, would contribute to increased demand for fire protection services. However, each future project would be required to provide facilities and/or fees, as applicable, for each jurisdiction (i.e., County of Los Angeles, County of Kern, cities of Lancaster, Palmdale, and Santa Clarita) to ensure they would be adequately served by fire protection services. In addition, implementation of MM 16-1 through 16-3 will ensure that the Project meets its requirements for fire services. Thus, the Project’s contribution to increased demand for fire protection services would not be cumulatively considerable and there would be a less than significant cumulative impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 16-1 to 16-3 above.
(4) **Potential Impact:** The Project, in combination with other development, would contribute to significant cumulative increased demand for law enforcement services.

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce potential cumulative impacts to sheriff protection services to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project, in combination with other development, would contribute to increased demand for law enforcement services. However, as future growth occurs in unincorporated County areas and in other surrounding jurisdictions, the law enforcement agency serving that jurisdiction would be required to assess the demands placed on local stations and the staff and facilities needed to serve that growth, to be supported by general fund, taxes, and other revenues that occur with urban development. In addition, implementation of **MM 16-4** will ensure that the Project provides the necessary on-site law enforcement facilities. Thus, the Project’s incremental contribution to law enforcement services would not be cumulatively considerable, and there would be a less than significant cumulative impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measure 16-4 above.

G. **Geotechnical**

(1) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. The Project has the potential to be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to potential landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse or vibration due to blasting activities to less than significant levels. The Count hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Development of the Project may require localized blasting associated with excavation on site, and this would have the potential to result in geotechnical instability. Excavations within the Neenach Volcanic Formation and Oso Canyon Formation that encounter strongly cemented zones would likely require a very heavy effort with conventional heavy-duty grading equipment and / or localized breaking or possible blasting. Existing bedrock outcrops are located in proposed open space areas. However, if bedrock is discovered in areas within the development footprint blasting
may be necessary. A Blasting Plan, to be reviewed and approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, would be required to conduct blasting on the Project site, which would include procedures to limit rock falls, vibration, and other safety concerns. In addition, vibration monitoring would be performed near existing structures to control and record ground vibration during blasting events. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 12-7**: In the event that blasting is necessary in order to fracture non-rippable rock, the Project Applicant/Developer shall prepare a Blasting Plan to be submitted and approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department in order to obtain a blasting permit; evidence of this approval shall be submitted to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning in order to obtain an Explosives Permit. The Blasting Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the United States Department of Interior, Office of Surface Mining (USOSM) standards and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. A pre-blast survey.

b. The site and location of planned blasting and hours of operation (blasting to be conducted during the daylight hours only).

c. Notification of blasting activities to all property owners within one-half mile of the blasting area. This notification shall describe the expected period and frequency that the blasting shall occur and give a contact phone number for any questions or complaints. All complaints shall be responded to in a method deemed satisfactory to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning.

d. The types and amounts of explosives.

e. Warning system information.

f. Methods of transportation and handling of explosives.

g. Minimum acceptable weather conditions.

h. Procedures for handling, setting, wiring, and firing explosives.

i. Procedures for clearing and controlling access to blast danger.

j. Procedures for handling misfires and other unusual occurrences.

i. Material safety data sheet for all explosives or other hazardous materials expected to be used.

m. Procedures to ensure compliance with local, State and federal laws.

n. Requirements and procedures for vibration monitoring near existing structures during blasting events.

(2) **Potential Impact:** The Project could contribute to significant cumulative geotechnical and seismic impacts.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce cumulative geotechnical and seismic impacts to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Geotechnical impacts tend to be site-specific in nature, while seismic conditions are regional in nature. As discussed above, the Project’s geotechnical and seismic impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of MM 12-7 and through compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Future development of other project sites in Los Angeles County and Kern County would have to comply with current State and applicable County building codes and development requirements as they pertain to protection against identified geologic hazards. Development projects would be subject to applicable Seismic Design requirements and the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act, which restricts development on the traces of active faults. The Project components would not exacerbate or otherwise influence any geotechnical hazards for off-site development. Similarly, the related projects are not expected to have an adverse impact on the Project. With implementation of MM 12-7, the Project’s contribution to cumulative geotechnical and seismic impacts would not be considerable.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measure 12-7 above.

H. **Hazards and Fire Safety**

(1) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The Project has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment. The Project has the potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses.
Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to the public or the environment related to potential disposal or upset and accident conditions related to hazardous materials or waste. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Implementation of the Project would involve the limited transport, storage, use, and/or disposal of common construction-related hazardous materials, including oil and grease, solvents, diesel fuel, and other chemicals in vehicles, trucks, and heavy equipment and operational-related hazardous materials, including commercial cleansers, solvents, and other janitorial materials, paints, landscape maintenance materials, pressurized gases, chlorine for pools, and petroleum products at gas stations. These materials could be released into the environment in small amounts in the event of an accident. Any hazardous materials would be transported, used, stored, and disposed of according to any applicable local, State, and/or federal regulations. While many such common materials are technically labeled “hazardous”, the presence of such materials is common in a mixed-use urban environment, and their use on the Project site would not pose an unusual or uncommon threat to the health or safety of the future population of the Project site.

Pesticides (insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides) are used for current agricultural operations on the Project site and in the pivot fields located east of 300th Street West. No pesticides are currently used that are subject to Proposition 65 restrictions. It is anticipated that use of pesticides would continue as long as these areas remain under agricultural use but they would continue to be applied according to federal, State, and local requirements and manufacturer recommendations, such as concentration and method of application. The Project will introduce new land uses and residents onto the Project site while current pesticide use continues. The small volume of on-site pesticide use for landscaped areas would also be applied in accordance with federal, State, and local requirements as well as manufacturer recommendations.

Valley Fever spores have the potential to be found in soils of the Antelope Valley. Conditions on-site could result in (1) disturbance of existing soils on the site; (2) dust formation associated with this disturbance; and (3) a resultant risk of Valley Fever for residents in the Project area. However, even if Valley Fever spores are present on site and are disturbed during grading, if they do not become airborne they do not have the potential to be inhaled and result in illness. While construction workers would be at highest risk, on-site populations would also be at risk for exposure during interim phases of development, depending on the proximity to on-site construction activities. Off-site features of the Project would also introduce a new population into an area that could potentially be exposed to environmental hazards, such as hazardous materials, pesticides and Valley Fever. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project's environmental effects. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by ensuring dust control management during the
construction process, and by providing adequate education and training regarding
the risks and management of Valley Fever spores for Project workers and residents.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 3-1:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall employ a Dust-Control Supervisor who will be on the site within 30 minutes of the start of work taking place each morning; will have the authority to expeditiously employ sufficient dust mitigation measures to ensure compliance with all Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) Rule 403 and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 requirements; and will have completed the SCAQMD Fugitive Dust Control Class and has been issued a valid Certificate of Completion for the class. Contact information for the Project’s Dust Control Supervisor shall be posted on-site to ensure that the public has a means of providing complaints regarding fugitive dust. The Dust Control Supervisor shall be responsible for tracking complaints, conducting corrective action, as necessary, and for maintaining an up-to-date log of complaints and responses for periodic County review.

**Mitigation Measure 3-2:** To aid in the prevention of Valley Fever among construction crews on the Project site, the following shall be implemented by the Construction Contractor during all construction activities:

- Have Tyvek™ coveralls/suits available in a range of sizes for construction worker use upon request. If used, require the worker to remove the Tyvek™ suit at the work site at the end of the day.

- Hire crews from Los Angeles and/or Kern County populations, or other areas where Valley Fever is endemic, where possible, since it is more likely that they have been previously exposed to the fungus and are therefore immune.

- Prior to Project construction initiation, and for any personnel additions after initial Project construction initiation, the following California Department of Public Health (CDPH) materials on Valley Fever (or the most updated materials applicable to Los Angeles County) shall be distributed to worksite supervisors:

- Prior to Project construction initiation, and for any personnel additions after initial Project construction initiation, the following CDPH materials on Valley Fever (or the most updated materials
applicable to Los Angeles County) shall be distributed to construction workers:


- During rough grading and construction, the access way into the Project site from adjoining paved roadways shall be paved or treated with environmentally safe dust-control agents.

- Provide evidence to the Department of Public Health that the Project Applicant/Developer has developed a “Valley Fever Training Handout,” training, and schedule of sessions for education to be provided to all construction personnel. All evidence of the training session materials, training handout(s) and training schedule shall be submitted to the Department of Public Health within 24 hours of the first training session. Multiple training sessions may be conducted if different work crews will come to the Project site for different stages of construction; however, all construction personnel shall be provided training prior to beginning work. The evidence submitted to the Department of Public Health regarding the “Valley Fever Training Handout” and training sessions shall include the following:
  - A sign-in sheet (to include the printed employee names, signature, and date) for all employees who attended the training session;
  - Distribution of a written flyer or brochure that includes educational information regarding the health effects of exposure to criteria pollutant emissions and Valley Fever (including the CDPH informational materials described in this mitigation measure);
  - Training on methods that may help prevent Valley Fever infection; and
  - Train employees how to use personal protective equipment, such as respiratory equipment, how to reduce exposure to
pollutants, how to recognize symptoms of Valley Fever, and to promptly report any suspected systems to a work supervisor. Training shall also emphasize the benefits of wearing Tyvek suits in relation to Valley Fever exposure and explain that such protective clothing is available upon request. Proof that the demonstration is included in the training shall be submitted to the Department of Public Health.

- Provide construction workers separate, clean eating areas equipped with hand-washing facilities.
- Require crews to use masks or half-faced respirators equipped with a minimum N-95 protection factor and that are adequate to restrict inhalation of particulates during Project clearing, grading, and excavation operations in accordance with California Division of Occupational Safety and Health regulations. Respirator equipment shall be readily available and shall be provided to employees during work.
- Require employees to be medically evaluated, fit-tested, and properly trained on the use of the required masks or respirators
- Provide High-Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filters for heavy equipment with factory enclosed cabs capable of accepting the filters. Require contractors utilizing applicable heavy equipment to furnish proof to the Department of Regional Planning of worker training on proper use of applicable heavy equipment cabs, such as turning on air conditioning prior to using the equipment.
- Provide communication methods, such as two-way radios, for use in enclosed heavy equipment cabs.
- Install equipment inspection stations at each construction equipment access/egress point. Examine construction vehicles and equipment or excess soil materials and clean, as necessary before equipment is moved off-site.
- When possible, position construction workers upwind or crosswind when digging a trench or performing other soil-disturbing tasks.
- Prohibit smoking at the worksite outside of designated smoking areas; designated smoking areas will be equipped with hand-washing facilities.
- Post Valley Fever warnings at on-site construction areas and restrict access to such areas by visitors without adequate training and respiratory protection.
Audit and enforce compliance with applicable California Occupational Safety and Health Administration health and safety standards on the job site.

**Mitigation Measure 3-3:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide to each prospective property purchaser or tenant a notice and statement of acknowledgment that shall be executed (i.e., read and signed) by the prospective purchaser, lessee, or tenant that the property within Centennial may present a risk of exposure to Valley Fever spores during construction or other earth-moving activities. The form shall include strategies to reduce potential exposure to Valley Fever spores. The form and method of distribution of said notice and statement of acknowledgment shall be as approved by the County.

**Mitigation Measure 3-11:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for the creation of a website on the proposed Centennial community internet that provides public information in both English and Spanish regarding dust-generating activities, to be maintained and updated as appropriate throughout the Centennial Project construction period. The purpose of the website would be to enable interested parties both on- and off-site to easily access information relevant to potential Valley Fever risk, including information relevant to potential Valley Fever risks to pets, horses, and other animals that may be present at or around the Project site during construction activities. The Project Applicant/Developer shall also be responsible for the preparation and one-time distribution to surrounding communities and to all schools located in the communities of Gorman, Lebec, and Frazier Park of a notice describing the availability of this website to provide awareness of the site and its contents.

(2) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to the Project site’s proximity to hazardous materials sites.

**Finding 1.** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts due to a potential significant hazard to the public or the environment due to the Project site's proximity to hazardous materials sites. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) prepared for the Project site indicated that listed sites (properties having potential environmental concerns) and/or current or historic land uses in the Project vicinity would be unlikely to adversely affect site development and the future population on the site. Two historic non-producing oil wells are present on the Project site generally north of Quail Lake. Based on testing and review of records from the California Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal
Resources (DOGGR), the oil well and drill sites were abandoned with appropriate notice to DOGGR and no seepage or hazardous conditions are present. However, as part of the Project, the wells would need to be re-abandoned according to current DOGGR guidelines. In addition, a small (approximately four-foot-high) tunnel was dug in the side of a hill as an attempted gold mine located near the southern access point to the Project site. Available information indicates that the mine shaft was abandoned and thus it does not represent a potential health hazard. However, to eliminate potential risks from the abandoned mine shaft and to prevent any future accessibility into the tunnel, prior to approval of construction permits the tunnel shall be permanently closed in accordance with applicable regulations.

In an area in the central portion of the Project site formerly used as a homestead, a water well and three 55-gallon metal drums were observed during preparation of the Phase I ESAs. One of the drums had a black tar-like substance leaking from it, and the ground surface beneath the drum was stained. As part of the Project, the drums and the limited areas of identified asbestos and/or other debris in the area of the former homestead site would be removed in accordance with all applicable regulatory standards.

The National Cement Plant is located approximately one mile north of the Project site, and groundwater contamination resulted from historic activities at this facility. Accordingly, there has been agency oversight by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the Lahanton Regional Water Quality Control Board related to remediation. The contaminant source areas pose no threat to the Project site and its water supply sources due to distance; lack of connectivity between the shallow groundwater impacted by historic releases and Tejon Ranch water supplies; and the results of ongoing groundwater remediation. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project's environmental effects related to a potential significant hazard to the public or the environment due to the Project site's proximity to hazardous materials sites. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by ensuring the proper abandonment of any on-site petroleum wells and mine shafts, appropriate treatment of unanticipated hazardous materials, coordination with expert agencies, and the proper destruction of on-site water wells.

Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure 3-4:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall coordinate with the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geological Resources (DOGGR) to facilitate re-abandonment of the two on-site historic dry oil wells in accordance with current DOGGR specifications. The Project Applicant/Developer shall present documentation to the County that it has complied with the DOGGR requirements for re-abandonment of the two on-site wells.
Mitigation Measure 3-5: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide documentation to the County that the abandoned mine shaft is permanently closed in accordance with applicable regulations, as directed by the California Department of Conservation Office of Mine Reclamation, to prevent future access and potential ground instability issues.

Mitigation Measure 3-6: If unanticipated hazardous materials or waste is encountered during construction, all work in the immediate vicinity of the suspect hazardous material shall be halted and the applicable oversight agency(ies) shall be notified. The applicable agency(ies) are determined based on the type and extent of the material encountered, and may include the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the State Water Quality Control Board, and/or local agencies, such as the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. The Project Applicant/Developer shall coordinate with appropriate agency(ies) on the appropriate means to address the suspect hazardous material/waste. All environmental investigation and/or remediation shall be conducted under a Workplan approved by the primary oversight agency(ies) and construction in the affected area shall not proceed until clearance has been issued by the applicable agency(ies).

Mitigation Measure 3-10: The Project Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for ensuring the destruction of the historic water well associated with the former homestead in the central portion of the site is completed in full compliance with the requirements of the California Department of Water Resources’ Water Well Standards, including Chapter II, Part III, Section 23 (Requirements for Destroying Wells). The applicable Local Enforcement Agency for implementation of the DWR’s Well Standards is the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services, Drinking Water Program (LACDHS). The Project Applicant/Developer shall present documentation that is has complied with the DWR Well Standards to the LACDHS.

(3) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to interfering with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.
Facts in Support of Finding

In 2012, the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (OAERP) was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors. The OAERP is an extension of the State of California Emergency Plan. The Project would have adequate intersection levels of service (LOS) for all points of access into the Project site and for the internal circulation system, and it includes locations for up to four new fire stations and a new Sheriff’s substation which would contribute to improved emergency and evacuation response in northern Los Angeles County. To ensure that Centennial residents would be informed regarding evacuation routes and other aspects of an emergency response, the Project Applicant has had an Emergency Response Plan prepared for the Project, which will be updated with each new tract map and be reviewed and approved by the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, who would facilitate review by the LACFD and the County of Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department. This review would ensure that the Project’s Emergency Response Plan does not conflict with or otherwise impair the OAERP. Project roadways would be built to County of Los Angeles standards and would be designed to ensure that proper access for emergency ingress and egress would be accomplished. The off-site Project features would not adversely affect traffic circulation or otherwise affect emergency response or evacuation. During construction of the SR-138 intersections in the public right-of-way, the Project Applicant/Developer would be required to prepare and implement a Traffic Control Plan in compliance with California MUTCD standards. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects related to the potential to impact emergency response plans. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 3-7: The Project Applicant/Developer shall prepare an Emergency Response Plan for the Project, which shall be updated as needed for each Tentative Map, and shall be submitted to the County for review and approval. The Project Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for distributing the current Emergency Response Plan to each purchaser or tenant of each property within Centennial, and shall distribute the Plan to all landowners through the Transportation Management Agency (TMA).

Mitigation Measure 3-8: The Project Applicant/Developer shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The Traffic Control Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and all construction activities in the public right-of-way shall comply with the approved Traffic Control Plan to the satisfaction of Caltrans. Documentation of Caltrans approval shall be...
provided to the County for any Tentative Map involving construction within State Route 138 right-of-way.

(4) **Potential Impacts:** The Project has the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires because the Project is located within (i) a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4), (ii) a high fire hazard area with inadequate access, (ii) an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards, and/or (iv) proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard.

**Finding 1:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to potential fire hazard to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project would introduce urban development in an undeveloped area subject to wildfire hazards. The Project area is within a VHFHSZ and an HFHSV, which are subject to high fire hazards due to the presence of high brush, woodlands, and steep slopes. Current characteristics of the Project site that contribute to this designation include (1) limited access, (2) lack of existing adequate fire flows, (3) topography, and (4) types of vegetative cover. These characteristics would be addressed as the Project site is developed.

1. **Access.** The Project’s vehicular circulation system would provide five points of access to the site. The Project’s internal circulation system would implement County standards. The Project will incorporate up to four new fire stations within the site.

2. **Fire Flows.** The Project’s proposed water system includes water mains, water tanks, pump stations, and fire hydrants to ensure sufficient fire flows and water pressure to meet County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works’ and LACFD’s fire-suppression standards. The Project would implement a water system that would meet all County requirements in support of fire-suppression activities.

3. **Topography.** The Project’s land uses would be developed in accordance with fuel modification requirements to ensure appropriate buffer zones for protection from wildfire events. Areas of the Project site that are undeveloped and contain steep slopes would restrict human access to the use of trails. Despite limited access to the general population, and the portions of the site with the greatest topographic relief would be accessible to fire-fighting equipment via helicopter, other air transport access, and existing unpaved fire roads. As required by the LACFD, upon their Project-level review (e.g., tract map review), clearance for fire access roads and gates would be incorporated into developed areas. Implementation of the Fuel Modification Plan (MM 3-9) for the Project would ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.
4. **Vegetative Cover.** The majority of residential development is proposed for the flatter portions of the site. Some residential development, however, is proposed in areas that would be adjacent to large open space areas with moderate vegetative cover. The plant communities that make up this cover are highly combustible and would present a high fire hazard and pose a potentially significant impact to development in these areas.

As development of the Project site proceeds, fire hazards associated with the natural vegetative cover would be eliminated through its replacement with urban landscape vegetation. However, the potential for wildland fire hazards would still exist at the wildland/urban interface due to (a) the presence of brush; (b) increased human activity; and (c) the increased potential for fires due to accidental and arson-related causes. The sole risk of reasonably foreseeable explosion on or near the Project is related to flammable materials transport on SR-138. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project's environmental effects related to hazards and fire safety. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by ensuring Project preparation and implementation of a legally compliant Fuel Modification Plan.

**Mitigation Measure 3-9:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall prepare a Fuel Modification Plan demonstrating compliance with the County Fire Code Title 32 and shall provide all new residents and business owners with recorded Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) or disclosure statements that identify the responsibilities for maintaining the fuel modification zone(s) on their property, as defined in the approved Fuel Modification Plan. The CC&Rs or disclosure statements prepared by the Project Applicant/Developer shall be submitted to the County to confirm that new property owners will be informed of their responsibilities for maintaining the fuel modification zone(s) on their property.

(5) **Potential Impacts:** The Project could have a significant cumulative impact related to hazardous materials.

**Finding: 1.** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to people and the environment due to hazardous materials to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

After implementation of MM 3-1 through MM 3-6 and MM 3-10 through MM 3-11, Project-specific impacts due to hazardous materials would be reduced to a less than significant level. Although some of the related projects would also have potential impacts associated with hazardous materials, the environmental concerns associated
with hazardous materials are generally site-specific. Each project is required to address any issues related to hazardous materials or wastes. Federal, State, and local regulations require mitigation to protect against site contamination by hazardous materials. Therefore, with mitigation, the Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts to people and the environment due to hazardous materials would not be cumulatively considerabl and this cumulative impact would thus be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 3-1 to 3-6 and 3-10 to 3-11 above.

(6) **Potential Impacts:** The Project could have a significant cumulative impact related to fire safety and emergency access.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to people and the environment due to fire hazard and emergency access to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

 Portions of the Project site are designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and portions are designated as a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. With development of related projects located in wildfire hazard areas and projected growth in the region, new development and population would be introduced into the wildland/urban interface. As a result, the number of structures and people that would be affected by a wildland fire, and the potential losses if a fire occurs, would increase, as would demand for emergency services. However, like the Project, each of the related projects would be required to meet local and State fire safety measures dependent on the fire hazard designation, including fuel modification, emergency access, building materials, and/or building methods. Therefore, with implementation of MM 3-7 through MM 3-9, the Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts to people and the environment due to fire hazard and emergency access would not be cumulatively considerabl and this cumulative impact would thus be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 3-7 to 3-9 above.
I. Hydrology and Flood

(1) Potential Impact: The Project could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Finding: Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to drainage of the site or area to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Changes in runoff patterns caused by introducing development-related impervious surfaces and drainage infrastructure can modify natural watershed and stream hydrologic (water flow) and geomorphic (landform) processes. These potential channel changes are commonly referred to as hydromodification impacts and can cause channel erosion, migration, or sedimentation unless managed and controlled. The Project will implement a comprehensive system of site-design, source-control, low impact development (LID), and hydromodification best management practices (BMPs) that will meet or exceed the hydromodification control requirements of the County MS4 Permit, the LID standards per Chapter 12.84 of the County Code, and the LID Standards Manual. Mitigation Measure 2-1 requires compliance with County requirements for hydromodification control. All distributed and parcel-specific LID control facilities will comply with the LID performance standard in Mitigation Measure 4-1 as well. Project compliance with the requirements in Section 8 – Hydromodification Impacts of the County LID Standards Manual will be confirmed by the County during the tract map application and review and approval process. Runoff from most off-site locations will be controlled in the proposed regional or distributed, parcel-specific LID facilities and the Project will implement maintenance measures in consultation with a qualified biologist that encourage stabilized native grasses and/or deep rooting plants to minimize sediment transport within applicable post-construction facilities that incorporated BMPs for hydrology and flood control facilities (MM 2-5). Off-site water wells will comply with all applicable LID requirements. During construction, the Project will comply with the Construction General Permit (MM 2-4) and will implement hydromodification BMPs based on the level of risk determined for the site in accordance with an SWPPP. With the implementation of mitigation and compliance with all laws and regulations potential impacts from existing drainage pattern alterations that could result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 2-1: The Project shall implement hydromodification control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will meet the requirements of Section 8 – Hydromodification Impacts of the County LID Standards Manual, as confirmed by the County based on a Drainage System
Engineering and Planning Report to be submitted with each Project tract map application. This Drainage System Engineering and Planning Report shall describe applicable hydromodification control BMPs and utilize approved Los Angeles County methods to demonstrate compliance with the County LID Standards Manual.

**Mitigation Measure 2-4:** The Project shall comply with the California General Construction Permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (CAR000002, Order 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by Order 2010-0014-DWQ and Order 2012-0006-DWQ) during all Project construction activity that meets or exceeds the applicable levels of land disturbance and other applicable coverage criteria in the California General Construction Permit notwithstanding the potential absence or presence of Waters of the United States in any Project construction location.

**Mitigation Measure 2-5:** The Project shall implement maintenance measures in consultation with a qualified biologist that encourage stabilized native grasses and/or deep rooting plants to minimize sediment transport within applicable post-construction facilities that incorporated Best Management Practices for hydrology and flood control facilities.

**Mitigation Measure 4-1:** The Project shall implement Low Impact Development (LID) and water quality control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will achieve the following LID performance standard:

*LID BMPs shall be selected and sized to retain the volume of storm water runoff produced from the higher of the 85th percentile or ¾ inch, 24-hour storm depth as determined from the Los Angeles County 85th Percentile 24-hr Rainfall Isohyetal Map (February 2004) (LID design volume). When it has been demonstrated that 100 percent of the LID design volume cannot be feasibly infiltrated within the Project, then the volume shall be harvested and reused. If that volume cannot be harvested and reused within 96 hours, then biofiltration shall be provided for 1.5 times the portion of the LID design volume that is not retained. Runoff from roadways shall be retained or biofiltered in retention or biofiltration BMPs sized to capture the design storm volume or flow, per the guidance in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (USEPA’s) Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure: Green Streets. LID BMPs may be parcel-based or regional facilities.*

Compliance with the LID performance standards shall be confirmed by the County based on a Drainage System Engineering and Planning Report to be submitted with each Tentative Map application. The Report shall describe applicable water quality control and LID BMPs
and shall utilize approved Los Angeles County methodologies to demonstrate compliance with the LID performance standards. To the extent feasible, incorporate permeable pavement, groundcovers, and/or other measures to increase infiltration.

(2) Potential Impacts: The Project has the potential to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to alteration of the drainage pattern of the site or area to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project will alter portions of the existing drainage pattern and introduce new impervious surfaces to the site. These changes could result in on- or off-site flooding unless managed with flow controls and a storm drain system. The primary hydrology concern during Project construction is that construction activities could substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off the site. Potential operational flood and hydrology impacts could occur if the peak rate or amount of surface runoff under post-project condition increases above pre-development levels and results in flooding on or off the site. The Project will increase the amount of impervious surfaces, and runoff would increase from new, impervious locations on the site, which could result in significant flooding impacts.

The Project will implement a comprehensive system of site design, source control, LID, and hydromodification BMPs that will meet or exceed the hydrology and flood control requirements of the County MS4 Permit, the LID standards per Chapter 12.84 of the County Code, and the LID Standards Manual. Mitigation Measure 2-2 requires compliance with the County 50-year storm event hydrology and flood-control standards. The analysis of pre- and post-development runoff utilizing the County's methodology shows that the post-development 50-year storm event peak flow rates and runoff volumes will be the same or lower than under existing conditions. Project compliance with the hydrology and flood-control performance standards will be confirmed by the County during the tract map application and review and approval. Runoff from most off-site locations will be controlled in the proposed regional facilities. Other off-site facilities, such as water wells, will comply with all applicable LID requirements. During construction, the Project will comply with the Construction General Permit and will implement hydrology and flood-control BMPs based on the level of risk determined for the site in accordance with an Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). With the implementation of mitigation and compliance with all laws and regulations potential impacts from existing drainage pattern alterations or changes in peak flow rates and volumes that could cause flooding on or off the site will be less than significant.
Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 2-2: The Project shall implement hydrology and flood-control BMPs that will achieve the following hydrology and flood performance standards:

All project water conveyance facilities must be designed to provide capital flood protection. The “capital flood” is the runoff produced by a 50-year frequency design storm falling on a saturated watershed (i.e. soil moisture at field capacity). A 50-year frequency design storm has a probability of 1/50 of being equaled or exceeded in any year. BMPs must be implemented to ensure that, for the capital storm event, there is no increase in peak discharge rates and no increase in runoff volume offsite compared with peak discharge rates and runoff volumes under existing, pre-development conditions. Compliance with the hydrology and flood performance standard shall be demonstrated by using a methodology approved Los Angeles County Department of Public Works for comparing project site pre- and post-development peak discharge rates and runoff volumes.

Compliance with the hydrology and flood performance standards shall be further confirmed by the County, based on a Drainage System Engineering and Planning Report submitted with each Project tract map application. The Drainage System Engineering and Planning Report shall describe applicable hydrology and flood-control BMPs and utilize approved Los Angeles County methodologies to demonstrate compliance with the hydrology and flood performance standards.

(3) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce Project impacts related to runoff water and its effects on storm water drainage systems and water quality to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project will construct and maintain distributed and parcel-specific LID and regional flood, flow, and water quality facilities that will meet or exceed applicable County, State, and federal hydrology and water quality control requirements. The Project includes distributed and regional runoff-control BMPs that are sufficient to control peak and volumetric flows from a 50-year storm event to meet all applicable County standards. Project development, including off-site facilities, will not generate runoff water in amounts that will exceed the capacity of planned storm water drainage systems, including regional and distributed or parcel-specific controls.
Potential impacts related to the creation or contribution of runoff water that exceeds the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems will be less than significant with implementation of mitigation. Potential impacts related to the creation or contribution of runoff water that could provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff are discussed in Section 5.4, Water Quality, and would also be less than significant with mitigation. With the implementation of mitigation and compliance with all laws and regulations potential Project impacts concerning runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 2-1, 2-2, 2-4, 2-5, and 4-1 above.

(4) Potential Impact: The Project could conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84).

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to conflicts with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project has been designed to meet LID requirements for hydrology and flood, hydromodification, and water quality control. Mitigation Measure 2-1 requires compliance with the requirements in Section 8 – Hydromodification Impacts of the County LID Standards Manual. Mitigation Measure 2-2 requires compliance with the County hydrology and flood control standards. Mitigation Measure 4-1 requires compliance with the County LID performance standards. The Project will not conflict with the County LID standards per Chapter 12.84 of the County Code. Proposed off-site Project facilities include intersections with SR-138, utility connections, water wells, and Aqueduct crossings. Runoff from new impervious surfaces related to intersection improvements along SR-138, utility connections, and Aqueduct crossings would be controlled in the proposed regional detention and retention basin system or in distributed or parcel-specific LID facilities as necessary to meet LID requirements. Runoff from off-site water well installations will be controlled by implementing all applicable parcel-specific LID BMPs at these locations. All off-site Project facilities will be consistent with the LID requirements. With the implementation of mitigation and compliance with all laws and regulations potential Project impacts related to conflicts with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 2-1, 2-2, 2-4, 2-5, and 4-1 above.
(5) **Potential Impact:** The Project could place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain.

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to flood hazard to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Portions of the Project site in the Oso Creek drainage along the northern boundary and certain drainages along the eastern boundary of the site are within a 100-year floodplain mapped by FEMA. County flood risk maps for the site include the same locations. The Project requires that a Floodplain Safety Overlay be implemented for the mapped floodplain portions of the site that precludes the placement of housing within a 100-year floodplain. This requirement has been incorporated in Mitigation Measure 2-3. No housing will be placed in a 100-year floodplain, or other floodway or floodplain identified on other hazard delineation map. No off-site housing will be constructed with implementation of the Project.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 2-3:** Each Tentative Map shall depict the 100-year floodplain mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The placement of habitable residential, commercial, school and institutional buildings shall be precluded within any mapped 100-year floodplain. All applications for Project tract maps that would locate any structures within a mapped 100-year floodplain must include an engineering report that provides a detailed description of the floodplain boundaries and demonstrates that as-built conditions comply with all applicable FEMA requirements. If required, a conditional letter of map revision (CLOMR) shall be obtained from FEMA prior to construction within a mapped 100-year floodplain.

(6) **Potential Impact:** The Project could place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain.

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to flood hazard to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Portions of the Project site in the Oso Creek drainage along the northern boundary and certain drainages along the eastern boundary of the site are within a 100-year floodplain mapped by FEMA. County flood risk maps for the site include the same locations. The Project includes a Floodplain Safety Overlay that precludes the
placement of habitable residential, commercial, school, and institutional buildings within a 100-year floodplain. This requirement has been incorporated in Mitigation Measure 2-3. Certain proposed Project utility infrastructure, including a water treatment facility in the northwest portion of the site and utilities located along the eastern boundary of the site, could be located in a mapped 100-year floodplain. Mitigation Measure 2-3 requires that, prior to the recordation of any tract map that would locate any structure within a mapped 100-year floodplain, the floodplain boundaries must be more precisely determined and an engineering study must be conducted to identify applicable flood-control and floodplain development protection measures. The study must demonstrate that all applicable FEMA and County of Los Angeles floodplain flood flow and development standards will be met after the proposed construction has been completed. Most of the off-site Project facilities would not be located within a 100-year floodplain. Certain off-site well locations and portions of proposed water pipelines could be located within or near a designated 100-year floodplain. Off-site wells would result in minute changes to existing runoff conditions and would not have the potential to significantly impede or redirect flood flows. Proposed pipeline facilities would be located underground and would have no effect on existing flood flows.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure 2-3 above.

(7) Potential Impact: The Project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to flood hazard to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Portions of the Project site in the Oso Creek drainage along the northern boundary and certain drainages along the eastern boundary of the site are within a 100-year floodplain mapped by FEMA. The Project includes a Floodplain Safety Overlay that precludes the placement of habitable residential, commercial, school, and institutional buildings within a 100-year floodplain. This requirement has been incorporated in Mitigation Measure 2-3. No habitable residential, commercial, school, or institutional buildings will be placed in a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain. Certain Project utility infrastructure, including a water treatment facility and utilities, could be located in a mapped 100-year floodplain. Mitigation Measure 2-3 requires that, prior to the recordation of any tract map that would locate any structure within a mapped 100-year floodplain, the floodplain boundaries must be more precisely determined and an engineering study must be conducted to identify applicable flood-control and floodplain development protection measures. The study
must demonstrate that all applicable FEMA and County of Los Angeles floodplain flood flow and development standards will be met after the proposed construction has been completed. Mitigation Measure 2-3 requires that a conditional letter of map revision (CLOMR) be obtained from FEMA indicating that any proposed facility that would modify a mapped floodplain would be recognized by FEMA if built as proposed. Most of the off-site Project facilities, including intersections with SR-138, utility connections, and Aqueduct crossings, would not be located within a 100-year floodplain. Certain off-site well locations and portions of proposed water pipelines could be located within or near a designated 100-year floodplain and could result in small changes to existing runoff conditions and would not have the potential to significantly impede or redirect flood flows. Proposed pipeline facilities would be located underground and would have no effect on flood flows. Potential impacts from off-site structures that could impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measure 2-3 above.

**(8) Potential Impact:** The Project could place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to inundation to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project site is not subject to tsunami or seiche risks. The Project will avoid steeper topography associated with higher mudflow risks where feasible. Mitigation Measures 2-1, 2-2 and 4-1, require the implementation of flow and sediment-control facilities that will also capture and control mudflows should it occur on the site. With mitigation, potential impacts from mudflows will be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 2-1, 2-2, 2-4, 2-5, and 4-1 above.

**(9) Potential Impact:** The Project could add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as the West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to conditions of standing water that increase potential for diseases to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.
Facts in Support of Finding

The Project would include 28 regional retention and detention basins, modifications to some existing stream channels, storm drain pipes, catch basins, distributed and parcel-specific detention facilities, and other structural BMPs that would temporarily retain wet- or dry-weather runoff. The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) has developed BMPs for mosquito control in storm water management facilities, including the full discharge of captured water in 96 hours (4 days) or less (CDPH 2012), which is the minimum time necessary for mosquito development. All soft-bottom drainage facilities—including regional and distributed basins and stream channels—would be designed to fully drain or infiltrate captured water in less than four days and avoid the creation of mosquito vectors. This drainage or infiltration management requirement is incorporated into Mitigation Measure 4-2. Mitigation Measure 4-2 also requires the implementation of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) BMPs consistent with the integrated pest management and pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines established by the University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources Statewide Integrated Pest Management Program. The IPM BMPs will be further confirmed prior to the issuance of building permits and during the County tract map review process. Mitigation Measure 19-5 requires the implementation of recommended CDPH BMPs for Project wastewater treatment facilities. Proposed Project land uses would not result in unusual standing or otherwise stagnant water accumulation that could increase habitat for mosquitos or other insect vectors. Off-site Project facilities will not result in standing or otherwise stagnant water that could support mosquitos or other vectors.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 4-2: The Project shall implement integrated pest management (IPM) and landscaping best management practices (BMPs) consistent with the integrated pest management and pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines established by the University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources Statewide Integrated Pest Management Program which are available online at http://www.ipm.ucdavis.edu/. The integrated pest management program will be provided to the County in association with the Landscape Plan submitted to the County with each tentative tract map. The IPM and landscaping BMPs shall be confirmed in a Landscaping Plan submitted to the County during the review and approval process for each tract map application. The BMPs shall include a Planting Plan that is consistent with the plant water use requirements of Section 3.4 of the Centennial Specific Plan; with procedures for removing non-native vegetation and planting native vegetation; with fertilizer guidelines; and with the IPM approach for preventing or suppressing pest problems (i.e., insects and diseases). This shall be done through a combination of techniques including using pest-resistant plants; using biological controls; incorporating cultural practices; including habitat
modification; and judiciously using pesticides. The IPM and landscaping BMPs shall, in addition to identifying IMP and landscaping BMP management and funding roles and responsibilities, monitoring, training, and timely IPM and BMP program review requirements to incorporate new technologies that may become available, address the following:

- Pest identification.
- Practices to prevent pest incidence and to reduce pest buildup.
- Monitoring to examine vegetation and surrounding areas for pests to evaluate trends and to identify when controls are needed.
- Establishment of action thresholds that trigger control actions.
- Pest-control methods (cultural, mechanical, environmental, biological, and appropriate pesticides).
- Pesticide management, which includes safety requirements (e.g., Material Safety Data Sheets, precautionary statements, protective equipment); regulatory requirements; spill mitigation measures; groundwater and surface water protection measures associated with pesticide use; and pesticide applicator certifications, licenses, and training (i.e., all pesticide applicators must be certified by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation).
- All rodenticides containing anticoagulants shall be prohibited from use on the Project site or Mitigation Preserve lands. The prohibition shall be clearly described and distributed to home buyers through their home purchase contracts and CC&Rs.

Mitigation Measure 19-5: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the County with plans and specifications that have been prepared in accordance with the Project Water Purveyor or alternate qualified public utility district requirements and standards that demonstrate that the WRF East shall serve the Project site east of the West Branch of the California Aqueduct. WRF East will be located near the northeasterly corner of the Project and shall treat an average flow of 4.28 million gallons per day. Biosolids shall be hauled to a suitable landfill or used for conversion into fertilizer products. Lined seasonal recycled water storage ponds shall be implemented as required to temporarily store recycled water during times of low demand. The ponds shall implement feasible and applicable wastewater treatment facility best management practices for mosquito and health vector recommended in the California Department of Public Health’s 2012 Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in California:
Recommendations of the California Department of Public Health and the Mosquito and Vector Control Association of California.

(10) Potential Finding: The Project could have significant cumulative impacts related to hydrology and flood.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to cumulative hydrology and flood conditions to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project has been designed to meet or exceed the new development requirements of the MS4 permit, the County’s LID standards, and the County’s LID Standards Manual. Specifically, the Project would implement site design, source control, LID, hydromodification, flow control, and runoff water quality BMPs and treatment requirements, ensured with implementation of mitigation. Impacts related to on-site hydrology would be less than significant with mitigation.

Potential mudflow impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels by (1) capturing debris flows in on-site basins and engineered and natural stream channels and (2) avoiding disturbance in on-site locations with slopes in excess of 25 percent that could generate mudflows. Storm water basins would be managed to avoid potential mosquito-borne health vectors by implementing California Department of Public Health (CDPH) recommendations and fully discharging captured storm water within 96 hours. Also, an integrated pest management program must be developed and confirmed during the County review and approval process for Project tract maps.

Additional urbanized uses and increases in impervious surface areas in the Project site’s vicinity (within the same watershed) could produce, if left unmitigated, increases in runoff volume, velocity, and peak discharge rates, and could lead to potential erosion and sedimentation impacts. All future developments in the Antelope Valley and Quail Lake Watersheds would have to comply with the same flood-control criteria and general storm water drainage requirements with which the Project must comply. These requirements serve to minimize direct and cumulative impacts to runoff, debris production, water quality, and flooding potential to downstream areas. Therefore, development of the Project would not cause a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative hydrology, flood, or drainage impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 2-1 through 2-5, 4-1 to 4-2, and 19-5 above.
J. Noise

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts due to generation of noise in excess of County standards or other applicable standards to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Receivers on the Project site would be exposed to both internal and external (operational) noise sources such as traffic on Project roadways and stationary sources such as school activities and commercial centers that, without mitigation, would exceed County noise standards. The Project would also include a number of land uses where installed equipment or activities may generate noise levels that could create a significant impact without mitigation. These include commercial/retail, business park, schools, community uses (e.g. fire station, library), community recreation areas, and utilities, noise associated with the arrival and departure of delivery trucks, noise from business parks, stationary sources such as HVAC equipment at schools, noise from trash pickup and compacting, emergency generator use, public and private park and recreation areas, a planned animal control facility, HVAC at homes, and siren testing at fire stations. In addition, without mitigation, Project construction activities could also generate noise levels in excess of the County Code standards. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project's environmental effects related to the potential to result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise in excess of standards. Implementation of the following mitigation would ensure that the Project’s potential to exceed applicable noise standards would be less than significant by requiring the Project and its structures are designed to ensure that exterior and interior noise standards are achieved using sound attenuation measures such as setbacks, noise barriers, exterior and interior building orientation, and noise reducing building materials, by implementing a variety of restrictions on the type, use, and location of construction equipment, and by implementing noise monitoring and notification measures.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 12-1: For residences, hotels and motels, schools, and places of worship within 500 feet from the centerline of a collector road with a buildout forecast of 10,000 average daily trips (ADT) or greater, a limited secondary road with a buildout forecast of 6,500 ADT or greater, or any higher classification road, the Project Applicant/Developer shall submit to the County an Acoustical Study
prepared in accordance with Section 1207.12 of the County Building Code. The Acoustical Study shall demonstrate that exterior noise levels at areas where residents would reasonably be expected to spend more than one hour (e.g., backyards) would not exceed 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). The Acoustical Study shall also verify, including during construction and before Certificate of Occupancy (CofO) issuance, that the buildings have been properly designed to comply with a CNEL requirement of 45 dBA for habitable interior living areas, classrooms, and rooms used for patient care and worship. The design features required to achieve the noise standard shall include one or more of the following elements, as verified by the Acoustical Study: building setbacks from the roadway; noise barriers; building orientation relative to the roadway; interior living space (bedroom, common area) orientation; sound-rated windows; upgraded exterior wall and/or roof construction; insulation batts; and forced air ventilation.

**Mitigation Measure 12-2:** For each business park use, school, community use area, park and recreation area, animal control facility, utility, County maintenance facility, commercial development, or manufacturing/industrial development, the Project Applicant/Developer shall submit an Acoustical Study verify that the Project has been properly designed to comply with the County of Los Angeles’s Noise Ordinance standards at the nearby sensitive properties (both on and off site). The design features required to achieve the noise standard shall include one or more of the following elements, as verified by the Acoustical Study: building setbacks from the sensitive receptors; noise barriers; building orientation relative to the sensitive receptor; sound-rated windows; and upgraded exterior wall and/or roof construction. All stationary and point sources of noise shall adhere to the requirements of the County Code, including but not limited to Section 12.08.390, Exterior Noise Standards, Section 12.08.460, Loading and Unloading Operations, and Section 12.08.530, Residential Air-Conditioning or Refrigeration Equipment.

**Mitigation Measure 12-3:** To ensure that construction noise is minimized, in addition to meeting all requirements of Section 12.08 of the *County of Los Angeles Code*, the following measures shall be implemented during construction:

- All construction equipment, including internal combustion engines and stationary equipment (used for construction purposes) shall be equipped with noise-reducing features such as, but not limited to improved mufflers, intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustical shields or shrouds. All equipment items must have the manufacturers’ recommended
noise abatement measures, such as mufflers, engine enclosures, and engine vibration isolators, intact and operational.

- Stationary equipment (e.g., generators, air compressors, concrete pumps) located within 450 feet of residences or schools shall have noise abatement (e.g., engine enclosures or equipment placed behind barriers) to limit the noise level at the sensitive receptor to an average sound level (Leq) of 60 dBA or less. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors, to the greatest extent feasible. The construction contractor shall locate pile drivers, or other machinery capable of causing strong vibrations or load noises, such that the rear of the vibratory pile driver or machinery faces toward the noise sensitive receptor when the machine is being utilized, to the greatest extent feasible.

- Equipment and material staging areas and equipment maintenance areas shall be located at least 500 feet from sensitive noise receivers, if feasible.

- Construction activities should be timed to minimize noise impact on exposed areas, by sequencing the use of equipment with relatively low noise levels versus during noise sensitive periods, routing truck traffic and controlling construction traffic activity to minimize vehicle idling, gear shifting, and accelerating under load, to the greatest extent feasible.

- Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction should be hydraulically or electrically powered to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust can and should be used. External jackets on the tools themselves can and should be used, if such jackets are commercially available and this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures can and should be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever such procedures are available and consistent with construction procedures.

- Construction contracts shall specify that notices shall be sent out to all residences located within 1,000 feet of the Project site at least 15 days prior to commencements of construction. The notices shall include the construction schedule and a telephone number where complaints can be registered with the noise disturbance coordinator. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet, shall also be posted at the construction sites throughout construction which includes the same details as the notices.
A "noise disturbance coordinator" shall be established at all construction sites. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall be required to implement reasonable measures such that the complaint is resolved.

The construction contractor shall establish a training program for equipment operators to instruct them in methods of operating their equipment to minimize environmental noise, and to inform them of all applicable State and County noise regulations, including the requirements contained in these mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measure 12-6 The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide to each prospective purchaser or tenant with a notice and statement of acknowledgment that shall be executed by the prospective purchaser, lessee, or tenant that the Centennial property will be undergoing continuing development and, depending on relative location, noise from construction activities may be heard. The form and method of distribution of said notice and statement of acknowledgment shall be as approved by the County. Subsequent to Project buildout, this mitigation measure would no longer apply.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts due to the exposure to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Development of the Project may require pile driving and limited blasting during construction and this could result in noise impacts to sensitive receptors. It is anticipated that these would occur at large distances from existing or future receptors. Heavy construction equipment used for mass grading could be operated at a distance from sensitive receptors that would cause vibration to be beyond County Code levels. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project's environmental effects related to the potential to result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by requiring the preparation of a vibration analysis and the implementation of design features to ensure that construction related vibration meets applicable standards, and by
restricting the use of vibration-causing construction equipment within prescribed distances of sensitive receptors.

Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure 12-4:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall submit a vibration analysis to the County demonstrating that the pile installation has been designed to limit vibrations to 0.01 peak particle velocity (ppv) inch per second (in/sec) or less at occupied buildings. Design features may include alternate methods of installation that result in reduced vibrations such as pile driving cushions or jetting instead of drilling.

**Mitigation Measure 12-5:** For the Project site areas adjacent to 300th Street West, 290th Street West, and Malinda Avenue, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide information to County demonstrating that plans and specifications require that (1) vibratory rollers shall not be used within 300 feet of occupied residences or that vibratory rollers used within 300 feet of occupied residences shall be operated in the static mode and (2) large bulldozers and scrapers shall not be operated within 150 feet of occupied residences. Alternatively, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide information to County demonstrating that plans and specifications require that vibratory rollers, large bulldozers, large scrapers, and similar heavy equipment shall be operated to comply with the requirements of Section 12.08.560 of the County Code and that vibrations at residential properties would not exceed 0.01 inch per second (in/sec).

(3) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts due to substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the project to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Development of the Project may result in the generation of noise levels in excess of the Los Angeles County standards. The Project will cause temporary noise impacts during construction, as described above, which will temporarily increase ambient noise levels above existing levels. In addition, temporary noise impacts would occur during construction of off-site Project features also temporarily increasing ambient noise levels above existing levels. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects related to a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified
sound systems. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by implementing a variety of restrictions on the type, use, and location of construction equipment.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measure 12-3 above.

(4) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to contribute to significant cumulative noise impacts.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts due to cumulative noise impacts to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Cumulative construction noise impacts would only occur if there was a Project construction activity in the immediate proximity of construction activity from another project and if both activities are near a common sensitive receptor at the same time. The NW138 Corridor Improvement Project would occur along the length of SR-138, including the portion adjacent to the Project site. It is likely that both projects will have construction activities occurring at the same time. However, it is unlikely construction for both projects would occur simultaneously adjacent to the same noise-sensitive receptors. The potential for this occurrence is also low due to the mobile nature of construction activities. To minimize impacts due to construction noise, Caltrans projects are subject to the Caltrans Standard Specifications in Section 148.02, “Noise Control,” and also by Standard Special Provision S5-310, “Noise Control” (Caltrans 2016), which ensure that construction noise does not significantly affect adjacent sensitive receptors. There is also a possibility of concurrent construction activities on both the Project site and the Burrows Property adjacent to the eastern Project boundary and 300th Street West. However, an entitlement application has not yet been filed with the County of Los Angeles for the Burrows Property, and therefore, the potential for overlapping construction cannot be reasonably determined. The Project’s noise analysis determines that there would be less than significant construction noise impacts with implementation of the mitigation program. Therefore, there would not be cumulative noise impacts related to construction of the Project.

The NW138 Improvement Project would not have operational stationary sources. Stationary source noise from future development projects near the Project site would be limited by the County noise ordinance and would not have the same common property boundary with a sensitive receptor as the Project. There would be no cumulative stationary source noise impact.

The Project would generate mobile source noise from traffic. The analysis of traffic noise is inherently a cumulative analysis because the cumulative analysis of traffic
volumes includes noise generated by the Project and other projects in the traffic noise study area. The noise study determines that there would be less than significant traffic noise impacts to proposed on-site land uses with implementation of the mitigation program; therefore, there would not be cumulative traffic noise impacts at future on-site receptors. With implementation of MM 12-1 through MM 12-7, the Project’s noise-related impacts would be less than significant, and all cumulative projects would be required to implement similar mitigation requirements to achieve applicable noise standards. Accordingly, construction and operation of the Project is not expected to cause a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative noise impacts.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 12-1 through 12-7 above.

K. Other Public Services

(1) Potential Impact: With respect to public libraries, the Project has the potential to 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: libraries.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to library services to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Implementation of the Project will increase population and the Project residents will generate a demand for library services from the County Library. Residents will also require library and information services. This impact is considered significant. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects related to existing County Library facilities and impacts on library services. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by providing a site for, and constructing, a new library and by ensuring that library services are funded as needed to serve the Project and community.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 17-1: The Los Angeles County Code (Chapter 22.72 of Title 22) (“Library Ordinance”) imposes a Library Facilities Mitigation Fee on new residential development projects in the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles served by the County Library (the “Library Facilities Mitigation Fee”). The Library Facilities Mitigation Fee that is
in effect for the designated County Library planning area is charged upon approval of each residential building permit and is based on the estimated reasonable cost of providing the projected library facility needs in the applicable library planning area. The Project is located within Planning Area 2: Antelope Valley and, as of the date of this EIR, the Library Facilities Mitigation Fee is $844.00 per residential building permit (based upon the County Library's mitigation fee per building permit amount established on October 27, 1998, and last updated on July 1, 2015). The Project provides for the development of a maximum of 19,333 residential dwelling units. Based on the current fee, the total Library Facilities Mitigation Fee that would be due from the Project Applicant/Developer (or its successors in interest) is $16,317,052. Consistent with the Library Ordinance, the amount of the Library Facilities Mitigation Fee that shall apply to the Project shall be the fee payable on the date the County issues each building permit for a residential dwelling unit. The amount of the Library Facilities Mitigation Fee may be increased from time to time pursuant to Section 22.72.040 of the County Code and State law; provided, however, the Library Facilities Mitigation Fee applicable to residential dwellings within the Project shall be no more than the amount of the Library Facilities Mitigation Fee applicable to residential dwellings outside of the Project but within Planning Area 2. The aggregate Library Facilities Mitigation Fees payable for all of the residential dwelling units within the Project for which building permits have been issued shall be referred to herein as the “Project-Wide Fee Total.” The ordinance allows that in lieu of the payment of Library Facilities Mitigation Fees, the Project Applicant/Developer shall fulfill the obligations required by the mitigation measures in this EIR, to satisfy the requirements of the Library Ordinance.

Mitigation Measure 17-2: Section 22.72.090 of the Library Ordinance permits the County Librarian to accept substitute consideration in lieu of the Library Facilities Mitigation Fee if the proposed substitute consideration (such as land, facility construction, and/or materials) (i) has a value that is equal to or greater than the applicable Library Facilities Mitigation Fee that is otherwise due; (ii) is in the form acceptable to the County Librarian; and (iii) is within the scope of the applicable library facilities project. Because the Library Facilities Mitigation Fee only allows for an incremental accumulation of funds for future library facilities as building permits are issued and fees are collected pursuant to Section 22.72.060 of the County of Los Angeles Code, the County Library will implement a strategy that will better serve the residents of Centennial by ensuring that the timing and scope of public library facilities will meet the demands of the community. Centennial desires to cooperate with the County Library in meeting its goals and also seeks certainty with respect to the amount and timing of
the Project’s financial commitment to the County Library. Therefore, the parties’ objectives will be satisfied if, in lieu of the Project Applicant/Developer’s payment of Library Facilities Mitigation Fees at the time residential building permits are pulled in accordance with Section 22.72.060 of the County Code, the Project Applicant/Developer will instead set aside the land and contribute the funds required to build and equip a turnkey Permanent Facility, all in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Development Agreement. As discussed in MM 17-1, the Project Applicant/Developer’s provision of such land and funding will, in accordance with the required mitigation measures, be credited against Library Facilities Mitigation Fees that would otherwise be due.

Mitigation Measure 17-3: The Project Applicant/Developer shall dedicate to the County Library one (1) site of up to 2.62 acres within Village 3 of the Project (the "Dedicated Land") for public library purposes or other location for the permanent facility mutually agreed upon by the County Librarian and the Project Applicant/Developer. The Project Applicant/Developer shall receive a credit against unpaid Library Facilities Mitigation Fees in an amount equal to the fair market value of all Dedicated Land as of the date of the dedication to the County of Los Angeles for County Library purposes. The Dedicated Land shall be conveyed to the County concurrently with the filing and recordation of the final map within which the Dedicated Land is located. If the County Library desires to increase the size of the Dedicated Land, it shall make such request of the Project Applicant/Developer no later than the date that the County approves the tentative map for the proposed subdivision in which the Dedicated Land is located. The Project Applicant/Developer agrees to increase the size of the Dedicated Land upon the County’s request provided: (i) the County cooperates with the Project Applicant/Developer in any related land use boundary changes, transfers or conversions necessary to accommodate the larger library site, subject to the requirements of CEQA and (ii) the County either pays the fair market value for such land with either (A) U.S. funds or (B) a dollar-for-dollar credit against unpaid Library Facilities Mitigation Fees, so long as the Project-Wide Fee Total has not already been offset pursuant to MM 17-4 through MM 17-7. If the Dedicated Land is not used for a County Library within ten (10) years of the land’s conveyance, or if the Dedicated Land is not fully used for a library or another use by the County that is mutually approved by the County and Project Applicant/Developer, then the Dedicated Land (or portion thereof) will revert back to the Project Applicant/Developer.

Mitigation Measure 17-4: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications with a one or two-story, turn-key public library building (the “Permanent Facility”) on the Dedicated Lands. The Permanent
Facility may be constructed in phases. The size and scope of the Permanent Facility will be determined by the County Librarian in consultation with the Project Applicant/Developer provided, however, that the Project Applicant/Developer’s maximum financial contribution shall not exceed the Project-Wide Fee Total, less any offsets pursuant to Mitigation Measures 17-4, 17-6, and 17-7 in this EIR. The sizing, design and programming of the Permanent Facility, including the influence of technology on library services, will be agreed upon by representatives from County Library and the Project Applicant/Developer. A report shall be prepared in conjunction with the preparation of the architectural design parameters that will solicit input from the community with respect to the types of library services desired at the Permanent Library Facility. The consultant’s report shall be paid for by the Project Applicant/Developer and the Project Applicant/Developer shall receive a credit against the Project-Wide Fee Total for the Project Applicant/Developer’s payment of such costs. The Permanent Facility and Permanent Library furniture, fixture, and equipment (FF&E, as defined below) will be substantially similar in quality and materials to the Quartz Hill branch of the County Library on November 2016. The design of the Permanent Library will be performed by an architect mutually selected by the Project Applicant/Developer and the County Librarian. The Permanent Facility must comply with all requirements of the County Library’s Low Voltage Specifications in effect on the date the design contract for the Permanent Facility is fully executed. The County Library shall be responsible for all costs of design and construction of the Permanent Library in excess of the Project Applicant/Developer’s Library Facilities Mitigation Fee obligations hereunder. If, after application of the fee credits against Library Facilities Mitigation Fees to which the Project Applicant/Developer is entitled, there is insufficient funds to construct the Permanent Facility and purchase the Permanent Library FF&E, the Project Applicant/Developer shall not be required to fund construction of the Permanent Facility until additional and sufficient funds are authorized by the County to construct the Permanent Facility and to procure the Permanent Library FF&E. The Permanent Facility will be completed and operational on a date agreed to between the County Librarian and the Project Applicant, subject to force majeure and events within the control of the County (such as, for example, the County’s failure to pay any funding shortfalls if credits against the Project-Wide Fee Total are exhausted). The size of the Permanent Facility will be proportionately reduced in size and materials if the County approves less than the 19,333 residential units proposed for the Centennial Project.

Mitigation Measure 17-5: The Project Applicant/Developer agrees to install furniture, fixtures and equipment (“Permanent Library FF&E”) and
purchase library materials in connection with the Permanent Facility, provided that the Project Applicant/Developer's financial contribution toward the cost of the Permanent Library FF&E and library materials shall not exceed the Project-Wide Fee Total when taken together with all other Project Applicant/Developer expenses then credited against the Project-Wide Fee Total. The County Library shall be responsible for all costs of Permanent Library FF&E and library materials in excess of the Project-Wide Fee Total. The Permanent Library FF&E specifications will be provided by the County Library. Any FF&E purchased shall remain the property of the County Library.

**Mitigation Measure 17-6:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications that demonstrate on-site parking for library patrons at a ratio of 4 parking spaces per 1,000 gross square feet of library space. The parking lot shall also include two spaces adjacent to the staff entrance of the library for County library service vehicles. Parking may be shared with adjacent uses with the consent of the County Library.

**Mitigation Measure 17-7:** If the Project Applicant/Developer has satisfied its obligations in Mitigation Measures 17-1 through 17-6, above, and the Project Applicant/Developer continues to pull building permits within the Project, then the Project Applicant/Developer (or its successors in interest) shall pay any Library Facilities Mitigation Fees still owing as construction permits are issued, which shall be expended by the County Library for the benefit of the Permanent Facility on library materials, FF&E, facility enhancements or library programs as determined by the County Librarian.

**Mitigation Measure 17-8:** No later than December 1 and July 1 of each calendar year, the Project Applicant/Developer shall deliver to the County Library a report in writing providing the number of residential building permits actually issued to date. Within 30 days from the date the report is received, the County Library will deliver, or cause to deliver, to the Project Applicant/Developer a report on the revised Project-Wide Fee Total.

(2) **Potential Impact:** The Project could have a significant cumulative impact on library facilities and services.

**Finding: 1.** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to library services to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Development occurring in Los Angeles County and Kern County surrounding the Project site that contributes to the resident population will increase the demand
placed on public library facilities and services. Implementation of **MM 17-1** through **MM 17-8**, described above, will meet the Project’s anticipated library demand. As with the Project, each related project will be required to meet the respective County’s library mitigation fees to allow for construction and/or expansion of facilities and services to accommodate the needs of the surrounding area’s population. In addition, one of the related Projects, Tejon Mountain Village, located in Kern County involves the construction of an on-site library. As such, the impacts on nearby Kern County and Los Angeles County library services attributable to the Project (when combined with other related projects) will not be cumulatively considerable and this impact is less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 17-1 to 17-8 above.

(3) **Potential Impact:** The Project may not be served by a landfill with permitted capacity sufficient to accommodate the Project’s construction-related solid waste disposal needs.

**Finding 1:** Project impacts on landfills caused by the Project’s construction-related solid waste disposal needs would be less than significant with mitigation.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

It is estimated that site-preparation (vegetation removal and grading activities) and construction activities will generate approximately 602,910 tons total (or approximately 115.94 tons per day) of construction wastes over the 20-year buildout of the Project without the implementation of recycling or other diversion. The waste materials generated during site preparation and grading are expected to include typical construction debris including packaging, building material wastes (e.g., excess wood, tile, steel), organic materials, and green wastes. With implementation of MM 17-9, the Project will divert from landfill disposal 100 percent of soil during grading activities, and at least 75 percent of nonhazardous construction and demolition waste, which exceeds the 65 percent diversion standards of the voluntary Tier 1 2016 California Green Building Standards. This will result in less than approximately 180,873 tons of construction wastes requiring disposal over the 20-year Project buildout period, or approximately 34.8 tpd. This construction-related solid waste need would be nominal in comparison to available capacity (i.e., less than one percent) and be considered a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 17-9:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for implementing the following construction waste reduction requirements to ensure that 100 percent of soil is diverted during grading activities, and that at least 75 percent of nonhazardous construction and demolition waste is diverted from landfill disposal.
During all construction phases, wastes would be managed with the use of recycling bins for various debris materials which would be sent to existing recycling and/or processing facilities in accordance with all provisions of the County Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance. This would include submitting and implementing a Recycling and Reuse Plan to Public Works in connection with obtaining a building or grading permit.

L. Parks and Recreation

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to create capacity or service level problems, or 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, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to capacity or service level problems or adverse impacts associated with government facilities to a less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Without mitigation, implementation of the Project could lead to a failure to meet both the Parkland Dedication Ordinance/Quincy Act Ordinance requirements and the County General Plan standards related to parkland per person. Under the Parkland Dedication Ordinance/Quincy Act Ordinance requirements, the Project would have a preliminary parkland obligation of approximately 147 acres. Based on the County’s General Plan standard of 4 acres of local parkland per 1,000 persons, the Project would have a preliminary requirement to provide approximately 195 acres of parkland. The Project includes approximately 163 acres of Park Overlay, which would include neighborhood parks, community parks, and community regional parks. Nonetheless, this impact is considered significant without mitigation which requires the parkland to be created by the Project. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by ensure that the Project provides healthy outdoor parks and recreational resources and amenities on the Project site that equate to applicable state and local parkland requirements. Although not required to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level, the Project Development Agreement requires the Project to dedicate an additional 96 acres of designated park space, thus increasing identified Project parkland to 6 acres per 1,000 persons.
Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 14-1: The Project shall implement the following components of the Green Development Program to provide healthy outdoor parks and recreational resources on the Project site:

- Provide a functional system of community trails, greenway trails, and natural corridors to serve as recreational opportunities and as alternative means of transportation to reduce vehicular traffic.

- Provide “complete streets” throughout the community to provide alternative modes of transport (walking, biking, low-speed vehicles (LSVs) such as neighborhood electric scooters, bikes and other low-speed electric vehicles (NEVs).

- Incorporate sidewalks (separated by a parkway from streets) and trees to be the main street elements to create a walking environment, promoting pedestrian activity.

- Provide Class I – IV bike lanes throughout the Project to ensure a variety of alternative transportation options.

- Provide permanently anchored bicycle racks within 200 feet of visitors’ entrance of nonresidential buildings, readily visible to passers-by, for 5 percent of new visitor motorized vehicle parking spaces being added, with a minimum of two-bike capacity rack.

- For new nonresidential buildings with over 10 tenant-occupants or for additions or alterations that add 10 or more tenant vehicular parking spaces, provide secure bicycle parking spaces at a rate of 5 percent of tenant parking being added, with a minimum of one space.

- For residential buildings, provide permanently anchored bicycle racks within 100 feet of the visitor’s entrance, readily visible to passers-by, for 5 percent of visitor motorized vehicle parking capacity with a minimum of one two-bike capacity rack.

- Nonresidential buildings within the Business Park and Commercial areas with 75,000 or more square feet of gross floor area shall provide locker rooms and shower facilities.

- For multifamily buildings, provide on-site bicycle parking for at least one bicycle per every two dwelling units.

- Include planned green space, which are integrated pockets of open space (including greenways, tree stands, hillsides, and community parks) with minimal developed amenities. Planned green space reduces evapotranspiration; allows natural
percolation of runoff from adjacent lands; reduces the heat island effect; and adds aesthetic value to a site. Planned green space can provide habitat as well as linkages to other habitat areas.

**Mitigation Measure 14-2**: The Project Applicant/Developer shall implement the Parks and Recreation Plan as set forth in Chapter 3.12 of the *Centennial Specific Plan* to provide visually appropriate parks and recreational amenities to the Project site.

**Mitigation Measure 14-3**: The Project Applicant/Developer shall construct 163 acres of parks consistent with the Park Overlay requirements of the Centennial Specific Plan, which includes acreage to meet the County's Parkland Dedication Ordinance requirements. In addition, the Project Applicant/Developer will fund the cost of constructing and equipping the public parks within the Project, pursuant to a park Development Agreement, a statutory Development Agreement pursuant to Section 65864 et seq. of the *California Government Code*, or other condition of approval.

For purposes of this measure, and as applied to all future Tentative Maps, the County shall deem all parks that are 3.0 acres or more in size as public parks, so long as each park site meets County standards for site suitability. The Project shall provide public parks to be developed in accordance with the schematic designs approved by the County.

Neighborhood and community parks shall contain various types of improvements that may include, but not be limited to, parking lot, walkways, plazas and other forms of hardscape, shade trellis, security lighting, trash enclosures, locking gates, fencing, open turf sports fields, basketball courts, multi-purpose ballfields, tennis courts, children's play areas, picnic areas (picnic tables with pads), shade structures/pavilions, restrooms with drinking fountains, recreation building, office and storage space/service yards, trees, landscaping (including plant material, grading, drainage, and irrigation), and park entry monuments.

**Mitigation Measure 14-4**: The Project shall provide public parkland in compliance with the County of Los Angeles Parkland Dedication Ordinance/Quimby Act, with all acreage figures stated as "net" (three percent slope, maximum). Additionally, public parks shall be dedicated to the County in a developed condition, in accordance with the schematic designs recommended by the County and/or as approved by the Regional Planning Commission and/or the County Board of Supervisors as part of approval of each tract map as each phase of development occurs throughout the Project site with amenities
consistent with County-approved plans. Developed public parks shall also be credited with an equivalency acreage correlating with the current Representative Land Value for the applicable Park Planning Area (currently Park Planning Area 48). All public parks must comply with County’s Park Design Guidelines and Standards, Public Parks.

**Mitigation Measure 14-5:** The Project shall provide public and private recreation amenities that equate to the acreage requirements of the County of Los Angeles General Plan local parkland standard (4 acres for every 1,000 persons in the unincorporated County).* For purposes of monitoring compliance with the General Plan standard, whenever either a Tentative Map or a Final Map is submitted for the County’s review and clearance, those maps shall have a table that provides a breakdown of acreage per lot for the following categories: (1) Public Park acreage (maximum slope 3 percent or less); (2) Public Park Acreage Equivalency (which shall be based upon estimated Public Park Improvement Values derived from Total Project Cost Estimates required at the time of map clearance and the Parkland Dedication Ordinance/Quimby Ordinance in effect at the time the map is submitted); (3) Private Park acreage, including pocket parks; (4) Greenway and County multi-use (hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking) trail acreage; (5) Community Recreation Facility acreage; and (6) Private Recreation Facility acreage.

*Note:* Independent of this measure, an additional 96 acres of designated park space (increasing identified parkland to 6 acres per 1,000 persons) has been voluntarily agreed to by the Project applicant as a component of the Development Agreement. See Item 7.1 (entitled “Commitment to Provide Additional Regional Park Land”) in Exhibit G of the Development Agreement.

(2) **Potential Impact:** The Project could contribute to significant cumulative impacts to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities.

**Finding: 1.** Mitigation measures would reduce potential cumulative impacts to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities to a less than significant levels. The Count hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project will provide abundant on-site park acreage and other recreational facilities, and the planned parkland will meet State and County parkland requirements with implementation of MM 14-1 through MM 14-5, described above. Each future project in the region that includes a residential subdivision would be required to meet State (i.e., Quimby Act) and local parkland requirements. The Project
will not result in substantial deterioration of any existing recreation facilities or trails, nor will the Project require off-site construction or expansion of recreation facilities or trails. Since the Project provides adequate parkland and trails onsite to serve the Project’s residents and exceeds the public parks requirement in an area with little local parkland, and since cumulative projects will be required to meet state and local parkland requirements, the Project’s contribution to increased demand for parks and recreational facilities will not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 14-1 to 14-5 above.

**M. Traffic, Access, and Circulation**

(1) **Potential Impact:** The Project could substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) or result in inadequate emergency access.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses or due to inadequate emergency access to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines this impact to be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Circulation Plan for the Project was designed to accommodate the projected traffic volumes that would be generated by on-site development. The Project’s Mobility Plan has been designed to reduce vehicle trip generation and provide adequate roadway capacity. A capacity verification of the on-site circulation system was made using long-range traffic forecast data. The Project roadways would be built to County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works standards as contained in County design manuals, the AVAP and the *Centennial Specific Plan*. The roadways will be designed to ensure that there is proper access for emergency ingress and egress for evacuation and for access by emergency vehicles. In addition, the conceptual alignment of the roadways for the Project area has been designed to accommodate general design speeds in accordance with County standards. There are no off-site Project features that will impede traffic flow or restrict emergency access to or from the Project site or create a hazardous situation; therefore there will be no impacts to or from off-site Project features. There are no known traffic hazards, nor are there existing or planned Project components that may create hazards that will impact the Project or surrounding area. There will be less than significant Project impacts related to hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses or due to inadequate emergency access with implementation of the proposed roadway improvements at intersections with SR-138 and compliance with existing regulations and implementation of MM 10-2, MM 10-5, MMs 10-7 through 10-17, MM 10-20, MM 10-25, and MM 10-26. Project mitigation measures require that Project traffic conditions
and impacts be analyzed in conjunction with each Tentative Tract Map (TTM) application. The MMRP requires the Project Applicant/Developer to enter into a Traffic Mitigation Agreement prior to approval of the Project’s first TTM and that traffic studies be prepared and that Specific Plan transportation measures be confirmed in conjunction with each TTM application. As discussed on EIR page 5.10-140, Project roadways must be built to County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works standards as contained in County design manuals, the AVAP and the Specific Plan, and must be designed to ensure that there is proper access for emergency ingress and egress for evacuation and for access by emergency vehicles. Compliance with all such design standards and access requirements will be enforced by the County as part of the TTM approval process.

Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure 10-2:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall submit a traffic study that addresses site access and local circulation in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines. The Project Applicant/Developer shall retain a Traffic Engineer or Civil Engineer licensed in the State of California to perform the traffic study to the satisfaction of the County.

**Mitigation Measure 10-5:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall submit Traffic Management Plans to the County for review and approval. The Traffic Management Plans shall describe traffic-control measures that shall be implemented to maintain traffic flow in all directions, including where utilities and other improvements are being implemented in existing roadways. The Traffic Management Plans shall identify the following: construction haul routes; duration and location of lane closures; location of parking for the public and construction workers during construction phases; use of flag persons; and any pedestrian-related impacts to sidewalks and intersection crossings. The Traffic Management Plan shall be implemented during all stages of Project construction that generate traffic impacts.

**Mitigation Measure 10-7** *(Supplemental Traffic Study MM-2)* To mitigate the Project’s impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for the following intersection improvements at Specific Plan Westerly Access and SR-138:

- Widen SR-138 to a six-lane expressway from westerly project entrance to 300th Street West, resulting in three through lanes in the WB and EB directions.
- Construct intersection to include: two NB left-turn lanes, three NB through lanes and one NB right-turn lane.
In the SB direction, construct two left turn lanes, three through lanes and two right-turn lanes.

In the EB direction, construct three left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane.

In the WB direction, construct two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes.

Install traffic signal.

Or, contribute fair share to intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

Mitigation Measure 10-8 (Supplemental Traffic Study MM-3): To mitigate the Project’s impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for implementation of the following intersection improvements at Specific Plan Central Access and SR-138:

- Widen SR-138 to a six-lane expressway from westerly project entrance to 300th Street West, resulting in three through lanes in the WB and EB directions.
- In the NB and SB directions, construct two left-turn lanes, three through lanes and one right-turn lane.
- In the EB direction, construct two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane.
- In the WB direction, construct two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes.
- Install traffic signal and include SB and NB right-turn overlap phasing.

Or, contribute fair share to intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

Mitigation Measure 10-9 (Supplemental Traffic Study MM-4): To mitigate the Project’s impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for implementation of the following intersection improvements at 300th Street West and SR-138:

- Widen SR-138 to a six-lane expressway from westerly project entrance to 300th Street West, resulting in three through lanes in the WB and EB directions.
• Construct two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane in the EB direction and two left-turn lanes and dual right-turn lanes in the WB direction.
• In the NB direction, construct two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane.
• In the SB direction, construct two left turn lanes, three through lanes and one right-turn lane.
• Install traffic signal and include WB right-turn overlap phasing.

Or, contribute fair share to intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

**Mitigation Measure 10-10 (Supplemental Traffic Study MM-6):** To mitigate the Project’s impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for implementation of the following intersection improvements at Margalo Drive and SR-138:

• Widen SR-138 to a four-lane expressway from 300th Street West to 240th Street West.
• Additional intersection improvements include: two EB left turn lanes, one WB right-turn lane, one SB left-turn lane, and two SB right-turn lanes.
• Install traffic signal.

Or, contribute fair share to intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

**Mitigation Measure 10-11 (Supplemental Traffic Study MM-7):** To mitigate the Project’s impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for implementation of the following intersection improvements at Three Points and SR-138:

• Widen SR-138 to a four-lane expressway from 300th Street West to 240th Street West resulting in two through lanes in the WB and EB directions.
• Additional improvements include adding one NB left-turn lane, one SB left turn lane and one SB right turn lane.
Mitigation Measure 10-12 *(Supplemental Traffic Study MM-8)*: To mitigate the Project's impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for implementation of the following intersection improvements at 250th Street West and SR-138:

- Widen SR-138 to a four-lane expressway from 300th Street West to 240th Street West resulting in two through lanes in the WB and EB directions.
- Additional improvements include adding one SB left turn lane, one EB left-turn lane, one WB U-turn lane and one dedicated WB right-turn lane.
- Install traffic signal.

Or, contribute fair share to intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

Mitigation Measure 10-13 *(Supplemental Traffic Study MM-9)*: To mitigate the Project's impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for implementation of the following intersection improvements at 210th Street West and SR-138:

- Widen SR-138 to a four-lane limited access conventional highway from 240th Street West to 190th Street West.
- Additional improvements include one SB left-turn lane, one NB left-turn lane, one EB left-turn lane, one EB right-turn lane, and one WB left-turn lane.

Or, contribute fair share to intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

Mitigation Measure 10-14 *(Supplemental Traffic Study MM-11)*: To mitigate the Project's impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for
implementation of the following intersection improvements at 170th Street West and SR-138:

- Roadway augmentation at intersection, approximately ¼ mile in length for the east and west legs, resulting in 2 through lanes in the WB and EB directions at the intersection.
- Additional improvements include one EB left-turn lane, one WB left-turn lane, one NB left-turn lane and one SB left-turn lane.

Or, contribute fair share to intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

**Mitigation Measure 10-15 (Supplemental Traffic Study MM-13):** To mitigate the Project’s impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for implementation of the following intersection improvements at 90th Street West and SR-138:

- Roadway augmentation at intersection, approximately ¼ mile in length for the east and west legs, resulting in 2 through lanes in the WB and EB directions at the intersection.
- Additional improvements include: two EB left-turn lanes, one EB right-turn lane, one WB left-turn lane, one WB right-turn lane, one NB left-turn lane and one SB left-turn lane.

Or, contribute fair share to intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

**Mitigation Measure 10-16 (Supplemental Traffic Study MM-14):** To mitigate the Project’s impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for implementation of the following intersection improvements at 60th Street West and SR-138:

- Roadway augmentation at intersection, approximately ¼ mile in length for the east and west legs, resulting in 2 through lanes in the WB and EB directions at the intersection.
- Additional improvements include: one EB left-turn lane, one EB right-turn lane, one WB left-turn lane, one WB right-turn lane, one NB left-turn lane and one SB left-turn lane.
- Install traffic signal.
Mitigation Measure 10-17 *(Supplemental Traffic Study MM-15)*: To mitigate the Project’s impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for implementation of the following intersection improvements at the SR-14 and SR-138 interchange:

- Install traffic signals at the NB off-ramp and the SB off-ramp.

Mitigation Measure 10-20 *(Supplemental Traffic Study MM-18)*: To mitigate the increase of side-street delay for the existing adjacent off-site areas and for planned on-site side streets along SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) dedicate right-of-way within the project site at each site access location to accommodate the ultimate intersection or interchange configuration to be determined by the Northwest Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative at the following SR-138 intersections:

- Westerly Access
- Central Access
- 300th Street West

Mitigation Measure 10-25 *(Traffic Study MM-24)*: The Project Applicant/Developer shall implement the Mobility Plan, included as Section 3.2 of the Specific Plan, which provides an extensive system of sidewalks, greenway trails, community trails, a dedicated transit easement, and two transit hubs to serve as alternative means of transportation on the Project site. The Mobility Plan also requires creation and ongoing operation of a Transportation Management Association (TMA) to implement ongoing transportation improvements and programs.

The Project Applicant/Developer, through the required implementation of the Mobility Plan, shall:

- Reinforce and serve the Land Use Plan;
- Provide future residents, visitors and employees with multiple modes of transit/non-single occupancy vehicle (non-SOV) accessibility for internal and external trips;
- Provide options to reduce vehicle trips and emissions by linking effective travel demand management with transportation systems and parking policies;
- Provide residents and employees on the Project site with multiple modes of transportation options (i.e., walk, bike, public transit, private auto, car share, bike share, etc.);
- Provide for 80 percent on average, but no less than 50 percent of each Village’s residential units to be located within one-half mile of a Village Center that includes retail and service uses;
- Provide parks within a 5-minute walk (0.25 mile) of 80 percent of all residential units;
- Provide a transit route easement no less than 25 feet wide in the Centennial Commerce District connecting the Town Center, Business Park, and Industrial/Civic areas and also northerly connecting to the Village Five Core;
- Require TMA implementation of a combination of transit and transportation measures to ensure that a minimum of 30 percent of total daily internal on-site trips are completed by using transit modes other than SOV use, including on-demand pooled car or multi-passenger vehicle service;
- Require TMA implementation of a combination of transit and transportation measures to ensure that a minimum of 20 percent of total off-site peak hour commutes to and from the Project site are completed by using transit modes other than SOVs, which shall include requiring the TMA to provide am and pm peak hour demand-based multi-passenger transit services for Project residents and employees that link the Project to the nearest Metrolink station and commuter transit hub to the south (currently Santa Clarita) and the east (currently Palmdale), and to the north (Tejon Mountain Village, Tejon Commerce Center, and Grapevine), and to other commuter destinations as warranted by consumer demand;
- Require TMA implementation of a program to coordinate with automotive dealers on the Project site to promote battery electric or hydrogen fuel cell (collectively “electric”) vehicles; at minimum, this program shall include preferences for dealers offering bulk discounts or other financial incentives;
- Require TMA oversight of requirement for service fleet vehicles for agencies or businesses located on-site to be electric vehicles to the maximum extent feasible, as determine by the Project Applicant/Developer in consultation with the County, or other future vehicle technologies as may be developed and comply
with California’s air quality, greenhouse gas, and climate change mandates, and which meet the performance and affordability needs of Project employees and residents as determined by the Project Applicant/Developer in consultation with the County (collectively, “Future Vehicle Fleet” or “FVF”); and

- Require TMA implementation of a combination of measures to provide adequate temporary bike or personal electric vehicle (e.g., scooter) parking during large public events conducted at civic center, large amphitheaters, fairgrounds or athletic stadium uses that may be permitted, temporarily permitted, or conditionally permitted on the Project site pursuant to the Specific Plan. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, providing valet bike parking, temporarily anchored bike parking racks, or a secured temporary bike parking enclosure.

The Circulation Plan sets forth requirements for roadway classifications; intersection controls; and traffic calming measures. Where approved by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the County and where maintenance and durability costs are comparable to traditional materials, use “cool” pavement materials, which reduce heat island effect.

**Mitigation Measure 10-26 (Traffic Study MM-24):** Each component of the Mobility Plan incorporates Transportation Demand Management (TDM) features to reduce dependence on the automobile, provide for a more efficient use of transportation resources among Project occupants, and thereby reduce pollutant emissions. Related to this is the creation and ongoing operation of a Transportation Management Association (TMA) to fund and manage the operation of ongoing transportation programs, including but not limited to transit and on-demand services. The key TDM elements that are inherent in the overall Mobility Plan are:

- Sidewalks, greenway trails, and community trails that link residential, schools, shopping, and employment areas;
- Small- to medium-sized streets and blocks that allow for shorter walking distances to retail, parks, schools, and other destinations;
- Pedestrian environments incorporated with public streets;
- Transit route easement connecting the residential and commerce areas;
- Parking behind buildings to encourage walking in retail areas along street frontage; and
- Parks within 0.25 mile of 80 percent of all residential units
N. Visual Resources

(1) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to views to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact is less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Existing views from public regional trails and bikeways would have less than significant impacts due to both the distance and the intervening topography between these trails and the Project site. Views of the Project site from existing trails are currently blocked or infrequent due to distance and intervening topography and vegetation and because development associated with the Project would not block major views from these trails, less than significant visual impacts are expected. The relocation of one segment of the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) that currently crosses Lancaster Road at 270th Street West would potentially move approximately 1.75 miles east so that it is generally aligned along 300th Street West between SR-138 and the northeastern corner of the Project site. Views from the conceptual alignment of the PCT, if constructed, would be of the Project site, nearby foothills, and the distant Tehachapi Mountains. MM 13-4 requires that structures proposed along 300th Street West be screened by a block wall along the rear of the structures and a wide, landscaped setback containing the conceptual PCT realignment. This would ensure that the urban uses on the site would have limited visibility from the trail, and would therefore result in a less than significant impact. Proposed off-site features of the Project (such as wells, utility lines, and an existing bridge) would be visible to trail users on the PCT but would have a very low profile and/or would not be a visually prominent change to the existing condition. The newly proposed bridge crossing over the West Branch of the Aqueduct would be visible by viewers in the immediate area and would alter the visual character of the portion of the Aqueduct that bisects the Project site, but would be too distant to affect views from hikers along the PCT. In the context of the Project as a whole, these features would not be noticeable as a substantial change to the viewshed and would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 13-4:** Structures proposed along the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail (PCT) shall be screened by a block wall or comparable screening along the rear of the structures abutting the trail and a 34-foot-wide landscaped setback shall be provided that would contain the conceptual PCT realignment.

(2) **Potential Impact:** Project construction activities could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.
Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce Project impacts related to light or glare caused by construction activities that may adversely affecting day or nighttime views to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact is less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Since the Project site is in an undeveloped area with few existing light sources, Project construction would create new sources of light and glare such as security lighting in the construction equipment and building material staging areas. However, compliance with MM 13-5 would reduce construction-generated light and glare impacts to less than significant by ensuring that security lighting used for construction areas, equipment, and building materials staging areas are be directed away from adjacent residents, roads and highways, by screening construction security lighting at construction staging areas as feasible, and by ensuring that construction equipment and materials staging areas are located as far as feasible from surrounding adjacent residences.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 13-5: Security lighting used for construction areas, equipment, and building materials staging areas shall be directed away from SR-138, 300th Street West, 290th Street West, and existing residences east of 300th Street West and east of 290th Street West and Malinda Avenue. Screening of construction security lighting at construction staging areas shall be implemented, as feasible. Construction equipment and materials staging areas shall be located as far as feasible from surrounding adjacent residences and lights shall be directed away from adjacent on-site residences that are occupied, as each development phase is built.

O. Wastewater Collection

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB).

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts from potentially exceeding wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan RWQCBs to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project will use approximately 4.48 mgd (5,019 afy) of water for indoor use at buildout and 0.03 mgd (29 afy) for other uses. In addition to the indoor potable water flows contributing to wastewater flows, buildings in the Business Park land use will
implement dual plumbing which will add 0.14 mgd (157 afy) to the wastewater flows for a total of 4.62 mgd (5,176 afy). Treatment of all wastewater generated on the Project site would occur at two permanent on-site wastewater reclamation facilities (WRF). The WRFs will have a nominal peak treatment capacity of 2.0 times the average daily flow, or 9.24 mgd. Wastewater will be treated to meet state standards. Recycled water will be generated by the WRFs and pumped into a recycled water distribution system and/or stored in ponds. At full buildout, recycled water will be used for (i) 100 percent of the commercial, business park, institutional, school, hotel, park, and slope outdoor irrigation demand; (ii) 56 percent of the total very low and low density residential lot outdoor irrigation demand (50 percent of the very low and low density landscape lot area); and (iii) wastewater and cooling use within the proposed business park except where prohibited by applicable law for particular types of areas or uses (e.g., employee cafeterias). The proposed WRFs, wastewater treatment system, and recycled water system will not be located on or discharged to portions of the site within the boundaries of the Los Angeles RWQCB. However, the Project has the potential to create impacts from exceeding the wastewater treatment requirements of the Lahontan RWQCB without mitigation. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects related to potential exceedances of wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan RWQCB. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 19-1:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide documentation to the County that it has completed all required procedures and has paid all applicable fees associated with establishing the Project Water Purveyor, or an alternate qualified public utility district, as the operator of the WRFs.

**Mitigation Measure 19-2:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall demonstrate that the Project has either been annexed into an existing qualified public utility district (e.g. Golden Valley Municipal Water District) or that a new public utility district (e.g. Project Water Purveyor) has been created to serve the Project. The Project Water Purveyor or alternate qualified public utility district shall be responsible for the design, construction, and operation of the wastewater facilities, and shall ensure compliance with all applicable standards and regulations, including all Lahontan RWQCB and Title 22 requirements of the California Code of Regulations.

Wastewater treatment facilities, effluent facilities, and sewer lift stations shall be designed with emergency backup power sources and spill containment features, which shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Lahontan RWQCB.
**Mitigation Measure 19-3:** The Project shall incorporate the Wastewater Management Plan (*Centennial Specific Plan, Section 3.5*), and the Project Applicant/Developer shall prepare a Facilities Report, a Pump Station Feasibility Report, and a Sewer Area Study consistent with County Policies and Requirements.

**Mitigation Measure 19-4:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the County with plans and specifications that have been prepared in accordance with the Project Water Purveyor or alternate qualified public utility district requirements and standards that demonstrate that the WRF West shall serve the Project site west of the West Branch of the California Aqueduct. The facility shall be located on an approximate 3-acre site and shall treat an average flow of approximately 0.34 million gallon per day. Biosolids shall be hauled to a suitable landfill or used for conversion into fertilizer products.

**Mitigation Measure 19-5:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the County with plans and specifications that have been prepared in accordance with the Project Water Purveyor or alternate qualified public utility district requirements and standards that demonstrate that the WRF East shall serve the Project site east of the West Branch of the California Aqueduct. WRF East will be located near the northeasterly corner of the Project and shall treat an average flow of 4.28 million gallons per day. Biosolids shall be hauled to a suitable landfill or used for conversion into fertilizer products. Lined seasonal recycled water storage ponds shall be implemented as required to temporarily store recycled water during times of low demand. The ponds shall implement feasible and applicable wastewater treatment facility best management practices for mosquito and health vector recommended in the California Department of Public Health’s 2012 *Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in California: Recommendations of the California Department of Public Health and the Mosquito and Vector Control Association of California*.

**Mitigation Measure 19-6:** Recycled water from Project Wastewater Reclamation Facilities that is used in a manner that could accidentally recharge groundwater shall meet the groundwater quality objectives in the Lahontan Basin Plan for nitrate as nitrogen, or 10 milligrams per liter based on the California state drinking water standard as referenced in the Lahontan Basin Plan for groundwater quality objectives of 45 milligrams per liter of nitrate as nitrate.

**Mitigation Measure 19-7:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide an evaluation of alternate disinfection measures, including the use of ultraviolet disinfection, for water treatment at the eastern wastewater reclamation facility (WRF East) and the western wastewater
reclamation facility (WRF West), and provide a recommendation regarding the most efficient and effective means of disinfection to the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Lahontan RWQCB) for review. The WRF East and WRF West shall be designed to the satisfaction of the Lahontan RWQCB, with appropriate disinfection measures to ensure that any incidental recharge from the use of recycled water will not adversely affect receiving groundwater.

(2) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

**Finding:** 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts from construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project would involve the construction of new wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities. Potential environmental effects of the facilities' construction on resources categories other than wastewater are assessed in the appropriate topical sections of the EIR. As stated above, the Project would generate approximately 4.62 mgd (5,176 afy) of wastewater flows which will have to be treated by two new WTFs on the Project site. All wastewater generated on the site will be reused. However, the Project could potentially create water or wastewater system capacity problems without mitigation. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s environmental effects related to creating water or wastewater system capacity problems, or resulting in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 19-1 to 19-7 above.
P. Water Quality

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to violate a (surface water) water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to surface water quality or violations of waste discharge requirements to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Potential impacts related to construction runoff, erosion, and dewatering and operational impacts may occur. Post-development concentrations of TSS, nutrients, trace metals, and chloride would be consistent with or significantly below applicable narrative and numerical water quality objectives in the Lahontan and Los Angeles Basin Plans and in the California Toxics Rule (CTR). The qualitative analysis shows potential Project impacts related to turbidity, pesticides, pathogens (bacteria, viruses, and protozoa), petroleum hydrocarbons (oil and grease, PAHs), trash and debris, MBAS, toxicity, and emerging contaminants would be less than significant. The Project will implement a comprehensive system of site design, source control, low impact development, and hydromodification Best Management Practices (BMPs) that meet or exceeds the water quality and hydrology (storm water runoff) standards for new development in the County Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance, LID Standards Manual, and MS4 Permit. The project will also implement integrated pest management and landscaping BMPs consistent with integrated pest management and pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines. Compliance with these requirements will be reaffirmed in drainage and landscape plans to be submitted to the County in conjunction with each Project tract map review and approval process. These requirements are incorporated in MM 4-1 and MM 4-2. During construction, the Project will comply with the state Construction General Permit, the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Limited Threat Discharge Permit, and the Los Angeles RWQCB General Dewatering Permit and implement BMPs that will comply with all applicable waste discharge requirements and water quality standards. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s impacts to existing water resources. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to reduce the impacts to water resources to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 4-1: The Project shall implement Low Impact Development (LID) and water quality control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will achieve the following LID performance standard:

\[
\text{LID BMPs shall be selected and sized to retain the volume of storm water runoff produced from the higher of the 85th percentile or } \frac{3}{4}\]
inch, 24-hour storm depth as determined from the Los Angeles County 85th Percentile 24-hr Rainfall Isohyetal Map (February 2004) (LID design volume). When it has been demonstrated that 100 percent of the LID design volume cannot be feasibly infiltrated within the Project, then the volume shall be harvested and reused. If that volume cannot be harvested and reused within 96 hours, then biofiltration shall be provided for 1.5 times the portion of the LID design volume that is not retained. Runoff from roadways shall be retained or biofiltered in retention or biofiltration BMPs sized to capture the design storm volume or flow, per the guidance in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (USEPA’s) Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure: Green Streets. LID BMPs may be parcel-based or regional facilities.

Compliance with the LID performance standards shall be confirmed by the County based on a Drainage System Engineering and Planning Report to be submitted with each Tentative Map application. The Report shall describe applicable water quality control and LID BMPs and shall utilize approved Los Angeles County methodologies to demonstrate compliance with the LID performance standards. To the extent feasible, incorporate permeable pavement, groundcovers, and/or other measures to increase infiltration.

**Mitigation Measure 4-2:** The Project shall implement integrated pest management (IPM) and landscaping best management practices (BMPs) consistent with the integrated pest management and pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines established by the University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources Statewide Integrated Pest Management Program which are available online at http://www.ipm.ucdavis.edu/. The integrated pest management program will be provided to the County in association with the Landscape Plan submitted to the County with each tentative tract map. The IPM and landscaping BMPs shall be confirmed in a Landscaping Plan submitted to the County during the review and approval process for each tract map application. The BMPs shall include a Planting Plan that is consistent with the plant water use requirements of Section 3.4 of the Centennial Specific Plan; with procedures for removing non-native vegetation and planting native vegetation; with fertilizer guidelines; and with the IPM approach for preventing or suppressing pest problems (i.e., insects and diseases). This shall be done through a combination of techniques including using pest-resistant plants; using biological controls; incorporating cultural practices; including habitat modification; and judiciously using pesticides. The IPM and landscaping BMPs shall, in addition to identifying IMP and landscaping BMP management and funding roles and responsibilities, monitoring, training, and timely IPM and BMP program review requirements to
incorporate new technologies that may become available, address the following:

- Pest identification.
- Practices to prevent pest incidence and to reduce pest buildup.
- Monitoring to examine vegetation and surrounding areas for pests to evaluate trends and to identify when controls are needed.
- Establishment of action thresholds that trigger control actions.
- Pest-control methods (cultural, mechanical, environmental, biological, and appropriate pesticides).
- Pesticide management, which includes safety requirements (e.g., Material Safety Data Sheets, precautionary statements, protective equipment); regulatory requirements; spill mitigation measures; groundwater and surface water protection measures associated with pesticide use; and pesticide applicator certifications, licenses, and training (i.e., all pesticide applicators must be certified by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation).
- All rodenticides containing anticoagulants shall be prohibited from use on the Project site or Mitigation Preserve lands. The prohibition shall be clearly described and distributed to home buyers through their home purchase contracts and CC&Rs.

**Mitigation Measure 4-3:** The Project shall, to the maximum extent feasible, retain, temporarily store and use native topsoil as topsoil cover in disturbed areas of the Project, and shall, in consultation with a qualified plant biologist, implement measures to encourage the germination of native plants in locations where native topsoil is used as a topsoil cover within the Project. Measures to encourage germination of native plants may include:

- Stockpile top soil at height no greater than 3 feet to retain native microorganisms
- Upon re-spreading of top soil, ensure soil placement areas are de-compacted for a minimum depth of one foot
- Conduct monthly weed removal following top soil placement in the first growing season and prior to seed setting to reduce competition for native plant species
• Conduct annual weed control in the post growing season, but prior to seed setting to further reduce and maintain low competition for native plant species
• Minimize disturbance of top soil to prevent new location for weed establishment
• Avoid irrigation overspray and run-off from adjacent areas that could lead to increased weed establishment
• Monitor and protect areas of native vegetation through signage and avoidance to the maximum extent feasible.
• Minimize weed seed source by implementing weed control on an as-needed basis and prohibit planting of non-native invasive species identified by California Invasive Plant Council within adjacent areas.

Mitigation Measure 4-4: The Project Applicant/Developer shall prepare, in consultation with a qualified biologist, a Restoration and Revegetation Monitoring Plan for the Project. The Restoration and Revegetation Monitoring Plan shall include appropriate metrics, as determined by the qualified biologist, for determining the success of Project revegetation efforts, including revegetation implemented in compliance with the approved Mitigation and Monitoring Plan for the Project. The Restoration and Revegetation Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to the County and updated as appropriate during the review and approval process for each tract map application.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project could generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to construction or post-construction runoff that would violate stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Project construction activities and operational activities could substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in the infiltration of pollutants into the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. No runoff from Project developed areas will occur in the Quail Lake Watershed. Approximately four percent of the site is in the Gorman Creek Watershed, which drains to the Hungry Valley and Peace Valley Groundwater Basins. Developed area runoff could infiltrate into groundwater by (1) the infiltration of water applied to outdoor areas for landscaping,
slopes, parks, schools, and common area irrigation; (2) infiltration in regional detention and retention basins and in distributed or parcel-specific LID BMPs; and (3) infiltration of post-treatment runoff that flows from regional detention and retention basins and distributed or from parcel-specific LID BMPs that eventually flows to Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin recharge locations. The Project will implement a comprehensive system of site design, source control, low impact development, and hydromodification BMPs that meet or exceed the water quality and hydrology for new development in the County LID Ordinance, the LID Standards Manual, and the MS4 Permit. The project will also implement integrated pest management and landscaping BMPs consistent with the integrated pest management and pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines. Compliance with the LID performance standards and integrated pest management and landscaping BMP requires will be reconfirmed in drainage and landscape plans to be submitted to the County in conjunction with each Project tract map review and approval process. These requirements are incorporated in MM 4-1 and MM 4-2. Two WRFs will be operated in conformance with all Lahontan RWQCB and Title 22 requirements, which will be reconfirmed in documentation and submitted to the County prior to the issue of building permits. These requirements are incorporated into MM 19-5. With implementation of MM 4-1, MM 4-2, and MM 19-5 as well as compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and WRF permits, potential Project impacts from construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable storm water NPDES permits or that would otherwise significantly affect groundwater quality would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 4-1 to 4-4 above.

Mitigation Measure 19-5: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the County with plans and specifications that have been prepared in accordance with the Project Water Purveyor or alternate qualified public utility district requirements and standards that demonstrate that the WRF East shall serve the Project site east of the West Branch of the California Aqueduct. WRF East will be located near the northeasterly corner of the Project and shall treat an average flow of 4.28 million gallons per day. Biosolids shall be hauled to a suitable landfill or used for conversion into fertilizer products. Lined seasonal recycled water storage ponds shall be implemented as required to temporarily store recycled water during times of low demand. The ponds shall implement feasible and applicable wastewater treatment facility best management practices for mosquito and health vector recommended in the California Department of Public Health's 2012 Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in California: Recommendations of the California Department of Public Health and the Mosquito and Vector Control Association of California.
**Potential Impact:** The Project could use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g., high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course).

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g., high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course) to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project will include two WRFs, including one to the west of the West Branch of the California Aqueduct (WRF West) and a larger facility to the east of the Aqueduct (WRF East). Each of the proposed WRFs will be required to obtain WDRs from the Lahontan RWQCB that include enforceable operational, treatment, conveyance, discharge, water quality, and monitoring requirements before wastewater treatment and recycled water operations may commence. With the implementation of MM 4-1, MM 4-2, and MM 19-5, compliance with all WRF permit terms and conditions, and compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, including the state Construction General Permit, the Lahontan RWQCB Limited Threat Discharge Permit, the Los Angeles RWQCB General Dewatering Permit and the SWRCB Recycled Water Policy, potential Project impacts from the use of on-site wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations or in close proximity to surface water will be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 4-1 to 4-4 and 19-5 above.

**Potential Impact:** The Project could otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

**Finding:** Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to potentially otherwise substantially degrade water quality to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project could cause potential surface water quality impacts during construction and operation (i.e., post-construction) for turbidity, pesticides, pathogens (bacteria, viruses, and protozoa), petroleum hydrocarbons (oil and grease, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), trash and debris, methylene-blue active substances (MBAS), toxicity, and emerging contaminants. The Project will implement a comprehensive system of site design, source control, low impact development, and hydromodification BMPs that meet or exceed the water quality and hydrology (storm water runoff) standards for new development in the County LID Ordinance, the LID Standards Manual, and the MS4 Permit. The Project will also implement integrated...
pest management and landscaping BMPs consistent with integrated pest management and pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines. Compliance with these requirements will be reconfirmed in drainage and landscape plans to be submitted to the County in conjunction with each Project tract map review and approval process. These requirements are incorporated in MM 4-1 and MM 4-2. During construction, the Project will comply with the state Construction General Permit, the Lahontan RWQCB Limited Threat Discharge Permit, and the Los Angeles RWQCB General Dewatering Permit, and implement BMPs that comply with all applicable waste discharge requirements and water quality standards. The qualitative analysis shows that potential Project impacts related to turbidity, pesticides, pathogens (bacteria, viruses, and protozoa), petroleum hydrocarbons (oil and grease, PAHs), trash and debris, MBAS, toxicity, and emerging contaminants would be less than significant. With implementation of MM 4-1 and MM 4-2 and with compliance with applicable laws and regulations (including the state Construction General Permit and the Lahontan RWQCB Limited Threat Discharge Permit), the Project will not otherwise degrade water quality; impacts will be less than significant with mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 4-1 to 4-4 and 19-5 above.

(5) Potential Impact: The Project could contribute to significant cumulative surface water quality impacts.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to cumulative surface water quality impacts to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The geographic area for evaluating cumulative water quality impacts is comprised of the four drainage areas on the Project site, the East Drainage Area, the Oso Canyon Drainage Area, the Quail Lake Drainage Area, and the Gorman Creek Tributary Drainage Area. Outside the Project site, the remainder of the drainage areas are largely undeveloped. Existing major roadways, which represent impervious surfaces and pollutant sources, include I-5, which traverses the Gorman Creek Tributary Drainage Area; Gorman Post Road in the Gorman Creek Tributary and East Drainage Areas; and SR-138 in the Quail Lake and the East Drainage Areas. The Project’s surface runoff water quality, would comply with adopted and applicable federal, State, and County regulations with implementation of planned BMPs, which would be ensured by implementation of mitigation, both during construction and operation. As determined by the Water Quality Technical Report, the anticipated quality of effluent expected from the Projects’ BMPs would not contribute concentrations of pollutants of concern that would be expected to cause or contribute to a violation of the water quality standards in the Project’s receiving waters. All future urban development occurring in the four drainage areas must also comply with these requirements. By
extrapolating the results of the direct impact analysis, the Water Quality Technical Report states it can be predicted that analysis of other proposed development combined with existing conditions would have similar surface water quality results. Therefore, cumulative impacts on surface water quality of receiving waters from the Project and future urban development in the four drainage areas are addressed through compliance with the above-mentioned regulatory requirements and with compliance with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), which are intended to protect beneficial uses of the receiving waters. Based on compliance with the applicable regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, cumulative surface water quality impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 4-1 to 4-4 and 19-5 above.

(6) Potential Impact: The Project could contribute to significant cumulative groundwater quality impacts.

Finding: 1. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to cumulative groundwater quality impacts to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that this impact would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project’s discharges to groundwater are predicted to comply with adopted and applicable federal, State, and County regulations. This would be ensured with implementation of planned BMPs and mitigation, both during construction and post-development. As determined by the Water Quality Technical Report, the anticipated quality of storm water runoff discharges from the Project’s developed areas and from irrigation to groundwater and the operating permits of the wastewater reclamation facilities would not contribute loads or concentrations of pollutants of concern that would be expected to cause or contribute to a violation of the groundwater quality standards. All future urban development occurring in the Antelope Valley Watershed must also comply with these requirements. Therefore, cumulative impacts on groundwater quality from the Project and future urban development in the Antelope Valley Watershed are addressed through compliance with the above-mentioned regulations and mitigation measures. Based on compliance with the applicable regulatory standards and mitigation measures, cumulative groundwater quality impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 4-1 to 4-4 and 19-5 above.
Q. Water Resources

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to have insufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the Project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses.

Finding: Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to water supplies to less than significant levels. The County hereby makes Finding 1 and determines that the Project would have sufficient reliable water supplies to serve the Project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses, and this impact would be less than significant.

Facts Supporting Finding

At full buildout, the Project will include up to 19,333 dwelling units, a resident population of 57,150, and up to 10,097,208 square feet of commercial, business park, recreation, civic, institutional, and utility uses. The total potable water demand for the Project will be approximately 6,788 acre feet per year (afy) and total water demand will be approximately 11,365 afy, including potable system losses. Approximately 4,577 afy of recycled water will be generated by treating the Project’s wastewater flow. The Project’s water supplies include: (1) approximately 17,287 af currently banked at the Tejon Ranch Company Water Bank; (2) purchased and in-lieu program rights to water deliveries from AVEK and the return of certain water supplies loaned to AVEK in 2008 and 2009; (3) groundwater subject to the allocations in the Judgment and Physical Solution; (4) Table A Amounts transferred from the Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District and the Dudley Ridge Water District; (5) service area deliveries of SWP water by AVEK that are incorporated in the Agency’s current UWMP; (6) recycled water treated to Title 22 unrestricted reuse levels generated by the Project’s on-site wastewater treatment facilities; and (7) in-basin return flows from Project imported water use in accordance with the Judgment and Physical Solution. An approximately 100-acre water banking facility will be designed, permitted, financed, and constructed by the Project with capacity to infiltrate and store approximately 7,200 afy.

The analysis of Project water supply and demand uses the most conservative residential indoor demand (i.e., 65 gpcd). As a result, the Project’s water use may be lower than projected. Based on projections, the Project’s water supplies will be able to sustainably meet demand up to and following buildout with an average annual banked reserve of more than 79,000 acre-feet, or more than 11 years of full buildout potable demand. However, potentially significant water supply impacts could occur if on-site water use exceeds projected levels or if SWP delivery reliability is lower than projected. If water use is less efficient than projected, demand could exceed supply in the latter years of the Project’s buildout. For this reason, the Project has the potential to create water supply issues and thus this impact is considered significant. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s impacts to existing water resources. The following mitigation measures will
be incorporated into the Project to reduce the impacts to water resources to a less than significant level by requiring the Project to implemented various water metering and budget requirements, recycled water use requirements, water efficiency requirements, water budget-based rate requirements, water use reporting requirements, and restrictions on tentative map approvals without evidence of available water supplies.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 18-1: In addition to complying with the water efficiency and conservation set forth in Divisions 4.3 and 5.3 of the California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code or the County Green Building Standards Code, whichever are more stringent, the Project Applicant/Developer shall implement the measures listed below.

**Meter Water Use.** Install, maintain, and monitor all non-construction potable and non-potable water use using appropriate metering equipment throughout the site.

**Reduce Potable Water Use with On-Site Recycled Water.** Install, maintain, and operate on-site wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities that provide recycled water treated to California Title 22 unrestricted reuse standards from on-site wastewater. Recycled water shall be used to meet (i) 100 percent of commercial, business park, institutional, school, hotel, park, and slope irrigation demand and (ii) outdoor irrigation demand in 50 percent of the total very low and low density residential lot landscaped area.

**Water Efficient Appliances.** Require installation of water-efficient major appliances (washers, dryers, dishwashers) in compliance with the California Appliance Efficiency Regulations, Energy Star®, or other applicable standards.

**Water Efficient Irrigation.** Require the installation of irrigation equipment with a minimum 0.80 irrigation efficiency for all public and private park, recreation and entertainment land use, arterial roadway, and slope irrigation uses. Water Smart/Evapotranspiration-based controllers shall be used. Low water use plants and shrubs shall be used in all irrigated slope areas with an average plant factor of 0.2, as defined in the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

**Water Budget Based Water Rates.** Require that the Project Water Purveyor implement water budget based rates in compliance with all applicable legal requirements and in a manner consistent with the use of such rates by other water districts in California (e.g., Irvine Ranch Water District). The water budget based rates shall incorporate and be
designed to ensure that Project potable water use meets or exceeds the following standards and adjusted as may be required to meet more stringent standards that may be adopted by the State or Los Angeles County:

1. Indoor Water Use Standards
   a) Residential indoor water use – 55 gallons per capita per day
   b) Commercial indoor water use – 200 gallons per day per thousand square feet
   c) Business Park indoor water use – 65 gallons per day per thousand square feet, including recycled water for commercial wastewater and cooling use except where prohibited by applicable law for particular types of areas or uses (e.g., employee cafeterias)
   d) Institutional indoor water use – 50 gallons per day per thousand square feet
   e) Hotel indoor water use – 125 gallons per day per room.

2. Outdoor Water Use Standards
   a) Residential outdoor water use – 55 percent of the reference evapotranspiration rate for the Project site
   b) Commercial, industrial, and institutional outdoor use – 45 percent of the reference evapotranspiration rate for the Project site

3. Water meters shall be required to measure potable water use and may be required to measure recycled water usage at commercial, recreational, and institutional uses; and to monitor single family home lots via sample home survey selection criteria

**Mitigation Measure 18-2:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall submit to the County Water Use Reports prepared by a qualified specialist to the satisfaction of the County to verify that projected water use efficiencies are being achieved (1) at the end of the 5th year following first occupancy or occupancy of the 4,000th dwelling unit, whichever occurs later and (2) at the end of the 10th year following first occupancy or occupancy of the 10,000th dwelling unit, whichever occurs later. In the event that a Water Use Report indicates that consumption exceeds projected levels, response measures must be implemented to ensure that available supplies will be sufficient to meet future demand. No further development will be approved until additional measures are implemented to achieve the required efficiencies and/or provide
additional water supplies, as confirmed by the Project Water Purveyor. No subsequent Tentative Maps shall be approved until the Project Water Purveyor has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the County that the implementation of specific water demand and supply response measures will ensure that available supplies will meet future Project demand.

6. FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

Where, as a result of the environmental analysis of the Project, the County has determined that either (1) even with the identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes and statutes, and/or the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts cannot be reduced to a level of less than significant, or (2) no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives are available to mitigate the potentially significant impact, the County has found in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3) that "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report." This is referred to herein as "Finding 3."

A. Air Resources

(1) Potential Impact: The Project could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, namely mass daily and annual thresholds of the AVAQMD and/or SCAQMD for volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) due to construction and operational emissions (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-1).

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

Air pollutants would be emitted by construction equipment and fugitive dust generated during grading of the Project site. Other construction activities that emit pollutants include painting, surface coating, and asphalt paving operations. Construction-related emissions of VOC and NOx would result in significant impacts as emissions would be in excess of the AVAQMD annual thresholds and SCAQMD mass daily thresholds. Mitigation Measure 11-1 and MM 11-2 would be implemented to reduce emissions by implementing restrictions on stationary sources at the Project and by implementing measures to reduce construction vehicle emissions; however, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable and even full implementation of MM 11-2 would result in a significant and unavoidable carbon monoxide (CO) impact for the SCAQMD threshold.
Long-term operational criteria pollutant emissions are generated by area, energy, and mobile sources. Area sources include landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products, and architectural coatings used for routine maintenance. Energy emissions are from natural gas consumption. Long-term operational emissions of CO, VOCs, NOx, respirable particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less (PM10), and fine particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less (PM2.5) would also result in significant impacts. Mitigation Measures 11-3 through 11-6 would be implemented to reduce emissions by prohibiting wood burning fireplaces, and by requiring non-carbon fuel vehicle and bicycle infrastructure improvements. Criteria pollutant emission reductions would also be realized by the Project’s compliance with applicable building code requirements and through implementation of the Project’s required transit demand management and greenhouse gas reduction mitigation measures to reduce traffic-related and climate change impacts however, even with all feasible and reasonable mitigation, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measure 11-1 above.

**Mitigation Measure 11-2:** The Project’s plans and specifications shall include the following measures to minimize nitrogen oxide (NOx) and volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions during construction:

- All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Tier 4 Final emission standards to the extent that the equipment is available. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices certified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Any emissions-control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations. If Tier 4 Final equipment is not available, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the County with documentation showing the reasons for non-availability.

- Alternatively, construction equipment may be selected according to the Green Construction Policy used by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority or the ports of Los Angeles/Long Beach. These policies include provisions to ‘step down’ from Tier 4 equipment to Tier 3 or Tier 2 if specified criteria are met. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices certified by the California Air
Resources Board (CARB) or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

- Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export). If the Project Applicant/Developer determines that 2010 model year or newer diesel trucks cannot be obtained, trucks that meet USEPA 2007 model year NOx emissions requirements shall be required. If 2010 model year or newer diesel trucks are not available, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the County with documentation showing the reasons for non-availability.

- A copy of each unit’s certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or District operating permit shall be provided to the County at the first occurrence of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.

- Construction contractors shall ensure construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer’s standards.

- Construction contractors shall limit non-essential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes.

- Construction contractors shall use Super-Compliant Architectural/Industrial (AIM) Coatings to the extent that they are commercially available and certified to meet the applicable requirements of Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District Rule 1113 and South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113.

**Mitigation Measure 11-3:** The Project’s plans and specifications shall prohibit wood-burning fireplaces as required by SCAQMD Rule 445 in single-family residences throughout the entire Project site, including at residences that are 3,000 or more feet above mean sea level at which the SCAQMD prohibition would otherwise not apply. Natural gas fireplaces shall be limited to a total of 13,954. These requirements shall be posted on the community intranet and shall be clearly described and distributed to home buyers through their home purchase contracts and CC&Rs.

**Mitigation Measure 11-4:** The Project’s plans and specifications for non-residential buildings shall demonstrate that the following features have been incorporated into the building designs. Proof of compliance shall be provided to the County prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.

- For buildings with over 10 tenant-occupants, changing/shower facilities shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.4.3,
Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the CALGreen Code as follows: for 11 to 50 tenant-occupants, one unisex shower and two 2-tier lockers; for 51 to 100 tenant-occupants, one unisex shower and three 2-tier lockers; for 101 to 200 tenant-occupants, one shower per gender and four 2-tier lockers; and for over 200 tenant-occupants, one shower per gender for each 200 additional tenant-occupants and one 2-tier locker for each 50 additional tenant-occupant.

- Preferential parking for electric vehicles, other FVF vehicles, and carpool/van vehicles shall be provided as specified in Section A5.106.5.1, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures, of the CALGreen Code as follows: two for 10 to 25 spaces; four for 26 to 50 spaces; six for 51 to 75 spaces; nine for 76 to 100 spaces; eleven for 101 to 150 spaces; 18 for 151 to 200 spaces; and at least 10 percent of total for 201 and more spaces.

- Electric Vehicle Charging Spaces (EV Space), as defined by CALGreen Code Section 202, shall be installed to support future installation of Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE), as defined by CALGreen Code Section 202, at each non-residential building with 10 or more parking spaces. Installation of each EV Space shall be consistent with Sections A5.106.5.3 and A5.106.5.3.1, Nonresidential Voluntary Measures (Tier 1), of the CALGreen Code. The EV Space facilities shall meet Section 406.9 (Electric Vehicle) of the California Building Code and as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Actual Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Tier 1 Number of Required EV Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;200</td>
<td>8 percent of total spaces rounded up to nearest whole number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple charging spaces required.** When multiple EV Spaces are required, plans shall include the location(s) and type of EVSE, raceway method(s), wiring schematics and electrical calculations to verify that the electrical system has sufficient capacity to charge simultaneously all the electric vehicles (EV) at all designated EV Spaces at their full rated amperage. Plan design shall be based on Level 2 EVSE at its maximum operating ampacity. Provide raceways from the electrical
service panel to the designated parking areas which are required to be installed at the time of construction.

Multiple charging spaces required. When multiple EV Spaces are required, plans shall include the location(s) and type of EVSE, raceway method(s), wiring schematics and electrical calculations to verify that the electrical system has sufficient capacity to charge simultaneously all the electric vehicles (EV) at all designated EV Spaces at their full rated amperage. Plan design shall be based on Level 2 EVSE at its maximum operating ampacity. Provide raceways from the electrical service panel to the designated parking areas which are required to be installed at the time of construction.

Increased EVSE Installations. Changes to EVSE parking shall be allowed to the extent allowed under state laws, and the duration of vehicular occupancy of EV spaces may be restricted as authorized by state law to allow charging of multiple vehicles each day. Demand for EV Space facilities shall be monitored biennially by the TMA, additional EV parking spaces shall be made available at lots where demand exceeds supply. The TMA biennial survey shall also consider future transportation technology and practices, including for example changes in vehicular electric charging technology, other FVF changes, or other transportation practices and services changes (e.g., with lower-automobile ownership rates leading to reduced parking demand and/or reduced private ownership of vehicles requiring daily electric charging).

Mitigation Measure 11-5: The Project’s plans and specifications for residential buildings shall demonstrate that the following features have been incorporated.

- Visitor parking shall include preferentially located parking spaces for electric vehicles.
- Exterior electrical receptacles and natural gas or propane hookups.
- Bicycle parking shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.9, Residential Voluntary Measures, of the CALGreen Code or as required by Section 22.52.1225B of the County Code, whichever is more stringent. The requirements under the Residential Voluntary Measures of the CALGreen Code are as follows:

  Short-term bicycle parking. Provide permanently anchored bicycle racks within 100 feet of the visitor’s entrance, readily visible to passers-by, for five percent of
visitor motorized vehicle parking capacity within a minimum of one two-bike capacity rack.

**Long-term bicycle parking for multifamily buildings.**
Provide on-site bicycle parking for at least one bicycle per every two dwelling units. Acceptable parking facilities shall be conveniently reached from the street and may include, but not limited to:

1. Covered, lockable enclosures with permanently anchored racks for bicycles.
2. Lockable bicycle rooms with permanently anchored racks.
3. Lockable, permanently anchored bicycle lockers.

**Long-term bicycle parking for hotel and motel buildings.**
Provide one on-site bicycle parking space for every 25,000 square feet, but not less than two. Acceptable parking facilities shall be conveniently reached from the street and may include, but not be limited to:

1. Covered, lockable enclosures with permanently anchored racks for bicycles.
2. Lockable bicycle rooms with permanently anchored racks.
3. Lockable, permanently anchored bicycle lockers.

**Bicycle parking areas may also be used by small electric vehicles such as scooters.**

**Mitigation Measure 11-6:** The Project’s plans and specifications for parking structures and parking lots with 20 or more parking spaces that serve uses other than residential or nonresidential buildings (e.g., trailhead, park), and parking structures and parking lots that serve multifamily residential buildings with 17 or more multifamily units, shall demonstrate that the following features have been incorporated into the parking facility.

- The parking facility shall include a minimum of five percent preferentially located parking spaces for electric vehicles.
- Five percent of the total number of parking spaces provided in the parking facility, but in no case less than one, shall be Electric Vehicle Parking Spaces (EV Spaces), as defined in CALGreen Code Section 202, capable of supporting future Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE), as defined in CALGreen Code Section 202. Calculations for the required number of EV Spaces shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number and the design and installation of each EV Space shall be consistent with Section
A4.106.8.2, Residential Voluntary Measures, and Section 4.106.4.2, of the CALGreen Code as follows:

**Single charging space requirements.** When only a single EV Space is required, install a listed raceway capable of accommodating a dedicated branch circuit. The raceway shall not be less than trade size 1 (nominal 1-inch inside diameter). The raceway shall be securely fastened at the main service or subpanel and shall terminate in close proximity to the proposed location of the charging system into a listed cabinet, box or enclosure.

**Multiple charging spaces required.** When multiple EV Spaces are required, plans shall include the location(s) and type of EVSE, raceway method(s), wiring schematics and electrical calculations to verify that the electrical system has sufficient capacity to charge simultaneously all the electric vehicles at all designated EV Spaces at their full rated amperage. Plan design shall be based on Level 2 EVSE at its maximum operating ampacity. Only underground raceways and related underground equipment are required to be installed at the time of construction.

- For residential parking facilities, bicycle parking shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.9, Residential Voluntary Measures, of the CALGreen Code, or as required by County Code Section 22.52.1225B, whichever is more stringent.

- Bicycle parking spaces at a rate of 5 percent of minimum required vehicle parking spaces for nonresidential land uses or as required by Section 22.52.1225B of the County Code, whichever is more stringent.

(2) **Potential Impact:** The Project construction emissions could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation due to violations of ambient air quality standards due to construction emissions (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-1).

**Finding:** 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Construction emissions could cause a potential temporary exceedance of federal, State, and SCAQMD PM10 and PM2.5 standards at Project residences that would be completed and occupied. Estimated NO2 concentrations would be less than State, federal, and SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds, but ambient concentrations
at sensitive receptor locations may exceed the 24-hour standards for PM10 and PM2.5 during construction. AVAQMD Rule 403 requires a dust control plan to be prepared for any residential developments that result in a disturbed surface area of 10 acres or more or 5 acres or more for non-residential development. As such, the Project Applicant/Developer shall prepare a Supplementary Dust Control Plan for approval by the County to minimize PM10 and PM2.5 emissions and the transport of those emissions towards sensitive receptors. Measures in the Supplementary Dust Control Plan may include, but not be limited to additional watering of active grading areas and disturbed areas; stopping operations when winds exceeding ten miles per hour are in the direction from the grading towards the receptors; and/or other measures to minimize fugitive dust. With incorporation of Rule 403, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the dust suppression resulting from the Supplementary Dust Control Plan cannot be quantified at this time. There is no feasible and reasonable mitigation to reduce this impact.

**Potential Impact:** The Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations due to construction emissions (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-2).

**Finding:** 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Project construction activities occurring subsequent to the completion and occupation of earlier Project phases could result in exceedance of federal, State, or SCAQMD local significance threshold ambient air quality standards for 24-hour concentrations of PM10 and PM2.5 at on-site receptors. Therefore, these receptors could be temporarily exposed to substantial concentrations of PM10 or PM2.5 during the later phases of construction. Diesel PM, a TAC, would be emitted during construction due to the operation of heavy equipment at the site. This impact would be significant and would be reduced with implementation of MM 11-2 (implementing measures to reduce construction vehicle emissions) but not to a level considered less than significant. Exposure of sensitive receptors to diesel PM would be less than significant, as discussed in Section 4(a) above. All feasible and reasonable mitigation measures have been implemented to reduce this impact, but not to a less of less than significant. This impact is thus significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measure 11-2 above.
(4) **Potential Impact:** The Project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 11-5).

**Finding:** 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) is in nonattainment for PM10 and ozone. The Los Angeles County portion of the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) is in nonattainment for PM10, PM2.5, lead, and ozone. The Project would contribute PM10, PM2.5, and ozone precursors (i.e., VOC and NOx) to the area during short-term construction and long-term operational activities. Lead emissions would be negligible. Even with the inclusion of mitigation measures for direct impacts, the Project’s emissions would be cumulatively considerable. Construction annual emissions of NOx, an ozone precursor, would be directly significant and therefore, cumulatively considerable and significant. Construction daily emissions of ozone precursors VOC and NOx, would be directly significant and therefore, cumulatively considerable and significant. Even with the inclusion of mitigation measures for direct impacts, these Project emissions would be cumulatively considerable. Construction mass emissions of PM10 and PM2.5 would not be directly or cumulatively significant. Even with the inclusion of mitigation measures, long-term operational emissions of PM10, PM2.5, and ozone precursors VOC and NOx, would be directly significant and therefore, cumulatively considerable and significant. All feasible and reasonable mitigation measures have been implemented to reduce this impact, but not to a less of less than significant. This impact is thus significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 11-1 to 11-6 above.

(5) **Potential Impact:** The Project could result in a cumulatively considerable impact to air resources (as analyzed in EIR Section 7, *Cumulative Impacts*).

**Finding:** 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project’s construction emissions would exceed AVAQMD annual mass emissions thresholds for NOx and SCAQMD daily mass emissions thresholds for VOC and NOx; these emissions would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of
mitigation. Construction activity near previously completed and occupied residences could result in exceedance of ambient air quality standards and exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial local emissions (i.e., not mass emissions) of PM10 and PM2.5 that would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation. At buildout of the Project, in 2035, long-term operational emissions of VOC, NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 would exceed AVAQMD and SCAQMD thresholds. These emissions would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation. Construction annual emissions of NOx (an ozone precursor) would be directly significant and therefore cumulatively considerable and significant. Construction daily emissions of VOC and NOx (ozone precursors) would be directly significant and therefore cumulatively considerable and significant. Construction mass emissions of PM10 and PM2.5 would not be directly or cumulatively significant. Long-term operational emissions of PM10, PM2.5, and ozone precursors VOC and NOx, would be directly significant and therefore cumulatively considerable and significant. All feasible and reasonable mitigation measures have been implemented to reduce this impact, but not to a less of less than significant. This impact is thus significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures
Refer to Mitigation Measures 11-1 to 11-6 above.

B. Biological Resources

(1) Potential Impact: The Project could cause significant cumulative impacts to native grasslands.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

Development of the Project would result in impacts on several sensitive vegetation types including oak woodlands, native grasslands, and wildflower fields. Implementation of the Project's mitigation measures, including preservation of at least 14,908 acres of grassland, would enhance, restore, and create these vegetation types within the proposed open space preserve and would therefore reduce impacts to less than significant levels for all vegetation types except native grasslands. It is likely that most of the identified related projects would also have impacts on sensitive vegetation types. Impacts would be mitigated in accordance with County standards with implementation of standard County mitigation requirements and/or “no net loss” conditions of permits from some resource agencies (e.g., Streambed Alteration Agreements issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW]). Although cumulative impacts would occur, these are expected to be less than significant after mitigation for all but one vegetation type (native grasslands) due to the applicable regulations that substantially minimize such impacts. Due to the
cumulative loss of native grasslands in the larger region and the state as a whole and the lack of a widely accepted definition for “native grassland” or a published standard for a mitigation ratio, the Project’s incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on native grasslands is considered to be cumulatively considerable and therefore this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of all reasonable and feasible mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 7-1 to 7-23 above.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project could cause significant cumulative impacts to wildlife movement.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

Development of the Centennial Project would contribute to a cumulative significant impact on wildlife movement when combined with projects in the region. Because movement events for some larger species may occur very rarely, the success of each event may be particularly important. As discussed in EIR Section 5.7, Biological Resources, because most of the larger wildlife species in the region do not typically cross large expanses of sparsely vegetated landscape (such as the majority of the Project site), the central and eastern portions of the Project site are not likely to be used by wildlife to move between and within the regional open space areas in the site vicinity, and the Project site provides unobstructed local movement opportunities for small animals within large portions of the site. However, due to the potentially heightened sensitivity of movement through the region for some species, the potential for a project or set of projects (e.g., Gorman Post Ranch, Tejon Mountain Village, Grapevine, or the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project) to substantially interfere with a wildlife corridor is greater. Indirect impacts such as increases in disturbances like noise, night lighting, non-native species introduction, vehicular traffic, domestic pet interactions, and human interaction may all also contribute to wildlife movement interference. Since the locations of many future projects in the region are unknown, there is the potential they may occur within important movement corridors. Therefore, the incremental effects of the Project combined with future regional development would be cumulatively considerable and, even with implementation of all reasonable and feasible mitigation, the Project’s cumulative impact to wildlife movement is considered to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 7-1 to 7-23 above.
C. Climate Change

(1) Potential Impact: Although the Project would comply and is consistent with applicable regulatory programs that are designed to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and contribute to the achievement of AB 32’s GHG reduction goals (as analyzed under EIR Threshold 21-1), and while the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs (as analyzed under Threshold 21-2), the Project’s incremental addition of GHG emissions is cumulatively considerable in light of the global climate change problem, and thus cumulatively significant.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this cumulative impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

In its 2015 decision, Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish and Wildlife, 60 Cal.4th 204, 219 (Newhall), the Court recognized that, “because of the global scale of climate change, any one project’s contribution is unlikely to be significant by itself” and, therefore, “the challenge for CEQA purposes is to determine whether the impact of the project’s emissions of greenhouse gases is cumulatively considerable” and thus significant. The Newhall court identified “potential options” for lead agencies evaluating cumulative significance of a proposed land use development’s GHG emissions in future CEQA documents, although cautioning that there was no “guarantee” that any of these would be sufficient. The “potential pathways to compliance” suggested by the Court are as follows:

1. Business As Usual (BAU) Model: The BAU Model assesses whether a project is consistent with meeting the California Air Resources Board’s AB 32 Scoping Plan statewide emission reduction goal of 29 percent less than business-as-usual emission levels projected for 2020. While the Court cautioned that the Scoping Plan may not be appropriate at the project-level, the BAU model might be used to determine what level of reduction from business as usual a new land use development at the proposed location must contribute in order to comply with statewide goals pursuant to AB 32. The Court specifically directed that reliance on this type of quantitative threshold must be supported by substantial evidence in the record that links the statewide GHG reduction standard to the appropriate GHG reduction standard for the specific type of project under consideration.

2. Compliance With Regulatory Programs Designed To Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions: The Court suggests that a lead agency could rely on a showing of compliance with regulatory programs designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in order to demonstrate consistency with AB 32’s goals. The Court
clarifies that a significance analysis based on compliance with such statewide regulations only goes to impacts within the area governed by the regulations.

3. **Local Climate Action Plan Or Other “Geographically Specific Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Plans”**: The Court points out that these plans may provide a basis for the tiering or streamlining of project-level CEQA analysis, so long as the plan is “sufficiently detailed and adequately supported.”

4. **Regional Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)**: The Court also articulates that a lead agency need not additionally analyze greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks in CEQA documents for certain residential, mixed use and transit priority projects that are consistent with an applicable SCS adopted pursuant to SB [Senate Bill] 375.

5. **Numerical GHG Significance Thresholds**: Although noting that use of such thresholds are not required, the Court favorably cited to the BAAQMD GHG significance thresholds, based on compliance with AB 32, which use a “service population” GHG ratio threshold for land use projects and a 10,000 ton annual GHG emission threshold for industrial projects. The Court remanded for further consideration the application of the 29 percent overall Scoping Plan metric, which is used by several Air Districts and, like the favorably-cited BAAQMD [Bay Area Air Quality Management District] metric, is based on AB 32.

The EIR analyzed the Project’s potential GHG-related impact on climate under two thresholds of significance that are derived from the County of Los Angeles Environmental Checklist (which is based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G) and which incorporate two of the “potential compliance pathways” described by the Court in the Newhall decision – specifically, (1) compliance with a local climate action plan and/or other geographically specific GHG emission reduction plans (i.e., the CCAP, the SCAG RTP/SCS); and (2) compliance with regulatory programs designed to reduce GHG emissions and that contribute to the achievement of AB 32’s goals. The EIR also considered a third Newhall compliance pathway – i.e., compliance with numerical GHG significance thresholds - but did so only for informational purposes, as discussed below.

Under Threshold 21-1, the EIR considered whether the Project would generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that may have a significant effect on the environment by quantifying the Project’s GHG emissions and evaluating the Project’s consistency with regulatory programs that are designed to reduce GHG emissions and contribute to the achievement AB 32’s goals. In addition, under Threshold 21-1, the EIR compared for informational purposes the Project’s estimated emissions to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) significance thresholds for GHG impacts, as well as certain GHG significance thresholds proposed by staff of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), but never adopted by SCAQMD Board.

Under Threshold 21-2, the EIR considered whether the Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the
emissions of GHGs by analyzing the Project’s consistency with (i) the Los Angeles County Community Action Plan, and (2) the South Coast Association of Government’s (SCAG’s) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy (SCAG RTP/SCS), the SB 375 SCS applicable to the Project.

Quantified Project GHG Emissions In Summary

As explained in EIR Section 5.21.6, Project GHG emissions were calculated by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.1. The Draft EIR’s quantification of greenhouse gas emissions estimated that the Project at buildout in 2035 would have GHG emissions of approximately 244,379 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO$_2$e) per year.

Following publication of the Draft EIR, a new version of CalEEMod was released (i.e., version 2016.3.2) and the 2019 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards were adopted. For the purpose of clarifying information presented in the Draft EIR, County staff directed its environmental consultant to prepare the Updated Greenhouse Gas Calculations for the Centennial Project Final Environmental Impact Report (the “Updated GHG Report”) to compare the Project’s GHG emissions calculated in the Draft EIR (“DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions”) with an updated analysis that takes into account: (1) emissions estimates calculated per CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2; (2) updated information regarding applicable electric vehicle (EV) adoption rates and quantified GHG emissions associated with EV charging stations; (3) estimated internal and external trip reductions attributable to the Project’s single occupancy vehicle (SOV) mitigation measures; (4) updated estimates of the Project’s water and wastewater energy use and emissions; and (5) revised estimates of the Project’s solid waste GHG emissions based on applicable landfill diversion mitigation requirements (“Updated GHG Calculations”). The Updated GHG Report has been incorporated into the EIR.

Updated GHG Report Table 1, below, compares the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions (as shown in Draft EIR Table 5.21-1) with the results of the Updated GHG Calculations described in the Updated GHG Report. As explained in the Updated GHG Report, total Project emissions in the Updated GHG Calculations are 157,642 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year (MTCO$_2$e/yr), a reduction of -86,736 MTCO$_2$e/yr (approximately 35 percent) from the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions of 244,370 MTCO$_2$e/yr.
### UPDATED GHG REPORT TABLE 1
DEIR QUANTIFIED GHG EMISSIONS AND UPDATED GHG CALCULATIONS
(MT\(\text{CO}_2\text{E/YEAR}\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Emission Sources</th>
<th>DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions</th>
<th>Reductions From Regulations and CalEEMod Update</th>
<th>From Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Net Change in GHG Emissions</th>
<th>Updated GHG Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>160,904</td>
<td>-52,694(^a)</td>
<td>-31,203(^b)</td>
<td>-83,897</td>
<td>77,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>49,414</td>
<td>5,584</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,634</td>
<td>55,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Power</td>
<td>23,276</td>
<td>5,806(^c)</td>
<td>50(^d)</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>29,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>26,137</td>
<td>-222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-222</td>
<td>25,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>7,387</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3,184(^e)</td>
<td>-3,184</td>
<td>4,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>10,214</td>
<td>-5,107(^f)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5,107</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>11,297</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-74(^g)</td>
<td>-74</td>
<td>11,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>-108(^h)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions</td>
<td>244,379</td>
<td>-52,324</td>
<td>-34,412</td>
<td>-86,736</td>
<td>157,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions from DEIR Section 5.21; Updated GHG Calculations from Psomas using CalEEMod version 16.3.2 (June 2018).

- \(^a\) Reducions assume that 80 percent of the GHG emissions reductions attributable to the utilization of EVs at Project buildout are due to regulatory, CalEEMod and EV market development factors (see "Mobile Emissions" discussion below).
- \(^b\) Reductions attributable to MM 10-1, MM 10-25, MM 10-26, MM 21-14, MM 21-22, and MM 14-11, as well as 20 percent of the reductions attributable to the utilization of EVs at Project buildout (see "Mobile Emissions" discussion below).
- \(^c\) Overall increases attributable to combination of EV charging infrastructure emissions (increase of 11,224 MT\(\text{CO}_2\text{E/yr}\) allocated at 80 percent per footnote "a" above, and due to MM 11-4, MM 11-6, MM 21-15, MM 21-16, MM 21-18 and MM 21-19). GHG decreased emissions are also included, due to 2019 Title 24 Standards (reductions of -3,173 MT\(\text{CO}_2\text{E/yr}\)).
- \(^d\) Overall increases attributable to combination of EV charging infrastructure emissions (increase of 11,224 MT\(\text{CO}_2\text{E/yr}\) allocated at 20 percent per footnote "b" above), and due to MMs 13-2 and 13-6 (reduction of -109 MT\(\text{CO}_2\text{E/yr}\)) and MM 21-1 (-2,086 MT\(\text{CO}_2\text{E/yr}\)).
- \(^e\) Reductions attributable to MM 18-1, MM 21-9, and MM 21-13.
- \(^f\) Reductions attributable to MM 17-10 and attributed to regulatory factors.
- \(^g\) Reductions attributable to MM 11-3 and electric landscape equipment (Green Development Program).
- \(^h\) Reductions attributable to MM 7-11, MM 7-12 and MM 21-20 and attributed to regulatory factors.

Note: Total emissions may not add up exactly due to rounding.

### Quantified Energy Emissions

As discussed in more detail in Updated GHG Report Section 2.2, *Energy*, due to the combination of quantified EV charging demand, which increases Project electricity use, and reductions in electricity use associated with the new 2019 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which decreases Project electricity use, the Updated GHG Calculations include an overall increase GHG emissions from the use of electrical power when compared to the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions. However, as discussed in Updated GHG Report Section 2.1, *Mobile Emissions*, a higher rate of EV adoption reduces mobile source GHG emissions by -83,897 MT\(\text{CO}_2\text{E/yr}\) from the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions.
Three primary factors contribute to the difference between the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions and the Updated GHG Calculations for Project energy-related GHG emissions:

- First, 2019 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which were adopted after the DEIR analysis was completed, reduce the Project’s electrical consumption estimates for low-density residential and non-residential uses when compared to the 2016 Title 24 Standards.

- Second, the electrical demand associated Project’s EV charging infrastructure (66,516 MWh/yr) required by MM revisions presented in the Final EIR would result in increased GHG emissions of 11,224 MTCO2e/yr.

- Third, unlike the Draft EIR, the Updated GHG Report quantifies GHG reductions attributable to the quantifiable portions of GHG-reducing Project mitigation measures, as discussed below.

In summary, the total projected electrical demand for the Updated GHG Calculations includes the reductions associated with 2019 Title 24 Standards (-3,173 MTCO2e), MM reductions (-2,195 MTCO2e), and EV charging demands (11,224 MTCO2e), resulting in a total increase of 5,856 MTCO2e for the Updated GHG Electrical Calculations when compared to the DEIR Quantified GHG Electrical Emissions. As shown in Updated GHG Report Table 1, the -222 MTCO2e/year reduction in GHG emissions for natural gas between the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions and the Updated GHG Calculations is due to energy use reductions associated with the 2019 Title 24 Standards.

**Quantified Mobile Emissions**

As discussed in more detail in Updated GHG Report Section 2.1, *Mobile Emissions*, the mobile GHG emissions estimates in the Updated GHG Calculations primarily reflect: (1) an increase in EV adoption rate from 4 percent to 50 percent at Project buildout (i.e., over at least 20 years); and (2) internal and external trip reductions from achieving the required minimum single occupancy vehicle use levels (MM 10-25). In addition, smaller mobile source reductions are attributable to the quantification of the Project’s mitigations for affordable housing (MM 21-14), pedestrian facilities (MMs 21-22, 14-11, and 10-26), and telecommuting attributes (MM 10-1).

**Quantified Water and Wastewater Emissions**

As shown in Updated GHG Report Table 1, Project GHG emissions attributable to water supply, treatment and distribution in the Updated GHG Calculations is 4,203 MTCO2e/yr, as compared to the 7,387 MTCO2e/yr in the Draft EIR Quantified GHG Emissions, which represents a reduction of -3,184 MTCO2e/yr. The water and wastewater emissions estimates in the Updated GHG Calculations reflect: (1) updated water supply and conveyance energy requirements for Project local water supplies; (2) CalEEMod wastewater treatment default adjustments to exclude treatment
technologies that will not be used by the Project; and (3) the Project’s recapture and use of biogas to generate power from the wastewater treatment process. The Updated GHG Report used MM 18-1 and MMs 21-9 through 21-13 to quantify the water and wastewater reductions in the Updated GHG Calculations. MM 18-2 and MMs 19-1 through 19-5 support the implementation and management of these quantified MMs, but were not directly quantified in the Updated GHG Report.

Quantified Solid Waste Emissions

As shown in Updated GHG Report Table 1, the Updated GHG Calculations attributable to solid waste is 5,107 MTCO$_2$e/yr, as compared to the 10,214 MTCO$_2$e/yr in the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions, which represents a reduction of -5,107 MTCO$_2$e/yr. The solid waste emissions estimates in the Updated GHG Calculations reflect quantified emission reductions associated with Project implementation of MM 17-10, which requires that at least 75 percent of Project operational waste be diverted from landfill disposal. CalEEMod calculates GHG emissions based on the volume of waste subject to landfill decomposition. The 75 percent waste diversion requirement in MM 17-10 reduces solid waste GHG emissions by -5,107 MTCO$_2$e/yr from the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions.

Quantified Area Emissions

As shown in Updated GHG Report Table 1, Project GHG emissions attributable to area emissions in the Updated GHG Calculations is 11,223 MTCO$_2$e/yr, as compared to the 11,297 MTCO$_2$e/yr in the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions, which represents a reduction of -74 MTCO$_2$e/yr. Project implementation of MM 11-3 related to fireplace restrictions and reductions associated with the electrification of landscaping equipment supports area GHG emissions reductions of -74 MTCO$_2$e/yr.

Quantified Construction Emissions

As shown in Updated GHG Report Table 1, Project GHG emissions attributable to construction activities in the Updated GHG Calculations are equal to in the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions – i.e., 4,490 MTCO$_2$e/yr. Project implementation of MM 11-2 contributes to emission reductions for air quality purposes, but does not directly contribute to GHG emissions reductions. Project related construction emissions were conservatively assumed to be diesel/gasoline and do not include any GHG emission reductions for electrically powered construction equipment.

Quantified Emissions Attributable to Vegetation Change

As shown in Updated GHG Report Table 1, Project GHG emissions attributable to vegetation change in the Updated GHG Calculations is 565 MTCO$_2$e/yr, as compared to the 673 MTCO$_2$e/yr in the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions (i.e. from Draft EIR Table 5.21-4, above, 922-249 = 673), which represents a reduction of -108 MTCO$_2$e/yr. Project implementation of MM 7-11 and MM 7-12, which require restoration of impacted woodlands and jurisdictional drainages pursuant to County and regulatory
agency permit requirements, as well as MM 21-20 related to County landscaping requirements, contribute to vegetation quantification reductions for the Updated GHG Calculations. MMs 4-4, 7-1, 7-13, and 7-19 support the implementation and management of these quantified MM, but were not directly quantified in the Updated GHG Report.

**Compliance with Regulatory Programs**

As discussed above, under Threshold 21-1, the EIR considered whether the Project would generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that may have a significant effect on the environment by quantifying the Project’s GHG emissions and evaluating the Project’s compliance and consistency with regulatory programs that are designed to reduce GHG emissions and contribute to the achievement AB 32’s goals.

As analyzed in EIR Section 5.21.6, the Project would comply and be consistent with an extensive list of applicable regulatory programs designed to reduce GHG emissions and would thus contribute to the achievement of AB 32’s GHG reduction goals, including but not limited to: Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and Green Building Code; Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code; Los Angeles County Tree Planting Ordinance; SCAQMD Rule 4-45; SB 1 (California Solar Initiative); SB 605 (short-lived climate pollutant reduction); SB 1078, AB 107, SB X1-2, and SB 100 (renewable portfolio standards); SB 350 (renewable energy procurement and energy efficiency/conservation); SB 375 (land use planning); USEPA and NHTSA fuel economy and CO2 standards; CARB Airborne Toxic Control Measures and Emissions Standards; California Water Code § 10910 et seq. (water supply planning); SB X7-7 (water conservation); State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance; AB 341 (solid waste recycling); AB 1493 (mobile source reductions); CARB Low Carbon Fuel Standards; AB 1826 (organic waste recycling); CARB Advanced Clean Cars Program; AB 1109 (lighting efficiency).

In addition to the regulatory programs described above, the Project will also comply with applicable provisions of, and is consistent with, CARB’s Cap and Trade Program; approximately 96 percent (150,808 MTCO2e/yr) of the Project’s GHG emissions are covered by, and subject to, the purchase of emission allowances under the Cap and Trade Program. The state extended the duration of the Cap and Trade program from 2020 to 2030 in July 2017 (AB 398), although CARB, the state’s expert air quality regulatory agency, and the California Attorney General have both publically concluded that CARB has the authority to continue to implement the Cap and Trade program under its general air quality and climate statutory authorities even in the absence of new legislation. Based on CARB’s expert opinion that specific statutory authorization for a Cap and Trade program is not required, the inclusion of a Cap and Trade program through 2050 in the CARB 2017 Scoping Plan, and other relevant climate laws, regulations, and policies, there is substantial evidence of the Cap and Trade program’s continued existence beyond 2030.
Compliance with the Cap and Trade program was upheld as a lawful CEQA mitigation measure to reduce GHG emissions to a less-than-significant-level for fossil fuels used by a refinery project for both direct refinery operations as well as indirect electricity consumption-related GHG emissions in Association of Irritated Residents v. Kern County Board of Supervisors, et al. (Alon USA Energy, Inc., et al., Real Parties in Interest) (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 708 (“Alon”). As stated by the Alon court, “we conclude it is appropriate for a lead agency to conclude a project compliance with the cap-and-trade program provides a sufficient basis for determining the impact of the project’s greenhouse gas emissions will be less than significant.” Id. at 743. The California Supreme Court declined to reverse, or de-publish, the 5th Circuit’s Alon opinion.

As shown in Updated GHG Report Table 1, Project compliance with the 2019 Title 24 Standards and applicable regulations assumed by the current version of CalEEMod reduce Project GHG emissions by -53,324 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year (MTCO₂E/yr) below the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions total of 244,379 MTCO₂E/yr. Reductions associated with Project compliance with the various EIR mitigation measures quantified in the Updated GHG Report are projected to reduce Project GHG emissions by an additional -34,412 MTCO₂E/yr, resulting in the Project’s total Updated GHG Calculations of 157,642 MTCO₂E/yr. As further explained in Section 3.0 and Table 3 of the Updated GHG Report, approximately 96 percent (150,808 MTCO₂e/yr) of the Project’s total Updated GHG Calculations emissions are covered by, and subject to, the purchase of emission allowances under the new, expanded state Cap and Trade program. Only approximately 4 percent of the total emissions, or 6,834 MTCO₂e/yr, largely from landfill waste and wastewater treatment process biogas reuse for energy production, would not be subject to the purchase of emission allowances under the Cap and Trade program.
### UPDATED GHG REPORT TABLE 1
**UPDATED GHG CALCULATIONS EMISSIONS SUBJECT TO CAP-AND-TRADE (MTCO2E/YEAR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Emission Sources</th>
<th>Updated GHG Calculations</th>
<th>Subject to Cap and Trade?</th>
<th>Amount Subject to Cap-and-Trade</th>
<th>Remaining Emissions After Cap-and-Trade Offsets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>11,223</td>
<td>Yes: natural gas for fireplaces and electricity for landscaping equipment</td>
<td>-11,223</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Power</td>
<td>29,132</td>
<td>Yes: emissions from generating electrical power</td>
<td>-29,132</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>25,915</td>
<td>Yes: Natural gas used for building heating, cooking, etc.</td>
<td>-25,915</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>77,007</td>
<td>Yes: transportation fuels</td>
<td>-77,007</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>5,107</td>
<td>No: landfill decomposition emissions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Electricity</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Yes: emissions from generating electrical power</td>
<td>-277</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Electricity</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>Yes: emissions from generating electrical power</td>
<td>-2,764</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio-Gas</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>No: biogas recovered from treatment process</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>Yes: transportation fuels</td>
<td>-4,490</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Loss</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Trees</td>
<td>-249</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>157,642</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-150,808</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,834</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Updated GHG Calculations from Psomas using CalEEMod version 16.3.2 (June 2018)

---

Net Zero Carbon For The Electric Sector

Even without consideration of the Project’s compliance and consistency with applicable GHG regulatory programs, the Project would more than offset its GHG emissions associated with electricity consumption. The Project’s Development Agreement obligates the Project to achieve a “net zero carbon for the electric sector” standard on all public and private facilities constructed within the Project. Per the Development Agreement, “net zero carbon for the electric sector” means that carbon emissions created to produce electricity that is consumed within the Specific Plan area will be offset with an equivalent amount of carbon emission reductions that result from quantified greenhouse gas emission reductions.

Table 4 of the Updated GHG Report compares the total reduction from the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions with the total electrical power emissions in the Updated GHG Calculations. Total Project emissions are -86,736 MTCO2e/yr lower in the
Updated GHG Calculations than the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions. The total level of emission reductions is nearly three times larger than the total GHG emissions from electrical power consumption in the Updated GHG Calculations. The Project’s quantified MMs reduce GHG emissions by -34,412 MTCO₂e/yr, which is greater than the emissions associated with Project’s electricity usage at Specific Plan buildout. Consequently, Table 4 demonstrates that, net of GHG emissions attributable to electrical power use, the Updated GHG Calculations reduces emissions by -2,239 MTCO₂e/yr from the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions counting only reductions attributable to quantified Project mitigation requirements. Therefore, the Updated GHG Calculations shows that, with mitigation, the Project would achieve net-zero electricity emissions even without consideration of GHG emissions reductions associated with regulations.

### UPDATED GHG REPORT TABLE 4
**ADDITIONAL REDUCTION ANALYSIS ELECTRICAL POWER EMISSIONS AND NET EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS FROM DEIR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Emission Sources</th>
<th>Electrical Power GHG Emissions (MTCO₂e/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>29,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical Power</strong></td>
<td>29,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Gas</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water (Supply, Treatment, Distribution)</strong></td>
<td>2,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater Electricity</strong></td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Electrical Power GHG Emissions</td>
<td>32,173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GHG Emission Reductions Net of Electrical Power Emissions**

-2,239

---

_Sources: DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions from DEIR Section 5.21; Updated GHG Calculations from Psomas using CaIEEMod version 16.3.2 (June 2018)._
MTCO$_2$e/yr. The Updated GHG Calculations show a GHG Efficiency of 1.93 MTCO$_2$e/SP/year based on an SP of 81,848 and GHG emissions of 157,642 MTCO$_2$e/yr. The Updated GHG Calculations consider residents, non-resident employees, and non-resident/non-employee visitors to the Project site. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, which recommends statewide targets of no more than 6 MTCO$_2$e per capita by 2030, and no more than 2 MTCO$_2$e per capita by 2050. The GHG Efficiency of the Updated GHG Calculation, 1.93 MTCO$_2$e/SP/year, is below the statewide Scoping Plan recommended targets for 2030 and 2050 and are thus consistent with the State's long-term GHG goals.

**UPDATED GHG REPORT TABLE 5**
**UPDATED GHG CALCULATIONS**
**SERVICE POPULATION GHG EFFICIENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1.93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents at Buildout</td>
<td>57,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Employees</td>
<td>15,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident/Non-Employee Visitors</td>
<td>8,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population (SP)</td>
<td>81,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project GHG Emissions (MTCO$_2$e/yr)</td>
<td>157,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG Efficiency (MTCO$_2$e/SP/yr)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: DEIR Section 5.9, Population and Housing and Stantec.

**Consistency with Numerical Thresholds for Informational Purposes**

In April 2008, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) convened a Working Group to develop GHG significance thresholds. On December 5, 2008, the SCAQMD Governing Board (Board) adopted its staff proposal for an interim CEQA GHG significance threshold applicable to projects for which the SCAQMD is the lead agency. As to projects where the SCAQMD is not the lead agency, the Board only adopted an interim threshold of 10,000 MTCO$_2$e per year for industrial stationary source projects, which is inapplicable to the Project.

As to non-industrial projects where the SCAQMD is not lead agency, SCAQMD staff proposed a multiple tier analysis to determine the appropriate threshold to be used. The draft proposal suggests the following tiers: Tier 1 is any applicable CEQA exemptions; Tier 2 is consistency with a GHG reduction plan; Tier 3 is a screening value or bright line; Tier 4 is a performance based standard; and Tier 5 is GHG mitigation offsets. According to the presentation given at the September 28, 2010 Working Group meeting, SCAQMD staff proposed a Tier 3 draft threshold of 1,400 to 3,500 MTCO$_2$e/year depending on if the project was commercial, mixed use, or residential. For the Tier 4 draft threshold, SCAQMD staff proposed to utilize an efficiency target. The proposed project-level efficiency target for 2020 was 4.8.
MTCO$_2$e per year per service population (SP), which includes residents plus employees. The proposed plan-level efficiency target for 2020 was 6.6 MTCO$_2$e per year per SP. The proposed project-level efficiency target for 2035 was 3.0 MTCO$_2$e per year per SP, and the proposed plan-level efficiency target for 2035 was 4.1 MTCO$_2$e per year per SP. The SCAQMD Working Group has not convened since the fall of 2010. To date, the SCAQMD staff proposal has not been considered or approved for use by the SCAQMD Board.

As discussed in the Updated GHG Report Section 5.0, the Project’s GHG Efficiency based on the estimated service population decreased from 3.02 as presented in the DEIR Quantified Emissions to 1.93 as calculated in the Updated GHG Emissions. Thus, for informational purposes, the Project’s estimated Updated GHG Emissions would not exceed either the unadopted 2035 project-level efficiency threshold of 3.0 MTCO$_2$e/yr or the unadopted 2035 plan-level efficiency threshold of 4.1 MTCO$_2$e/yr proposed by SCAQMD staff.

The Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District’s (AVAQMD’s) CEQA and Federal Conformity Guidelines (2011) establishes significance thresholds to assess the regional impact of project-related air pollutant emissions within its jurisdiction. The AVAQMD threshold for GHG emissions is 100,000 MTCO$_2$e per year. A project with emission rates below this threshold is considered to have a less than significant effect on regional air quality throughout the AVAQMD portion of the MDAB. As discussed in the Updated GHG Report, total Project emissions in the Updated GHG Calculations are 157,642 MTCO$_2$e/yr. Although the Updated GHG Calculations represent a reduction of -86,736 MTCO$_2$e/yr from the DEIR Quantified GHG Emissions, for informational purposes, the Updated GHG Calculations would exceed AVAQMD’s 100,000 MTCO$_2$e/yr threshold.

**Consistency with CAPP and RTP/SCS**

As discussed above, under Thresholds 21-2, the EIR considered whether the Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs by analyzing the Project’s consistency with (i) the Los Angeles County Community Action Plan (CCAP), and (2) the South Coast Association of Government’s (SCAG’s) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy (SCAG RTP/SCS), the SB 375 SCS applicable to the Project.

The Los Angeles County CCAP is designed to support the State’s overall GHG reduction goals for 2020 under AB 32. The Project’s consistency with the CCAP is evaluated in EIR Section 5.21, Climate Change Table 5.21-11, which compares the Project and its implementation actions to the existing County initiatives to reduce GHG emissions set forth in the CCAP. As shown in Table 5.21-11, the Project would be consistent with the CCAP and its greenhouse gas reduction strategy. Since the Project is consistent with the CCAP, it would not have significant GHG emissions relative to the CCAP’s 2020 planning horizon and the AB 32 reduction target. Since the Project has a phased implementation schedule with full buildout beyond the CCAP’s 2020 planning
horizon, consistency with the CCAP is only one *Newhall* compliance pathway used in EIR Section 5.21.6 to evaluate the significance of the Project’s GHG emissions. However, the Project’s consistency with the CCAP is important for determining the significance of GHG emissions for the current CCAP planning horizon.

Under Threshold 21-2, the EIR also evaluated the Project’s consistency with the SCAG RTP/SCS. Senate Bill 375 tasks CARB with calculating per capita GHG emissions reduction targets for each of the regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Each MPO must then adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that describes a regional development pattern and transportation network that, if implemented, will feasibly reduce VMT in an amount sufficient to achieve the regional GHG reduction target. The SCS is adopted as a component of each MPO’s federally mandated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). By law, every SCS must accommodate the region’s projected population growth over a 20-year period, as well as an 8-year projection of the regional housing need, as determined through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process. To comply with SB 375, SCAG adopted the current SCAG RTP/SCS in April 2016. In June 2016, CARB determined that implementation of the SCAG RTP/SCS would achieve SCAG’s per capita GHG reduction target of 8 percent by 2020 and would achieve an 18 percent per capita GHG reductions by 2035 (exceeding the SCAG 2035 target of 13 percent by five percentage points). State and federal regulators also determined that the 2016 RTP/SCS conforms to the federal Clean Air Act State Implementation Plan and certified that its control measures to reduce regional criteria pollutant emissions are consistent with National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Accordingly, all federal and state expert agencies with regulatory jurisdiction over air resources in the SCAG region have determined that, if implemented, the SCAG RTP/SCS would achieve targeted per capita GHG emissions reductions from passenger vehicles and will not impede or conflict with regional efforts to reduce criteria air pollutants to acceptable levels.

The SCAG RTP/SCS establishes a balanced land use plan that assumes a significant increase in multi-family housing to be constructed in urban infill areas and so-called High Quality Transit Areas (HQTA), but also targets some suburban and rural pockets of the region for additional housing and employment growth. Under the SCAG’s balanced land use plan, 68 percent of all new homes in the region would be constructed as multi-family units, and over 50 percent of new housing and employment growth would be located in urban infill areas and HQTAs. The balanced land use plan also provides for approximately 33 percent of all new housing units to be constructed in suburban and rural residential areas of the region. This balanced land use pattern was selected by SCAG, rather than a land use pattern more reliant on infill development, because the EIR prepared for the SCAG RTP/SCS determined that land use pattern that targets greater levels of infill development would cause unacceptable health risks and socioeconomic impacts to low income communities currently living in the urban core, among other concerns.

The Project is consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS, which targets the Project site for significant growth, relying on socioeconomic projections at the level of individually
mapped Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs). SCAG’s TAZ maps project that over 22,000 new households will be constructed in the Project area by 2035. Demographic projections included as part of the adopted SCAG RTP/SCS include development of the Project and are the most recently updated demographic projections available for the Project site and regional vicinity. The County and regional projections were formally adopted by SCAG and the Project has been analyzed to determine conformity with these projections in Sections 5.9, Population, Housing, and Employment, and 5.21, Climate Change, of the EIR. Since the SCAG RTP/SCS anticipates development of the Project site in the manner proposed by the Project, the Project is consistent with the regional development blueprint prepared in accordance with SB 375 to reduce regional GHG emissions attributable to the land use sector.

**Impact Summary under Thresholds 21-1 and 21-2**

Under Threshold 21-1, the Project would comply with, and would be consistent with, applicable regulatory programs designed to reduce GHG emissions and would thus contribute to the achievement of AB 32’s greenhouse gas reduction goals. Under Thresholds 21-2, the Project would be consistent with the Los Angeles CCAP and the SCAG RTP/SCS and thus would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The Project thus complies with multiple “pathways to compliance” identified by the Newhall court and arguably can be found to have less than significant adverse environmental effects related to GHG-related climate change.

As discussed above, however, climate change is a global phenomenon and the significance of greenhouse gas emissions is inherently cumulative in nature. The Project would emit GHGs at an estimated of 157,642 metric tons per year that would contribute to the global inventory of GHGs (although 96 percent of these emissions would be offset through the purchase of Cap and Trade emission allowances, and 100 percent of the Project’s GHG emissions related to electricity consumption would be offset with an equivalent of amount of carbon emission reductions per the Project mitigation measures). While California remains a global leader in mandating GHG emission reductions across its economy, and while the California already has nearly the lowest level of GHG per capita of any state, most other nations and states have not enacted regulations similar to those adopted in California. Moreover, the County of Los Angeles has no jurisdictional control or responsibility for GHG reductions in other parts of California (and certainly not in the context of global action), which all contribute to climate change. In addition, the County does not have jurisdiction to enforce statewide implementation of all of the applicable GHG-reducing regulatory programs with which the Project (and other statewide projects) must comply. Although many other agencies with the necessary jurisdiction are currently taking action to reduce GHG emissions, the County cannot assure that these measures would ultimately be implemented or sufficient to address climate change on a global scale. In light of these considerations, as well as the global nature climate change related to GHG emissions and the Project’s total estimated GHG emissions, the Project’s incremental contribution to the global GHG emissions inventory is deemed to be
cumulatively considerable and this cumulative impact is significant and unavoidable, despite the Project’s demonstrated consistency with applicable plans, regulations and policies to reduce GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures MM 10-1, MM 10-25, MM 10-26, MM 11-1 through MM 11-7, MM 13-6, MM 14-1, MM 17-9, MM 17-10, MM 18-1, MM 18-2, MM 19-1 through MM 19-5, MM 20.2-1, MM 20.2-2, MM 20.3-1 through MM 20.3-3, above.

Mitigation Measure 21-1: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the County with plans and specifications that demonstrate 50 percent of the Project’s anticipated electrical energy demand at buildout shall be satisfied from on-site renewable energy generation. “Anticipated electrical energy demand” shall be determined on the basis of the anticipated loads for each building as shown in the reports submitted at the time of building permit application pursuant to the Building Energy Efficiency Standards of Title 24. “On-site renewable energy generation” includes, but is not limited to, solar, wind, geothermal, biofuel and hydroelectric systems. These systems shall be installed in connection with the development of one or more of the following: residential units, nonresidential buildings, public buildings, or Specific Plan utility facilities located either within the Specific Plan area or within its immediate vicinity.

Mitigation Measure 21-2: The Project’s plans and specifications shall demonstrate compliance with California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code voluntary measure A4.203.1.2.1 Tier 1 for newly-constructed low-rise residential buildings. Therefore, the energy efficiency of these buildings would exceed 2016 Title 24 requirements by 15 percent. Low rise buildings are three stories or less. The Project shall incorporate the Green Development Program (Centennial Specific Plan, Appendix 2A), and the Project Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for the implementation of this requirement, which may include energy reduction measures such as use of high performance glazing, radiant heat roof barriers, insulation of all pipes, programmable thermostats, fluorescent and LED bulbs, solar access, sealed ducts, strategic placement of trees and other shading devices. All single-family homebuyers shall have the option to include a photovoltaic array system.

Mitigation Measure 21-3: The Project’s plans and specifications shall demonstrate compliance with CALGreen voluntary measure A5.203.1.2.1 Tier 1 for nonresidential buildings (e.g. hotel, high-rise residential), thereby exceeding the 2016 Title 24 energy efficiency requirements for these buildings by 10 percent. The Project shall incorporate the Green
Development Program (Centennial Specific Plan, Appendix 2A), and the Project Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for the implementation of this requirement, which may include energy reduction measures such as high performance glazing, radiant heat roof barriers, high-efficient HVAC with hot-gas reheat, insulation of all pipes, programmable thermostats, fluorescent and LED bulbs, solar access, sealed ducts, zero use of CFC refrigerants in commercial buildings, strategic placement of trees, and other shading devices. Commercial structures shall include passive solar design techniques, such as a north-south panel orientation on buildings, and shall install operable windows designed to maximize natural ventilation by opening into prevailing west winds at inlets and away outlets, thereby reducing use of interior climate controls.

**Mitigation Measure 21-4:** The-Project Applicant/Developer shall require in contract specifications, that contractors limit construction equipment idling to 3 minutes and include a program to ensure that equipment operators comply with the 3-minute limit.

**Mitigation Measure 21-5:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County demonstrating that all public and community pools and spas shall be equipped with active solar heating systems where heating is necessary or desired. The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the proposed plan for compliance with this provision prior to obtaining a permit for the pool.

**Mitigation Measure 21-6:** Deeds, CC&Rs or similar legal documents shall contain the following requirement: The owners of all single-family and multi-family residential units shall be required, upon resale, to present to the buyer a written energy audit checklist prepared by a qualified third party at the time the seller provides the buyer with the Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement required by California Civil Code, Section 1102 et seq. The energy audit checklist shall certify that all HVAC systems, thermostats, appliances, windows and swimming pools (if applicable) are the same as those originally installed or, if changed, otherwise comply with Centennial's Green Development Program. All residential pool covers shall be removable, and shall not be automatic retractable covers.

The CC&Rs of the master homeowners association or other applicable association shall require compliance with the provisions of this measure and shall provide notice to individual owners of the resale energy audit checklist requirement. The master homeowners association or other applicable association shall monitor compliance and provide the County with an annual report of compliance with this measure.
Mitigation Measure 21-7: Deeds, CC&Rs, or similar legal documents shall contain the following requirement: For nonresidential buildings, within ninety (90) days after the end of the first full calendar year following the issuance of the certificate of occupancy and within ninety (90) days after each five year period thereafter, the owner or tenant in possession thereof shall submit to the master commercial owners association or other applicable association a report prepared by the owner or a qualified, independent third party that evaluates whether all major building systems such as heat furnace, air conditioner, and other mechanical fixtures are working within the design standards established for each system. The master commercial owners association or other applicable association shall monitor compliance and provide the County with an annual report of compliance with this measure.

Mitigation Measure 21-8: Energy efficient major appliances and HVAC systems that meet the more stringent of applicable California Energy Commission (CEC) requirements or ENERGY STAR requirements, or equivalent, shall be offered by residential builders. Major appliances subject to this requirement include dishwashers, clothes washers, refrigerators, and room air conditioners.

Mitigation Measure 21-9: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County that have been prepared in accordance with the Project Water Purveyor or alternate qualified public utility district requirements and standards, demonstrating that the Project’s wastewater reclamation facilities (WRFs) shall capture and reuse biogas for energy production.

Mitigation Measure 21-10: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County demonstrating that nonresidential or multi-family buildings shall be constructed with recycled water infrastructure to serve common areas for these facilities, except where prohibited by law. To the extent recycled water is produced within the Project and available, recycled water shall be used for landscape irrigation within those common areas. Compliance with these measures shall be established prior to the of a construction permits for nonresidential and multi-family facilities and at the time of County approval of final landscaping plans submitted by the Project Applicant/Developer after final map recordation for homeowners association common areas. Covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs) shall require the owners of such common areas to maintain, repair and replace irrigation systems and plantings in accordance with County approved plans.
Mitigation Measure 21-11: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County demonstrating that nonresidential building shall be constructed with indoor plumbing fixtures and fixture fittings that would reduce the overall use of potable water within the building by 12 percent, consistent with 2016 CALGreen Tier 1 nonresidential voluntary measures as prescribed in Section A5.303.2.3.1 of the code.

Mitigation Measure 21-12: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County demonstrating that single or multi-family residential buildings shall be constructed with kitchen faucets and appliances that comply with 2016 CALGreen code residential voluntary measures specified in Sections A4.303.1 and A4.303.3 of the code.

Mitigation Measure 21-13: The outdoor residential (single-family and multi-family) water budget for water budget based ratemaking shall be based on having no more than 25 percent turf grass allowed in landscaped areas of single-family detached residential front yards and multi-family residential common areas.

Mitigation Measure 21-14: Ten percent of all homes in Centennial communities that permit housing, with the exception of the lowest density area (Community 8-2) will be affordable, in conformance with the Affordable Housing Implementation Plan (see Appendix 3-H of the Centennial Specific Plan).*

Note: Independent of this measure, the Project Applicant/Developer has voluntarily agreed to a higher affordability percentage than imposed by this measure as part of the Development Agreement. See Item 11 (entitled “Affordable Home Ownership and Rental Housing Program”) in Exhibit G of the Development Agreement.

Mitigation Measure 21-15: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County demonstrating that one 208/240 VAC receptacle that may be used for charging electric vehicles, shall be installed in each detached and attached single-family residence in a manner consistent with 2016 CALGreen Code Voluntary Tier 1 Section A4.106.4.1. The installation shall comply with requirements of the 2016 CALGreen Code Section 4.106.4.1, or the most applicable code at the time of construction. The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide a further credit of $500 to 50 percent of future homeowners (as requested by homeowner) to pay for the type of charging device then in use for electric vehicles or, with County approval, to pay for other energy conservation uses. The availability of this EV incentive benefit shall be disclosed and promoted at the time of initial sale of
single family homes and shall thereafter be promoted by the TMA on its website.

**Mitigation Measure 21-16:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County demonstrating compliance with the Electric Vehicle Supply (EVS) charging station measures specified in MM 11-4. If and to the extent subsequently approved by the County, compliant with state laws, and resulting in no new significant impacts to the environment following County review and approval, EVS charging stations may be replaced by “alternative energy fueling stations” which may include other types of electric vehicle charging technology (e.g., operating at higher or lower voltages), or alternative vehicular fuel technology that results in zero or near zero (as defined by CARB) GHG emission such as hydrogen fuel cells, biofuels, or other qualifying fuel technologies. An electric charging station shall allow for simultaneous charging of two electric vehicles.

- Business Park and Institutional land use designations shall provide a minimum of one alternative energy vehicle fueling station on site for the first 50,000 square feet of usable floor space and additional alternative energy vehicle fueling stations for each additional 50,000 square feet of usable floor space thereafter.

- Multi-family residential buildings of at least seventeen (17) residential units shall provide a minimum of one alternative energy vehicle fueling station for the first seventeen (17) residential units and an additional alternative energy vehicle fueling station for each additional seventeen (17) residential units thereafter.

- The Town Center and each Village Center shall provide a minimum of one alternative energy vehicle charging station.

- Designated Transit Hubs shall provide a minimum of one alternative energy vehicle charging station.

**Mitigation Measure 21-17:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County demonstrating that the following features have been incorporated into the building designs for non-residential buildings:

- Bicycle parking spaces at a rate of 5 percent of minimum required vehicle parking spaces for nonresidential land uses.

- Preferential parking for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles shall be provided as specified in Section
Mitigation Measure 21-18: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County demonstrating that the following features have been incorporated into the building designs or specifications for multi-family residential buildings:

- Visitor parking shall include preferentially located parking spaces for electric vehicles.

- Bicycle parking shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.9, Residential Voluntary Measures, of the CALGreen Code or as required by County Code Section 22.52.1225B, whichever is more stringent.

Mitigation Measure 21-19: For parking structures and parking lots with 20 or more parking spaces that serve uses other than residential or nonresidential buildings (e.g., trailhead, park), and parking structures and parking lots that serve multifamily residential buildings with 17 or more multifamily units, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide plans and specifications to the County demonstrating that the following features have been incorporated into the parking facility:

- The parking facility shall include a minimum of five percent preferentially located parking spaces for electric vehicles.

- Five percent of the total number of parking spaces provided in the parking facility, but in no case less than one, shall be Electric Vehicle Parking Spaces (EV Spaces), as defined in CALGreen Code Section 202, capable of supporting future Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE), as defined in CALGreen Code Section 202. Calculations for the required number of EV Spaces shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number and the design and installation of each EV space shall be consistent with Section A4.106.8.2, Residential Voluntary Measures, and Section 4.106.4.2, of the CALGreen Code as follows:

  **Single charging space requirements.** When only a single EV Space is required, install a listed raceway capable of accommodating a dedicated branch circuit. The raceway shall not be less than trade size 1 (nominal 1-inch inside diameter). The raceway shall be securely fastened at the main service or subpanel and shall terminate in close proximity to the proposed location of the charging system into a listed cabinet, box or enclosure.
Multiple charging spaces required. When multiple EV Spaces are required, plans shall include the location(s) and type of EVSE, raceway method(s), wiring schematics and electrical calculations to verify that the electrical system has sufficient capacity to charge simultaneously all the electrical vehicles at all designated EV Spaces at their full rated amperage. Plan design shall be based on Level 2 EVSE at its maximum operating ampacity. Only underground raceways and related underground equipment are required to be installed at the time of construction.

- For residential parking facilities, bicycle parking shall be provided as specified in Section A4.106.9, Residential Voluntary Measures, of the CALGreen code or as required by County Code Section 22.52.1225B, whichever is more stringent.

Mitigation Measure 21-20: The Project Applicant/Developer shall ensure that the implementation of the Green Development Program that complies with all applicable legal requirements, including but not limited to the following regulations (as may be amended):

1) Regulations that are quantified inputs into the CalEEMod analysis, resulting in GHG Reductions:

   a) Pavley Motor Vehicle Standards (AB 1493)
   b) Low Carbon Fuel Standard (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 10, Article 4, Subarticle 7, Section 95480 et seq.)
   c) Title 24 (part 6 [Energy Code] and part 11 [CALGreen Code]) of the California Code of Regulations
   d) Renewable Portfolio Standard (SB X1 2 and SB 350)
   e) Solid Waste Diversion (AB 341)
   f) Statewide reduction in potable urban water usage of 25 percent relative to water use in 2013 (Executive Order B-29-15)
   g) Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO) (California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 2.7)
   h) Los Angeles Tree Planting Ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 22, Division 1, Chapter 22, Part 20, Sections 22.52.2100 et seq.)
i) Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (Los Angeles County Code, Title 31, Chapter 1, Sections 100 et seq.)

j) California Water Code (California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Part 2.10, Sections 10910–10915)

k) Los Angeles County Community Climate Action Plan

2) Regulations that are not quantified inputs into the CalEEMod analysis, but should be considered for incorporation as appropriate:

a) EPA and NHTSA GHG and CAFE standards for passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty passenger vehicles (75 FR 25324–25728 and 77 FR 62624–63200) and for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles (76 FR 57106–57513)

b) Cap-and-Trade Program for Electricity, Stationary Sources, and Fuels (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 10, Article 5, Section 95801 et seq.)

c) Advanced Clean Cars Program (California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Division 3, Chapter 1, Articles 1, 2, 6 (parts); Chapter 2, Articles 1, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4 (parts); Chapter 4.4 (parts); Chapter 8 (parts).

d) Under Inflated Vehicle Tires (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 10, Article 4, Subarticle 8, Section 95550 et seq.)

e) Heavy-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Regulation (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 10, Article 4, Subarticle 1, Section 95300 et seq.)

f) Management of High Global Warming Potential Refrigerants for Stationary Sources (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 10, Article 4, Subarticle 5.1, Section 95380 et seq.)

g) Small Containers of Automotive Refrigerant (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 10, Article 4, Subarticle 5, Section 95360 et seq.)

h) High-Global Warming Potential Greenhouse Gases in Consumer Products (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 8.5, Article 2)
Mitigation Measure 21-21: The Project Applicant/Developer shall require contractors to use locally available and recycled building materials, provided such materials meet all applicable Building Code and other requirements, and are readily available and comparably priced to assure that such materials do not increase the cost and decrease the affordability of housing or community infrastructure.

Mitigation Measure 21-22: The Project parking lots shall be designed to reduce vehicle queuing and improve pedestrian safety. Parking lot access designs shall include self-enforcement features for reducing the speeds on driveways, such as speed bumps or curved driveways. The parking lots shall include clearly marked pedestrian pathways connecting building entrances to parking, sidewalk, and transit drop-off/pick-up locations.

D. Land Resources

(1) Potential Impact: The Project will result in the conversion of 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.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project will result in the conversion of approximately 642 acres of on-site Prime Farmland, for which there is no feasible mitigation. Approximately 642 acres of land in the easternmost portion of the Project site will be developed as residential, commercial, and business park uses. This conversion of farmland on the Project site is consistent with the Antelope Valley Area Plan’s (AVAP) intent to concentrate development that supports economic growth and stability within the designated Economic Opportunity Area (EOA), which includes localized areas of farmland conversion, thereby preserving Important Farmland and other agricultural resources in the remainder of the Antelope Valley. Nonetheless, implementation of the Project would result in the conversion of approximately 642 acres of Prime Farmland to urban and other land uses. The Project would also accommodate a total of 50 acres of small-scale agriculture and agriculture-related uses, including community gardens,
farmers markets/fresh fruit and vegetable stands, growing and sales of nursery stock, and commercial greenhouses. However, these activities may or may not occur within the 642 acres of the site currently designated as Prime Farmland. In addition, Tejon Ranch will put an agricultural preservation easement of not less than 489 acres of Prime and Unique farmland outside of the Project site, but on the Tejon Ranch property. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s impacts to land resources. Potential mitigation in the form of establishing 642 acres of new farming areas on Tejon Ranch has been investigated and determined to be infeasible with implementation of the Tejon Ranch Conservation and Land Use Agreement and other existing and proposed development on Tejon Ranch due to insufficient available land that could be cultivated to meet Prime Farmland standards. Because Project-related activities would convert approximately 642 acres of Prime Farmland and there are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, it remains a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project will combine with impacts of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects to result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to agricultural resources with respect to the conversion of approximately 642 acres of on-site Prime Farmland, for which there is no feasible mitigation.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project will result in the conversion of approximately 642 acres of on-site Prime Farmland, for which there is no feasible mitigation. Approximately 642 acres of land in the easternmost portion of the Project site will be developed as residential, commercial, and business park uses. This conversion of farmland on the Project site is consistent with the AVAP’s intent to concentrate development that supports economic growth and stability within the designated EOA, which includes localized areas of farmland conversion, thereby preserving Important Farmland and other agricultural resources in the remainder of the Antelope Valley. Nonetheless, implementation of the Project would result in the conversion of approximately 642 acres of Prime Farmland to urban and other land uses. The on-site conversion of farmland is part of the total of 6,169 acres of Important Farmland that the AVAP EIR identified would be converted as part of future growth. However, the Project’s incremental contribution to conversion of agricultural resources is cumulatively considerable and is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s impacts to agricultural and forestry resources. Because Project-related activities would convert approximately 642 acres of Prime Farmland, part of a total of 6,169 acres of Important Farmland that the AVAP EIR identified, and there are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce this impact to a
less than significant level, the Project’s incremental contribution to conversion of agricultural resources is cumulatively considerable and is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

E. Noise

(1) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project will result in long-term, or permanent noise impacts from traffic and stationary sources. At buildout, the Project would generate an estimated 77,000 external daily trips. The addition of Project traffic to existing traffic would increase traffic volume on roadways in the Project vicinity and there, the traffic noise at adjacent receptors. A doubling of traffic volume would increase traffic noise levels by 3 dBA. Under the existing year without/with Project scenario, multiple segments of SR-138 would experience a change in CNEL at sensitive receptors beyond 3 dBA due traffic increases from implementation of the Project. These impacts would occur at receptors adjacent to SR-138 between Gorman Post Road and 190th Street West and from 110th Street West to 60th Street West. No segments of I-5, SR-14, or SR-99 would experience CNEL increases at sensitive receptors above the threshold.

Under the long-range (2035) without/with Project scenario, impacts would be more limited. Only the segment of SR-138 between Gorman Post Road and Old Ridge Route Road would experience an increase in noise levels of 3.3 dBA. There is currently only one residence adjacent to this road segment.

CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s impacts to land resources. Typical mitigation measures for sensitive noise receptors such as the house between Gorman Post Road and Old Ridge Route Road would include construction of a noise barrier or resurfacing the roadway with rubberized asphalt pavement. However, these mitigations would involve alternations to private property and/or within Caltrans’ right-of-way, which are not within the County’s or the Project Applicant’s control. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable. Because Project-related activities would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project for the segment of SR-138 between Gorman Post Road and Old Ridge Route Road, and there are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, it remains a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project.
(2) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to contribute to significant cumulative impacts resulting from a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas.

**Finding:** 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

At the completion of Project buildout (2035), operation of the Project would expose some existing off-site noise-sensitive receptors adjacent to SR-138 between Gorman Post Road and Old Ridge Route Road to increases in exterior ambient noise levels that exceed the 3 dBA threshold criterion due to Project-related traffic. The impact would be considered significant and unavoidable because feasible mitigation to reduce these impacts is not within County jurisdiction. Therefore, when considering the additional regional traffic on SR-138, the Project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative noise impacts to these receptors. Since there are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

F. **Other Public Services**

(1) **Potential Impact:** The Project has the potential to be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s operational solid waste disposal needs.

**Finding:** 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project will generate approximately 55,394 tons of solid wastes per year at buildout. Per MM 17-10, the Project is required to divert at least 75 percent of the operation waste generated by the Project. This will result in approximately 13,849 tons per year (or 44.4 tpd) of solid waste requiring landfill disposal. The combined daily permitted capacity of the 4 major in-County landfills serving the Project area is 25,000 tpd. Despite the fact that Project waste will represent only 0.18 percent (for operations) and 0.14 percent (for construction) of the available landfills’ permitted daily capacity, permitted Class III landfill capacity cannot be guaranteed at the time of Project buildout and through the operational life of the Project, which are beyond the required 15-year LACDPW planning horizon for solid waste disposal (currently from 2015 to 2030). Therefore, while the County is committed to handling all solid wastes generated within the County now and in the future, to be conservative, this Project impact is considered a significant impact on the County’s anticipated Class III
landfill capacity. Mitigation measures MM 17-9 and 17-10 would reduce this significant impact to the extent feasible through waste management planning and diversion requirements, this impact is conservatively determined to be significant and unavoidable because Project buildout is beyond the required 15-year LACDPW planning horizon for solid waste disposal. The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project to lessen the impacts to the County’s anticipated Class III landfill capacity to the greatest extent possible.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measure 17-9 above.

**Mitigation Measure 17-10:** The Project shall incorporate the Solid Waste Management Plan (Section 3.7 of the Centennial Specific Plan) and the Property Owner/Developer shall be responsible for implementation of the following operational waste reduction requirements to ensure that at least 75 percent of operational waste is diverted from landfill disposal, which shall be posted on the community intranet, and shall be clearly described and distributed to home buyers through their home purchase contracts and CC&Rs:

- The Property Owner/Developer shall process an on-site contract with a waste management company and/or recyclers/composters, and/or self-haul to waste and recycling facilities to properly recycle, divert, compost, and dispose of solid waste generated on-site. Throughout the Project’s operation, the waste hauler shall be required by contract to maintain records showing the diversion of not less than 75 percent of the operational waste generated by the Project.

- The waste management contract will establish dedicated cans for green waste and a Green Waste Recycling Plan that must be adhered to by landscape maintenance companies as part of the CC&Rs. The CC&Rs will require the use of mulching mowers or mowers with mulching blades for common lawn area, use of California Air Resources Board- (CARB) approved or electric maintenance equipment; placing three to five inches of mulch in common areas’ planting beds each year as part of the Landscape Maintenance Plan for all non-residential and multi-family buildings; and diverting organic wastes to a mulching and composting facility or anaerobic digestion facility.

- The CC&Rs will require the Property Owner to recycle and divert from the waste bin, solids such as metal, glass, paper, plastic, cardboard, food and yard waste; and divert from the waste bin hazardous waste, electronic waste, and universal waste. Information on items prohibited from landfill disposal
and on recycling and composting will be provided to Property Owners.

- Household hazardous wastes and less commonly disposed materials (such as electronics and appliances) shall have seasonal pickup (at least two times a year) and residents would be notified of upcoming events.

- Semi-annual “exchange days” shall be organized, publicized, and paid for by the Master Homeowners Association (HOA).

- The Project Applicant/Master Developer shall set aside a minimum of 5 acres for a future Materials Recovery Facility/Transfer Station (MRF/TS) that includes a household hazardous waste permanent collection and reuse center and allows for mulching/composting operations. The site shall be located in a suitable location with the capacity to manage the nonhazardous solid waste and household hazardous waste generated by the Centennial Development Project at buildout. The Project Applicant/Master Developer shall prepare and grade the site, and install basic mainline infrastructure fronting the property prior to the issuance of any occupancy permits associated with the first phase of project implementation. The Master Developer shall continually encourage a waste management company to build these facilities on this build ready site. The CC&R for the future MRF/TS site shall require the land to be set aside for the MRF/TS in perpetuity.

- The Smart Gardening Learning Center specifications will be provided by County Public Works.

- Parking for the Learning Center and the MRF/TS may be shared with adjacent uses with the consent of the property owners and County Public Works.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project will contribute to significant cumulative impacts to solid waste disposal systems and landfill capacity during long-term operation.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

Future growth and development in the region will result in additional demands for private solid waste collection and disposal services. Waste generation from new developments requiring landfill disposal are expected to decrease landfill capacity over time. County and State waste reduction and recycling programs and regulations are expected to reduce solid waste generation, resulting in less landfill disposal.
demand and extending the life of existing landfills. However, permitted Class III landfill capacity cannot be guaranteed at the time of Project buildout and through the life of the Project, which are beyond the required 15-year LACDPW planning horizon for solid waste disposal. Therefore, while the County is committed to handling all solid waste generated in the County now and in the future, the Project will result in a significant impact on the County’s anticipated Class III landfill capacity due to uncertainty in planning. The Project’s contribution to solid waste disposal and associated landfill capacity during long-term operation is therefore conservatively deemed to be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of MM 17-9 and MM 17-10, described above, will reduce the cumulative effects of the Project on solid waste disposal and associated landfill capacity to the greatest extent feasible. Despite these mitigation measures, however, the Project will cause significant cumulative impacts to solid waste disposal and associated landfill capacity. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures that will prevent this cumulative impact of the Project. The Project’s cumulative impact is thus significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 17-9 to 17-10 above.

G. Population, Housing, and Employment

(1) Potential Impacts: The Project has the potential to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure) and to cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

The proposed Project would introduce a maximum of 19,333 housing units and approximately 57,150 residents at full buildout. This growth would occur in the West Economic Opportunity Area (EOA), where future growth is planned and would be in accordance with the Antelope Valley Area Plan’s (AVAP) Land Use Policy Map. The Project is consistent with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projections for the North Los Angeles County Subregion and the Antelope Valley in the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) at the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) level, which projects an increase of 64,892 residents by 2035. The Project would exceed the resident population of the TAZs on the Project site under the 2016 RTP/SCS, which projects 51,872 new residents by 2040, though this suggests that the SCAG projections assume a smaller average household size for the area. Future buildout population would likely be lower than the estimated 57,150 residents due to variations in development densities and
household sizes. The Project is also consistent with the population and housing projections included in the approved AVAP. The Project’s projected number of housing units are consistent with the 2012 and 2016 RTP/SCSs at the TAZ level. The Project would also contribute to meeting the State-mandated Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the County which identifies the need for 30,145 new dwelling units in unincorporated Los Angeles County.

The proposed Project would introduce approximately 23,675 jobs at the site at full buildout. The Project’s jobs represent only 0.24-0.25 percent of the projected 2035 and 2040 job base in the SCAG growth forecasts and thus there is not conflict at the regional level. At the TAZ level, SCAG projects a total of 23,931 jobs in the Project’s two TZAs by 2040 while Los Angeles County projects 563,300 new jobs within the County (of which Project jobs would represent 4.2 percent). Thus Project conditions are consistent with projections. Based on the estimated number of households and employment-generating uses on site at Project buildout, the Project would create a projected ratio of 1.22 jobs per dwelling unit. While this ratio would be lower than the AVAP goal of 1.3 jobs per dwelling unit, the Project would assist in providing housing and employment opportunities in the unincorporated Antelope Valley area consistent with the AVAP resident and employment projections. Thus, it would not cause an imbalance between jobs, housing and population, but would support the AVAP’s jobs-housing goal.

Implementation of the Project is considered growth accommodating rather than growth inducing at a regional level based on SCAG projections. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in relation to planned population, housing, and employment growth in the region and thus would not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. However, because the Project would substantially increase growth relative to the existing Project site conditions, this increase in population on the Project site is considered significant. No mitigation would be appropriate for this impact however as the Project is consistent with approved growth plans in the region and would help the County meet its Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) targets. Accordingly, this impact is conservatively deemed to be significant and unavoidable.

(2) Potential Impact: The Project has the potential to contribute to significant cumulative impacts to population and housing.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project would accommodate growth in the Antelope Valley consistent with the AVAP and the intent of the designated West EOA. The Project would provide for growth in employment, housing, and population that is consistent with the growth
projections for the area, as incorporated into the AVAP and with the housing and employment growth projections used by SCAG in the development of the 2012–2035 RTP/SCS and the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. The Project would also contribute to meeting the State-mandated RHNA housing production targets for the County of Los Angeles. The Project would be consistent with the AVAP’s strategy for increasing the jobs/housing ratio in the unincorporated area of the Antelope Valley, within designated EOAs. There would be less than significant impacts related to the potential displacement of people or housing units as a result of the Project since the majority of the Project site is undeveloped. While the Project would result in substantial growth, it would be consistent with local and regional growth assumptions.

Implementation of the Project is considered growth accommodating rather than growth inducing at a regional level based on SCAG projections. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant in relation to planned population, housing, and employment growth in the region and thus would not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. However, the Project will make a cumulatively significant contribution to population increases on the project site because the site is currently undeveloped and unoccupied. No reasonable or feasible mitigation would be appropriate since the Project is consistent with approved land use and growth plans in the region and would aid in the County’s effort to meet its RHNA target. The Project’s cumulative impact to population and housing is therefore significant and unavoidable.

H. Traffic, Access, and Circulation

(1) Potential Impact: The Project could conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project would result in additional housing, commercial and job-creating land uses and residents at the northwestern corner of Los Angeles County and would add new vehicle trips to the area’s roadway circulation network. The Project would generate vehicle trips that will require an internal roadway circulation network. To reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled, Project mitigation requires, among other mandatory actions, the implementation of the Mobility Plan in the Specific Plan (MMS 10-25 and 10-26). The Mobility Plan includes, among other measures, (a) the provision of an extensive system of sidewalks, greenway trails, community trails, and
two transit hubs to serve as alternative means of transportation on the Project site, (b) the creation and operation of a Transportation Management Association (TMA) to implement transportation improvements and programs, including transit and on-demand services, and implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures to reduce dependence on the automobile, provide for a more efficient use of transportation resources among Project occupants, and reduce pollutant emissions, (c) construction of sidewalks, greenway trails, and community trails that link residential, schools, shopping, and employment areas, (d) small- to medium-sized streets and blocks that allow for shorter walking distances to retail, parks, schools, and other destinations, (e) pedestrian environments incorporated with public streets, (f) parking behind buildings to encourage walking in retail areas along street frontage, and (f) parks within 0.25 mile of 80 percent of all residential units. MM 10-25 also requires that the TMA implement transit and transportation measures to ensure that (1) a minimum of 30 percent of total daily internal on-site trips, and (2) a minimum of 20 percent of peak hour external commuting trips are completed by using transit modes other than single-occupancy automobiles.

The EIR and Specific Plan discuss several Project design features and TDM measures that would reduce incentives to make trips using single occupancy automobiles and encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation. These measures include compact Project designs organized in villages where residential units, commercial facilities, employment generating land uses and other Project facilities are in close proximity and linked with bicycle and walking trails and the provision of transit centers, parking policies and local transportation systems that encourage non-automotive trips, and transit facilities and linkages with transit service providers to provide Project area residents and employees with multiple modes of accessibility for internal and external trips. The MMRP requires County verification of compliance with the Specific Plan Mobility Plan, including the internal and external non-single occupancy automotive trip objectives in MM 10-25, with each tentative map application. MM 10-2 also requires a traffic study prepared by a Traffic Engineer or Civil Engineer licensed in the State of California to the satisfaction of the County be submitted with each TTM application for review by the County.

As discussed in Specific Plan Appendix 2-C, the Project Mobility Plan requires the formation and funding of a TMA to promote, manage, and monitor transit and mobility services and infrastructure prior to the issuance of the first occupancy permit for the Project. The TMA will be responsible for monitoring the form of Project residential and employment travel, or transit modes and ensuring that the Project meets its mobility objectives. Specific Plan Table 2-C-1 lists TDM and auto demand reduction measures that have been documented and evaluated by planning and research groups that will be implemented by the TMA. Table 2-A-1 in Specific Plan Appendix 2-A lists the Project’s Green Development Program implementation measures, which include verification to the County that, prior 5,000th residential occupancy permit for the Project, the TMA has contracted with one or more public transportation providers to implement systems consisting of low-emissions buses, special charter operations, on-demand car or van services, or other types of transit
to increase public transit ridership and reduce vehicle trips and facilitate community connectivity.

Section 4 of Specific Plan Appendix 2-C requires that the TMA adaptively manage compliance with the internal and external mobility performance standards required by the Project mitigation measures by conducting transit mode surveys and other appropriate monitoring activities. Additional TDM measures will be implemented by the TMA as may be required to achieve the Mobility Plan goals, including the potential use of emerging transportation technologies listed in Table 2-C-2. Transit mode surveys using standard methodologies for assessing trip counts and transit and alternative transportation mode use, and other appropriate monitoring activities will be conducted to verify the effectiveness of the TDM measures. The monitoring and adaptive management process will be a continuing obligation of the TMA to verify compliance with the performance standards described in MM 10-25.

The Specific Plan’s on-site roadway network has been designed to accommodate projected traffic from proposed land uses so as to achieve applicable levels of service requirements. Accordingly, with respect to on-site roadways, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and, therefore, Project impacts on the internal roadway system would be less than significant after mitigation.

With respect to Project impacts to off-site roadways, Project buildout would result in significant traffic impacts on off-site roadways and freeways, including SR-138, I-5 mainline segments and interchange ramps, and arterial roadway intersections. Mitigation measures have been identified for improvements to Caltrans facilities that, if implemented, would reduce Project impacts to acceptable levels, as listed in EIR Table 5.10-31, Mitigation Summary. If improvements at Project access points on SR-138 are not constructed, however, impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The Traffic Mitigation Agreement or the Project Applicant’s fair share contribution requirements in MM 10-3, MMs 10-6 through 10-24 and MMs 10-27 through 10-41 will provide funding for the planning, design, and construction of certain improvements. The MMRP requires the Project Applicant/Developer to enter into the Traffic Mitigation Agreement prior to approval of the Project’s first TTM. MM 10-4 requires the Project Applicant to work to establish a funding program to collect fair share contributions from other projects for the required improvements. In addition, MM 10-20 would protect the right-of-way needed to widen and realign SR-138.

Project mitigation measures require that Project traffic conditions and impacts be analyzed in conjunction with each TTM application. MM 10-2, for example, requires a traffic study prepared by a Traffic Engineer or Civil Engineer licensed in the State of California to the satisfaction of the County be submitted with each TTM application for review by the County. MMs 10-25 and 10-26 require that the Project Applicant confirm that all Specific Plan traffic-related requirements, including the creating and operation of a Transportation Management Agency, the implementation of facilities
and measures that encourage non-automotive transportation, and the implementation of Transportation Demand Management measures, prior to County approval of a TTM. Consequently, Project and local traffic conditions and the need for the implementation of applicable mitigation measures in the MMRP that identify improvements to local and state highway facilities will be evaluated as the Project is developed and TTMAs are submitted for County review and approval. If the Project traffic evaluated in a TTM application deviates significantly from projected levels, the County has the authority deny the approval of any new TTMAs and additional development until Project conditions are verified to be within projected levels, or a new project application, with new CEQA analysis, is reviewed and approved.

As discussed on EIR pages 4-91 to 4-92, while the development of specific future phases and components of the Project will be based on the state of the economy, market demand for uses on the site and the timing of regional and off-site infrastructure, the Project land use approval process required by the Specific Plan, the implementation of the Subdivision Map Act by the County, and the Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ensure that future development will occur in a balanced pattern. As discussed above, Project development may only proceed after County approval of future TTMAs. The TTM review and approval process requires an environmental evaluation to confirm that the Project’s interim buildout (including the interim buildout of different categories of uses) does not cause any new or more significant adverse environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Draft EIR. The MMRP specifically requires that traffic studies be prepared and that Specific Plan transportation measures be confirmed in conjunction with each TTM application. In the event that the Project’s residential development substantially outpaces the proposed onsite employment or commercial land uses, the environmental and traffic analysis required for each TTM would find that Project-related traffic differs from the traffic volumes and patterns considered in the Draft EIR. If these differences are found to generate new or more severe significant impacts, a subsequent EIR, additional public and agency review, and future feasible mitigation to avoid or reduce Project traffic-related impacts under the conditions documented during the TTM review and approval process would be required before any additional development is approved.

Mitigation Measures:

Refer to mitigation measures MM 10-2, MM 10-5, MM 10-7 through MM 10-17, MM 10-25, and MM 10-26, above.

Mitigation Measure 10-1: The Project shall provide internet infrastructure and a community intranet with access for homeowners associations; interest groups; local event scheduling; schools, library, carpool and transit services; and other on-site entertainment and amenities for residential land uses. The internet and intranet will reduce the need for people to use automobile travel to obtain the information that is provided by both. The intranet shall also provide education about greenhouse gas
(GHG) emissions; GHG reduction opportunities; energy and water conservation opportunities; financial incentives (e.g., rebates and low-interest loans) for energy-efficiency improvements; and energy-efficiency technology systems, including those suitable for large commercial and industrial users.

**Mitigation Measure 10-3:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall seek to enter into a Traffic Mitigation Agreement for Land Development Impacts to California State Transportation Facilities by and between the Project Applicant/Developer and Caltrans, and during the term of such agreement shall comply with the terms and conditions thereof. Compliance with the Traffic Mitigation Agreement shall constitute compliance with the mitigation measures for the Project’s traffic impacts on the State highway system. Any required improvements that result from direct Project impacts (i.e., not from cumulative impacts), and are required on Caltrans-owned facilities, shall be implemented through a Traffic Mitigation Agreement. Any required improvements that result from cumulative traffic impacts may be implemented through payment of fair share fees.

**Mitigation Measures 10-4:** The Project Applicant/Developer will work with the County and/or Caltrans to establish a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program or an assessment district (an example of such is the Bridge and Thoroughfare District pursuant to *California Government Code*, Sections 66484 et seq.) or other equivalent program. Such a program or assessment district will mitigate vehicular trips related to new development accessing the SR-138 corridor between I-5 and SR-14 by establishing a fair share contribution from such new development to ensure the SR-138 needed improvements are fully funded. These fees shall be used for the needed improvements and may include the cost of engineering, soils analysis, right-of-way acquisition, demolition, relocation, construction, inspection, and other related expenses.

**Mitigation Measure 10-6 (Supplemental Traffic Study MM-1):** To mitigate the Project’s impacts to SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement to improve SR-138 to a four lane expressway from I-5 to 240th Street West and to a limited access four lane conventional highway from 240th Street West to 190th Street West, with right-of-way reserved for a six-lane expressway between Gorman Post Road and 300th Street West, or comparable improvements consistent with the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

**Mitigation Measure 10-18 (Traffic Study MM-16):** To provide adequate capacity at the I-5/SR-138 interchange, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or
(2) contribute fair share funding toward the following ramp improvement at I-5/SR-138:

- Addition of one auxiliary lane at the connector ramp from westbound SR-138 to southbound I-5 for existing plus Project conditions.

**Mitigation Measure 10-19** *(Traffic Study MM-17 and MM-34):* To provide adequate capacity at The Old Road at I-5 SB Ramps/Sedona intersection, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the addition of a second southbound left-turn lane from The Old Road to the I-5 Southbound On-Ramp.

**Mitigation Measure 10-20** *(Supplemental Traffic Study MM-18):* To mitigate the increase of side-street delay for the existing adjacent off-site areas and for planned on-site side streets along SR-138, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Centennial Transportation Improvement Program (CTIP) or (2) dedicate right-of-way within the project site at each site access location to accommodate the ultimate intersection or interchange configuration to be determined by the Northwest Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative at the following SR-138 intersections:

- Westerly Access
- Central Access
- 300th Street West

**Mitigation Measure 10-21** *(Supplemental Traffic Study MM-22):* To provide adequate on- and off-site capacity to accommodate up to 10 percent of the Project and anticipated cumulative development, the Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for the following SR-138 intersection improvements for site access:

- Westerly Access: Provide one EB left-turn lane, one EB through lane, one EB right-turn lane, one WB left-turn lane, one WB through lane, one WB right-turn lane, one NB left-turn lane, one shared NB through/right lane, one SB left-turn lane, and one shared SB through/right lane. Install traffic signal.

- Central Access: Provide one EB left-turn lane, one EB through lane, one EB right-turn lane, one WB left-turn lane, one WB through lane, one WB right-turn lane, one NB left-turn lane, one NB through lane, one NB right-turn lane, one SB left-turn lane,
one SB through lane, and one SB right-turn lane. Install traffic signal.

- **300th Street West**: Provide one EB left-turn lane, one EB through lane, one EB right-turn lane, one WB left-turn lane, one WB through lane, one WB right-turn lane, one NB left-turn lane, one shared NB through/right lane, one SB left-turn lane, and one shared SB through/right lane. Install traffic signal.

- **190th Street West**: Provide one EB left-turn lane, one EB through lane, one WB through lane, one WB right-turn lane, one SB left-turn lane, and one SB right lane.

**Mitigation Measure 10-22 (Supplemental Traffic Study MM-19)**: To provide adequate on- and off-site capacity to accommodate up to 75 percent of the Project and anticipated cumulative development, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the widening of SR-138, including:

- Addition of one additional lane in each direction (six lane freeway) from I-5 to Gorman Post Road
- Addition of two additional lanes in each direction (six lane expressway) from Gorman Post Road to 300th Street West
- Addition of one additional lane in each direction (four lane expressway) from 300th Street West to 240th Street West
- Addition of one additional lane in each direction (four lane limited access conventional highway) from 240th Street West to the SR-14 interchange.

**Mitigation Measure 10-23 (Supplemental Traffic Study MM-20)**: To provide adequate on- and off-site capacity to accommodate 100 percent of the Project and anticipated cumulative development, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the widening of SR-138, including:

- Addition of a second additional lane in each direction (six lanes total) from 300th Street West to approximately ½ mile east of 250th Street West
- Construct additional intersection turn lanes at the following SR-138 intersections:
  - Westerly Project Access
  - 300th Street West
Mitigation Measure 10-24 *(Traffic Study MM-21 and MM-26)*: To provide adequate capacity to the I-5 mainline freeway, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding towards RTP/SCS improvement projects on SR-58 between I-5 in Kern County and I-15 in San Bernardino County, as verified by the County in consultation with the Kern COG and Caltrans. Improvements could include development of a high capacity goods movement facility along the SR-58 and/or E-220 corridors.

Mitigation Measure 10-27 *(Traffic Study MM-25)*: To provide adequate capacity to the I-5 mainline freeway, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding towards the following planned improvements to I-5:

- I-5 between Lake Hughes and Parker: Addition of one auxiliary lane in each direction.
- I-5 between Parker Road and SR-14: Addition of one HOV or HOT lane in each direction.

Mitigation Measure 10-28 *(Traffic Study MM-27)*: To provide adequate capacity at the I-5/SR-138 interchange, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the following ramp improvement at I-5/SR-138:

- Addition of two auxiliary lanes at the connector ramp from westbound SR-138 to southbound I-5 for cumulative buildout conditions.

Mitigation Measure 10-29 *(Traffic Study MM-28)*: To provide adequate capacity at the I-5/SR-138 interchange, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the following ramp improvement at I-5/SR-138:

- Addition of two auxiliary lanes at the connector ramp mainline before the northbound I-5 to eastbound SR-138 connector ramp.
Mitigation Measure 10-30 (*Traffic Study MM-29*): To provide adequate capacity at the SR-14/SR-138 interchange, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the following ramp improvement at SR-14/SR-138:

- Construction of one auxiliary lane and a second off-ramp lane for the SR-14 northbound off ramp to SR-138.

Mitigation Measure 10-31 (*Traffic Study MM-30*): To provide adequate capacity at the SR-14/SR-138 interchange, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the following ramp improvement at SR-14/SR-138:


Mitigation Measure 10-32 (*Supplemental Traffic Study MM-31*): To provide adequate capacity at the SR-14 SB Ramps and SR-138 interchange, the Project Applicant/Developer shall (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for the reconfiguration of the interchange to include two eastbound through lanes and two westbound through lanes and install a traffic signal or (2) contribute fair share funding for intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

Mitigation Measure 10-33 (*Supplemental Traffic Study MM-32*): To provide adequate capacity at SR-14 NB Ramps and SR-138 interchange, the Project Applicant/Developer shall (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement for the reconfiguration of the interchange to include two eastbound through lanes and two westbound through lanes and a traffic signal or (2) contribute fair share funding for intersection improvements being advanced by Caltrans in the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project preferred alternative.

Mitigation Measure 10-34 (*Traffic Study MM-33*): To provide adequate capacity at Lake Hughes Road at I-NB Ramps intersection, the Project Applicant/Developer shall (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding towards planned improvements to I-5 for the addition of one lane to the northbound off-ramp and restripe the configuration to include one left-turn, one shared left/right-turn lane, and one dedicated right-turn lane.

Mitigation Measure 10-35 (*Traffic Study MM-35*): To provide adequate capacity at the Magic Mountain Parkway at I-5 SB Ramps intersection, the Project
Applicant/Developer shall (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding towards planned improvements to I-5 for the restriping of the southbound off-ramp to provide two left-turn lanes, one shared left-turn/through lane, and one right-turn lane.

**Mitigation Measure 10-36 (Traffic Study MM-36):** To provide adequate capacity at the Magic Mountain Parkway at I-5 NB Ramps intersection, the Project Applicant/Developer shall (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding towards planned improvements to I-5 for the conversion of the shared through/right-turn lane to a shared left/through/right-turn lane.

**Mitigation Measure 10-37 (Traffic Study MM-37):** To provide adequate capacity at the Valencia Road at I-5 SB Ramps intersection, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the striping of a third westbound through lane.

**Mitigation Measure 10-38 (Traffic Study MM-38):** To provide adequate capacity at the Valencia Road at I-5 NB Ramps intersection, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the traffic signal modification to add a northbound right-turn overlap phase.

**Mitigation Measure 10-39 (Traffic Study MM-39):** To provide adequate capacity at the McBean Parkway at I-5 SB Ramps intersection, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward the restriping of the dedicated westbound right-turn lane to a shared through/right-turn lane.

**Mitigation Measure 10-40 (Traffic Study MM-40):** To provide adequate capacity at the Calgrove Road at I-5 SB Ramps intersection, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward adding a second eastbound through lane and a de-facto right-turn lane and a second through lane in the westbound direction.

**Mitigation Measure 10-41 (Traffic Study MM-41):** To provide adequate capacity at the Calgrove Road at I-5 NB Ramps intersection, the Project Applicant/Developer shall either (1) comply with the terms of the Traffic Mitigation Agreement or (2) contribute fair share funding toward restriping to add a westbound de facto right-turn lane.
(3) **Potential Impact:** The Project could conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

**Finding: 3.** There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project site is largely undeveloped and does not have roadways that are part of the CMP highway network. Also, there is no transit system on or near the site. Thus, no on-site impacts would occur. With implementation of the improvements to various Caltrans facilities, as required by MM 10-20 through 10-24 and MMs 10-27 through 10-41, the Project would not conflict with the Los Angeles County and Kern County CMPs and this potential Project impact would be less than significant. However, because the County lacks jurisdiction and control over State highway facilities and cannot mandate the construction of improvements to these facilities, impacts on freeways, arterial roadways, and intersections on the CMP highway network are considered significant and unavoidable. All feasible and reasonable mitigation measures have been implemented to reduce this impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 10-2 and 10-20 through 10-24 and 10-27 through 10-41 above.

(4) **Potential Impact:** The Project could contribute to significant cumulative impacts on transportation.

**Finding: 3.** There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The traffic analysis indicates that, under existing plus Project conditions and 2035 cumulative conditions, the Project would contribute to significant impacts along SR-138 in regards to the percent of time-spent-following between the I-5 and SR-14 interchanges; it would also contribute to increased delay for side street vehicles, traffic signal requirements, and intersection capacity at multiple locations along SR-138 between the westerly access of the Project area and SR-14. Under cumulative conditions, the Project contributes to a significant cumulative impact to the I-5 mainline freeway; the truck lane in between the Grapevine and Fort Tejon Road interchanges; the segment between the SR-138 and Parker Road interchange and the segment from Magic Mountain Parkway to SR-14 interchange. Impacts are shown at
eight intersections at I-5 interchanges when applying the impact criteria of the County of Los Angeles. In addition, at the I-5/SR-138 interchange, the connector ramps from westbound SR-138 to southbound I-5 and from northbound I-5 to eastbound SR-138 are forecasted to exceed 1,500 vehicles per hour under cumulative conditions, which results in the need for an auxiliary lane. At the SR-14/SR-138 interchange, the SR-14 southbound on-ramp would require a second lane on the on-ramp and the SR-14 northbound off-ramp to SR-138 would need an additional lane and an auxiliary lane on the SR-14 mainline.

For 2035 cumulative conditions, the SR-138 was analyzed as a limited access facility with grade-separated interchanges, consistent with the Northwest 138 Corridor Project currently being advanced by Caltrans. The Project would be fully mitigated and all ramp-arterial intersections would operate at a level of service (LOS) B or better. Mitigation measures for impacts to the I-5 and off-site intersections involving fair share contributions to identified improvements would reduce all cumulative traffic impacts to a less than significant level. The proposed Traffic Mitigation Agreement provides a mechanism for the needed transportation improvements to be implemented by providing advance funding for planning, design, and construction of certain improvements and establishing a funding program to collect fair shares for other improvements. With these traffic mitigation assurances, there would not be a significant cumulative impact from Project traffic. However, since the County has no control over State facilities and cannot enforce the construction of the needed improvements within Caltrans’ jurisdiction, if Caltrans does not implement planned and needed improvements, the Project’s incremental contribution to cumulative traffic impacts would cumulatively considerable and this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable. All feasible and reasonable mitigation measures have been implemented to reduce this impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to Mitigation Measures 10-1 to 10-41 above.
I. Visual Resources

(1) **Potential Impact:** The Project could have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features.

**Finding:** 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to a change in visual character experienced from public vantage points (primarily transportation thoroughfares including SR-138, 300th Street West, 290th Street West, and Malinda Avenue). Project implementation would result in a significant change to the visual character of the Project site and its surrounding area by obstructing some views of the local foothills and the Tehachapi Mountains and by changing the Project site’s condition from rural to urban. Visual character impacts related to grading and development of the Project would be reduced through implementation of MM 7-13, MM 13-1, MM 13-2, and MM 13-3, which require the preservation of prominent rock outcroppings, the implementation of Green Development Program requirements to minimize aesthetic impacts, relocation or undergrounding of certain utility lines, and implementation of a landscaping plan; however, the change of the Project site from a rural to urban condition and the varying degrees of obstruction of existing views of local foothills and the Tehachapi Mountains would be considered a significant unavoidable impact, for which there is no additional feasible mitigation.

**Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure 13-1:** The Project’s plans and specifications shall demonstrate the implementation of measures to preserve existing rock outcroppings that are visible from off-site locations along the SR-138. In addition, the County shall review all final development plans (e.g., landscape, lighting, architectural plans)—as provided by the Project Applicant/Developer—to ensure that the development standards for each land use have been implemented to minimize the visual alteration of the site and to create an aesthetically pleasing development.

**Mitigation Measure 13-2:** Project shall implement the following components of the Green Development Program to minimize potentially adverse visual impacts:

- Site the highest density residential uses in areas adjacent to commercial centers and permit residential uses in commercial centers through the Mixed Use Overlay to place larger
populations within key centers, encouraging pedestrian activity and a reduction in vehicle trips.

- Preserve oak woodlands, savannas, and other sensitive habitat areas near Oso Canyon and at the foot of the San Gabriel Mountains southerly of SR-138.

- Exterior lighting shall not cause unacceptable light trespass and shall be fully shielded.

- Outdoor lighting shall be turned off using automatic control devices or systems between the hours of 10:00 PM and sunrise of the following day in commercial, business park, and mixed use areas, unless required by the County Building Code. If the property operates beyond 10:00 PM, then outdoor lighting shall be turned off 1 hour after the operation ends for the day.

- Outdoor lighting for safety and security reasons is allowed after 10:00 PM only if fully shielded motion sensors are used to turn off lighting after 10:00 PM and the sensors turn the lighting off automatically no more than 10 minutes after the area is vacated or at least 50 percent of the total lumen levels are reduced or 50 percent of the total outdoor light fixtures are turned off between 10:00 PM and sunrise.

- Outdoor lighting in residential and open space areas that are over 15 feet in height shall have an output no greater than 400 lumens.

- The maximum height of outdoor lighting fixtures shall be:
  - 20 feet in Residential and Open Space areas
  - 30 feet in Commercial, Mixed Use, and Public areas
  - 35 feet in Business Park areas

- Prohibit the use of outdoor lighting that includes drop-down lenses, mercury vapor lights, ultraviolet lights, search lights, laser lights and any outdoor lighting that flashes, blinks, alternates or moves unless mandated for health and safety reasons by a public agency.

- Outdoor light fixtures in outdoor recreational areas shall be mounted, aimed, and fully shielded so that light beams fall onto activity areas and no unacceptable light trespass occurs on surrounding areas or properties. Outdoor lighting shall only provide the minimum necessary to illuminate recreational activities areas and shall be no more than 75 feet high. Preferably, these fixtures shall also use high pressure sodium or metal halide lamps.
• Outdoor advertising signs, business signs and roof and freestanding signs that are lighted shall be fully shielded. Externally mounted light fixtures shall be mounted on the top of the sign and shall be oriented downward. Externally mounted bulbs or lighting tubes for signs shall not be visible from adjoining properties or public rights-of-way, unless such bulbs or tubes are filled with neon, argon, krypton or other self-illuminating substance.

**Mitigation Measure 13-3:** The existing off-site 66 kV electric lines that extend from SR-138 beginning at approximately the Old Ridge Route to 290th Street West, shall be relocated south of the Business Park area or may be placed underground.

**Mitigation Measure 7-13:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall develop a Landscaping Plan for review and approval by the County Biologist. The Landscaping Plan shall be (1) prepared by a qualified biologist; (2) submitted to the County for approval with each tentative map; (3) provided to builders; (4) provided to future project occupants as described in the Specific Plan; and (5) includes a plant palette composed of non-invasive species that are adapted to the conditions found on the Project site and do not require high irrigation rates. The Landscaping Plan will also include a list of invasive plant species prohibited from being planted on the Project site. In addition, retail sales of these invasive plant species will be prohibited at any businesses (nurseries) located within the Project site. Landscape plans shall encourage planting of local natives typical of native vegetation within ten miles of the Project site.

The Homeowners Association shall supply future residents of the Project site with the list of invasive plant species from the Landscaping Plan that will be prohibited from being planted on the Project site and educational materials that emphasize the importance of adhering to the list. The prohibition shall be clearly described and distributed to homebuyers through their home purchase contacts and CC&Rs. A list of local native plants and educational materials shall be provided to homeowners and shall be posted on the community intranet.

(2) **Potential Impact:** Project operations would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

**Finding 3:** There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.
Facts in Support of Finding

Since the Project site is in an undeveloped area with few existing light sources, operation of the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts by introducing new sources of daytime and nighttime light and glare into the area. Project development would create new sources of light and glare such as the illumination of on-site structures, such as residential structures, industrial lots, and commercial uses; recreational uses (i.e., signage, interior and exterior lighting); street and vehicle lights; lighting associated with commercial, industrial, and other business uses including security lighting, exterior lighting, parking lot lighting, and lighted signs; and glare (indirect reflected light) such as reflection off glass windows and other reflective materials on structures, automobiles, and trucks. Nighttime sources of light would include streetlights, vehicle headlights, and lights used within and around buildings, parking lots, parks, and walking paths located throughout the Project site. Project implementation would cause a new source of sky glow. Although implementation MM 13-2 and MM 13-6 would reduce this impact by ensuring that the Project is developed and operating in accordance with a detailed lighting plan that requires implementation of measures to reduce light and glare impacts, and by requiring implementation of those aspects of the Specific Plan’s Green Development Program that restrict the type, location and orientation of Project lighting to minimize land and glare impacts, these mitigation measures would not reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Accordingly, operation of the Project would cause a significant and unavoidable impact regarding light and glare, even with implementation of feasible and reasonable mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure 13-2 above.

Mitigation Measure 13-6: An Exterior Lighting Plan shall be prepared in coordination with a qualified Biologist, be reviewed by an Electrical Engineer who is registered in the State of California, and then approved by the County prior to the submittal of each building permit. The Lighting Plan shall apply to all proposed structures and for development areas that border natural open space resources.

The Lighting Plan shall be consistent with County Rural Outdoor Lighting District requirements for the Antelope Valley and shall provide guidelines for the outdoor lighting to be used throughout the Project site. Final lighting orientation and design shall be approved by the County.

The Lighting Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. All lighting within 300 feet of natural open space areas shall only be implemented where needed for safety and shall be directed away from these areas and shielded so that light is not directed into open space and riparian areas. Where possible,
these safety lights shall be motion sensor activated with infrared light sensors to prevent daytime lighting.

b. Mercury vapor and halide lighting shall not be used on the perimeter of the developed areas or adjacent to designated open space.

c. Illumination levels should be compatible with the character and use of surrounding development as determined by national lighting organizations. The Illuminating Engineering Society of North America publishes recommendations for the lighting industry that include illumination levels for outdoor lighting.

d. Low-pressure sodium lighting fixtures or flashing lights shall not be used except in emergency situations.

e. Exterior lighting standards and fixtures shall be located and designed to minimize direct glare beyond the site boundaries. Lighting shall be fully shielded and directed downwards to confine light spread solely within necessary locations. Illumination or glare from the exterior lighting system onto adjacent properties or streets should be minimized.

f. Security lighting fixtures shall not project above the roof line of the building on which they are mounted.

g. Where applicable, time-control devices shall be utilized on exterior lighting sources.

h. Street, parking lot, and structural lighting fixtures shall provide adequate illumination for safety and comfort of vehicular and pedestrian traffic while minimizing light spillover.

**Mitigation Measure 7-13:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall develop a Landscaping Plan for review and approval by the County Biologist. The Landscaping Plan shall be (1) prepared by a qualified biologist; (2) submitted to the County for approval with each tentative map; (3) provided to builders; (4) provided to future project occupants as described in the Specific Plan; and (5) includes a plant palette composed of non-invasive species that are adapted to the conditions found on the Project site and do not require high irrigation rates. The Landscaping Plan will also include a list of invasive plant species prohibited from being planted on the Project site. In addition, retail sales of these invasive plant species will be prohibited at any businesses (nurseries) located within the Project site. Landscape plans shall encourage planting of local natives typical of native vegetation within ten miles of the Project site.

The Homeowners Association shall supply future residents of the Project site with the list of invasive plant species from the Landscaping
Plan that will be prohibited from being planted on the Project site and educational materials that emphasize the importance of adhering to the list. The prohibition shall be clearly described and distributed to home buyers through their home purchase contacts and CC&Rs. A list of local native plants and educational materials shall be provided to homeowners and shall be posted on the community intranet.

(3) **Potential Impact:** The Project could contribute to significant cumulative visual impacts.

**Finding:** 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Facts in Support of Finding**

The geographic context for cumulative visual impacts generally encompasses the site and adjacent areas that share viewsheds or lines of sight with the site, as provided by open expanses of open land, agricultural land, and low density developments in the Antelope Valley and distant views of the foothills and ridgelines of the Tehachapi and San Gabriel Mountains. The cumulative impacts on visual resources from the Project and related projects in the area would be expected with new development throughout the site and surrounding areas. The construction of new structures and associated infrastructure would lead to visual changes that could be cumulatively considerable when assessed in combination with growth and development that would be visible to area residents, employees, visitors, and passing motorists. This growth and development may not necessarily be adverse to the visual character of the area, since development would occur in areas planned for development (such as EOAs in the Antelope Valley and City centers) and other areas are protected as permanent open space or designated as rural preserve areas. In addition, applicable design standards (including those contained in the *Centennial Specific Plan*) and the design review process for individual developments would ensure the construction of aesthetically pleasing developments in the area. Mountain and hillside views are expected to remain visible to public views, as a large portion of these areas have been or would be preserved as permanent open space or would support limited development. Hillside management and scenic resource regulations would limit development in the hillsides and areas with scenic resources. However, the Project would develop a community in a largely undeveloped area, and the accompanying visual change is considered significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation. While the related projects would not all be visible in the same viewsheds as the Project, visual changes in the surrounding areas that would result from continued development would contribute to the Project’s impact. Thus, cumulative impacts on visual resources would be significant and unavoidable.

There are limited light and glare sources in the area. Although the Project would include preparation of an Exterior Lighting Plan (also referred to as “the Dark Sky
Plan”) to minimize glare and limit light spillover, Project implementation would introduce development at a scale that would result in significant increases in lighting levels. The related projects would also increase lighting levels at individual development sites. While these related projects would not be located adjacent to the site, increases in ambient lighting levels would occur throughout the Project area. Regulations that prevent glare and light spillover into adjacent properties, including Specific Plan design standards and guidelines, would reduce impacts, but increases in sky glow are expected to occur. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. This Project’s incremental contribution to this significant impact would be cumulatively considerable, even with implementation of feasible and reasonable mitigation. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 13-1 to 13-6 and 7-13 above.

J. Water Resources

(1) Potential Impact: The Project will contribute to significant cumulative regional water supply impacts in the Antelope Valley region.

Finding: 3. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The County hereby makes Finding 3 and determines that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project has sufficient supplies to meet demand, Project-level impacts to water supply would be less than significant with mitigation, and the Project would result in an increment of regional growth that incorporates state of the art water use and conservation measures that would reduce per capita demand below existing levels. However, these conservation and efficiency measures would reduce but not eliminate the cumulative regional water supply impacts identified in the AVAP and General Plan EIRs. As determined during the AVAP and General Plan update CEQA review process, assuming buildout of the AVAP and General Plan in the Antelope Valley, regional water demands could exceed existing and planned supplies under post-2035 conditions. Accordingly, cumulative impacts to water supply are considered significant and unavoidable, and the Project’s incremental contribution to this cumulative impact is considered cumulatively considerable. CEQA requires that all feasible and reasonable mitigation be applied to reduce the Project’s impacts to water supply. Implementation of MM 18-1 and MM 18-2 described above, will reduce the effects of the Project on cumulative water supply to the greatest extent possible. Despite these mitigation measures, however, the Project’s incremental contribution to this impact will be cumulatively considerable and will result in significant cumulative impacts to water supply. There are no feasible and reasonable mitigation
measures that will prevent the Project from impacting water supply. Thus, the Project’s cumulative water supply impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measures 18-1 to 18-2 above.

7. FINDINGS CONCERNING CERTAIN RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES NOT INCLUDED IN MMRP

During the EIR’s public review process, various commenters recommended certain mitigation measures or revisions thereto, most of which were incorporated into the Final EIR, as explained in Responses to Comments, are included in the MMRP. With respect to those specific mitigation measures suggested in public comments and which were not incorporated into the Final EIR and are not included in the MMRP, the Board of Supervisors finds as follows:

Reflective Cool Roofs: To reduce Project impacts on certain soaring avian species, one commenter suggested a mitigation measure requiring the use of so-called “cool roofs” to minimize updrafts that could attract soaring boards (see EIR Comment A.3-8). The EIR identified mitigation measures to reduce impacts on wildlife, including birds, to a less than significant level. The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that other mitigation has been identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, and because the proposed measure would not be effective in mitigating a significant Project impact or provide substantial additional mitigation beyond the measures identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP, and for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment A.3-8.

Mitigation for Loss of Burrowing Owl Habitat: One commenter recommended mitigation for the loss of burrowing owl habitat that might be caused by the Project (see EIR Comment B.4-25). The EIR identified mitigation measures to reduce impacts on wildlife, including burrowing owl, to a less than significant level and determined that the Project’s impact on burrowing owl habitat would be less than significant. The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that the Project would not have a significant impact on burrowing owl habitat, other mitigation has been identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP to reduce Project impact on individual burrowing owls to a less than significant level, and because the proposed mitigation would not be effective in mitigating a significant Project impact or provide substantial additional mitigation beyond measures identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP, and for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment B.4-25.

Aqueduct Crossing Enhancements for Pronghorn Sheep. To reduce Project impacts on pronghorn sheep migration patterns, one commenter recommend mitigation measures to enhance California Aqueduct crossing locations (see EIR Comment B.4-26). The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that other mitigation has been identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, and because the proposed measure would not be effective in mitigating a
significant Project impact or provide substantial additional mitigation beyond the measures identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP, and for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment B.4-36.

**Bear-Proof Trash Cans.** To reduce urban wildlife conflicts that could result in mortality to bears and other wildlife species, one commenter recommended mitigation requiring the Project's use of bear-proof trash cans at all individual homes (see EIR Comment B.4-53). The EIR identified other mitigation measures to reduce impacts on wildlife, including bears, to a less than significant level, which are included in the MMRP. The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that other mitigation has been identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, and because the proposed measure would not be effective in mitigating a significant Project impact or provide substantial additional mitigation beyond the measures identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP, and for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment B.4-53.

**Use of Materials that Do Not Require Paint.** To reduce Project emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), one commenter recommended a mitigation measure requiring the Project to use materials that do not require paint (see EIR Comment F.2-3). The EIR identified all feasible measures to reduce Project impacts related to VOC emissions and the Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation measure on the basis that it is infeasible for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.2-3 and because the proposed measure could exacerbate the Project’s significant impacts related to visual resources (as also discussed in Response to Comment F.2-3).

**Tenting Construction Areas.** To reduce the Project’s impacts related to Valley Fever, one commenter suggested a mitigation measure requiring the Project to enclose construction areas in a mesh tent (see EIR Comment F.3-30). The EIR identified mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to Valley Fever to a less than significant level, which are included in the MMRP. The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that it is infeasible, other mitigation has been identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, and because the proposed measure would not be effective in mitigating a significant Project impact or provide substantial additional mitigation beyond the measures identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP, and for the reasons set forth in Responses to Comment B.4-53 and F.3A-43.

**Valley Fever Soils Testing.** To reduce the Project’s impacts related to Valley Fever, one commenter suggested a mitigation measure requiring the Project to undertake mandatory valley soil testing for Valley Fever spores (see EIR Comments F.3A-43 and ADD-F.13-9). The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that it is infeasible, other mitigation has been identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, and because the proposed measure would not be effective in mitigating a significant Project impact or provide substantial additional mitigation beyond the measures identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP, and for the reasons set forth in Responses to Comment F.3A-43 and ADD-F.13-9.
Valley Fever Medical Cost Endowment. To reduce the Project’s impacts related to Valley Fever, one commenter suggested a mitigation measure requiring the Project to establish an endowment to cover the medical costs of people who contract Valley Fever (see EIR Comment F.3A-43). The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that other mitigation has been identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, and because the proposed measure would not be effective in mitigating a significant Project impact or provide substantial additional mitigation beyond the measures identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP, and for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.3A-43.

Fair Share Contribution for Repair of the Ridge Route. To reduce Project impacts on Interstate 5, one commenter suggested a mitigation measure requiring the Project to make a “fair share” contribution for the repair of the Ridge Route roadway constructed prior to, and located generally to the east of, Interstate 4 extending from the community of Castaic north to State Route 137 (see EIR Comment F.3-38). The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that it is infeasible for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.3-38.

Requiring Notice To Homebuyers of Proximity to Seismic Hazard Zone. To reduce Project impacts related to seismic hazards, one commenter suggested a mitigation measure requiring sellers of lots and homes to notify purchasers and new homeowners of the location of certain earthquake faults (see EIR Comment F.3-39). The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that other mitigation has been identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, and because the proposed measure would not be effective in mitigating a significant Project impact or provide substantial additional mitigation beyond the measures identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP, and because functionally equivalent disclosures are already required by applicable law, and for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.3-39.

Goods Transport by Rail. To reduce the Project impacts on climate change, one commenter suggested mitigation requiring the Project to construct a spur at nonresidential uses to permit the use of nearby rail for goods movement (see EIR Comment F.8-204). The EIR identified all feasible measures to reduce Project impacts related to climate change and the Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation measure on the basis that there are no rail facilities proximate to the Project and it is infeasible for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.8-204.

Install Green Roofs. To reduce the Project impacts on climate change, one commenter suggested mitigation requiring the installation of so-called “green roofs” (see EIR Comment F.8-204). The EIR identified all feasible measures to reduce Project impacts related to climate change and the Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation measure on the basis that it would conflict with Project’s commitment to maximizing on-site generation of solar photovoltaic power and it is infeasible for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.8-204, and because the use of green roofs in an arid climate would require extensive maintenance that could exacerbate the Project’s impact on water resources.
**Schools Design that Meets CHPS Best Practices.** To reduce the Project impacts on climate change, one commenter suggested mitigation requiring that schools constructed on the Project site meet the Collaborative for High Performance Schools (CHPS) best practices (see EIR Comment F.8-204). The EIR identified all feasible measures to reduce Project impacts related to climate change and the Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation measure on the basis that on-site school construction is under the jurisdiction of affected school districts and not the County or Project Developer Applicant and because it is infeasible for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.8-204.

**Rainwater Collection Systems.** To reduce the Project impacts on climate change, one commenter suggested mitigation requiring the installation of rainwater collection systems in residential and commercial buildings (see EIR Comment F.8-204). The EIR identified all feasible measures to reduce Project impacts related to climate change and the Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation measure on the basis that such systems would interfere with the use of reclaimed water as part of the Centennial Wastewater Management Plan and the desirable, natural drainage that would recharge groundwater, and because it is infeasible for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.8-204.

**Zero Net GHG Emissions.** To reduce the Project impacts on climate change, one commenter suggested mitigation requiring that the Project achieve zero net GHG emissions (see EIR Comment F.8-204). The EIR identified all feasible measures to reduce Project impacts related to climate change and the Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation measure on the basis that it is infeasible for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.8-204.

**Expand Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve.** To reduce Project impacts on wildflower species, one commenter suggest mitigation requiring the Project to provide for the expansion of the Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve (see EIR Comment RPC-13). The EIR identified mitigation measures to reduce impacts to wildflowers a less that significant level. The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the proposed mitigation on the basis that mitigation has been identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP to reduce Project impact on wildflowers to a less than significant level, because the Project is not expected to have any impact on the Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve, and because the proposed mitigation would not be effective in mitigating a significant Project impact or provide substantial additional mitigation beyond measures identified in the EIR and included in the MMRP, and for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment RPC-13.
8. FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. The concept of “feasibility” encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (City of Del Mar); Sierra Club v. County of Napa (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509 [court upholds CEQA findings rejecting alternatives in reliance on applicant’s project objectives]; see also California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 (CNPS) [“an alternative ‘may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives as long as the finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record’”] (quoting Kostka & Zischke, Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act [Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed. 2009] (Kostka), § 17.39, p. 825); In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166 (Bay-Delta) [“[i]n the CALFED program, feasibility is strongly linked to achievement of each of the primary project objectives”; “a lead agency may structure its EIR alternative analysis around a reasonable definition of underlying purpose and need not study alternatives that cannot achieve that basic goal”].] Moreover, “‘feasibility’ under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.” (City of Del Mar, supra, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; see also CNPS, supra, 177 Cal.App.4th at p. 1001 [“an alternative that ‘is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint’ may be rejected as infeasible”] [quoting Kostka, supra, § 17.29, p. 824]; San Diego Citizenry Group v. County of San Diego (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 1, 17.)

Where an alternatives analysis is required, CEQA requires evaluations of alternatives that can reduce the significance of identified Project impacts that will not be avoided or substantially lessened by mitigation measures and can "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project." Thus, overall Project objectives were considered by this County in evaluating the alternatives.

The EIR’s range of alternatives was selected in the context of recent regional and County planning efforts to address projected population growth and housing needs in a manner that will also achieve regional greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction target established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in accordance with Senate Bill SB 375. At the regional level, the EIR’s range of alternatives is informed by the Regional Transpiration Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) adopted by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) pursuant to SB 375. At the County level, the EIR’s range of alternatives is informed by the community vision embodied in the Antelope Valley Area Plan, which was designed to be consistent with, and to implement, the RTP/SCS, as it applies to the Antelope Valley planning area and the Project site.

In adopting the AVAP, the County has established its preferred land use pattern for the overall Antelope Valley. The heart of the AVAP is its Rural Preservation Strategy, which focuses the majority of project growth within three designated Economic Opportunity Areas.
(EOAs) in order to preserve the rural character of the balance of the Antelope Valley. Having determined where future growth is best suited to occur within the Antelope Valley, the Centennial Project EIR describes a set of project objectives for the Centennial Project that would ensure implementation of the AVAP’s broader planning vision for the West EOA, as follows:

- Implement the Antelope Valley Area Plan (AVAP) by creating an environmentally and economically sustainable master-planned community on the Project site to help accommodate planned regional population and economic growth within the West EOA;
- Design the Project to maximize efficient utilization of regional infrastructure while preserving thousands of acres of contiguous natural open space and important biological resources;
- Size the Project to include a broad range of employment, residential, institutional, and recreational land uses to encourage walkability and wellness, while reducing off-site employment-related commuter trips;
- Ensure that all Project site infrastructure and public services are funded by the Project to avoid creating any financial obligations on existing residents and other taxpayers; and
- Integrate a multi-modal transportation network, renewable energy, water conservation, community wellness, and other green development features into the Project’s designs, buildout, and ongoing operations.

Thus, the Centennial EIR presents a reasonable range of potentially feasible on-site and off-site alternatives to the Project that would reduce and/or avoid some of the Project’s potentially significant environmental effects while achieving most of the project objectives listed above. The selected alternatives promote informed decision making and public participation by providing for consideration a range of alternative land use patterns and siting options that will reduce and/or avoid some of the Project’s significant environmental effects and attain most of the Project objectives. The following findings and brief explanation of the rationale for the findings regarding Project alternatives identified in the EIR are set forth to comply with the requirements of Section 15091(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

The consideration of alternatives is an integral component of the CEQA process. The selection and evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives provides the public and decision-makers with information on ways to avoid or lessen environmental impacts created by a proposed project. When selecting alternatives for evaluation, CEQA requires alternatives that meet most of the basic objectives of the Project, while avoiding or substantially lessening the Project’s significant effects.
Six alternatives to the Project were defined and analyzed:

A. **Alternative A: No Project**

**Facts in Support of Finding:** As required by CEQA Guideline §15126.6, this chapter describes and analyzes a “no project” alternative for the purpose of comparing the impacts of approving the Project with the impacts of not approving the Project. Alternative A, the “No Project” alternative, thus assumes that the Project’s proposed specific plan and related entitlements will not be approved. Alternative A further assumes that existing cattle grazing and agricultural land uses would remain, and that no new development would occur on the Project site.

Because Alternative A would not involve new development on the Project site, this alternative would have no impacts with respect to: geotechnical impacts; hydrology; hazardous materials; water quality; agricultural resources; mineral resources; cultural and tribal resources; biological resources; traffic and circulation; air resources; land use and planning; noise; visual resources; parks and recreation; population, housing and employment; education resources; fire and law enforcement services; other public services (e.g., library services, solid waste management, public facilities); water resources; wastewater generation and treatment; dry utilities; climate change. Since Alternative A would not involve any development on the Project site, the potential for wildland fire within the Project site would be greater as compared to the Project because no fire prevention program would be in place, though the risk of injury to persons or damage to structures from wildland fires would be less than the Project under Alternative A. Accordingly, on balance, implementation of Alternative A would result in fewer impacts compared to the Project, and Alternative A would avoid all of the significant and unavoidable impacts that have the potential to occur if the Project is implemented.

In sum, Alternative A would reduce or avoid the Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts, but it would not achieve most of the Project objectives, including its basic objective. The Project’s basic objective is to implement the AVAP by creating an environmentally and economically sustainable master-planned community on the Project site to help accommodate planned regional population and economic growth within the West EOA. Alternative A, however, proposes no development on the Project site and thus would not further regional and County planning efforts to provide needed housing to accommodate projected population growth in a location consistent with the RTP/SCS balanced land use plan and the AVAP’s Rural Preservation Strategy, nor would it create any long-term employment opportunities to serve the employment demands associated with such population growth. Nor would Alternative A provide for a green-development project designed to maximize the efficient utilization of regional infrastructure, integrate a multi-modal transportation network, provide renewable energy, or provide a broad range of employment, residential, institutional land uses that would reduce employment-related commuter trips.

**Finding:** The EIR, including Section 8.0 of the Draft EIR, contains facts and analysis supporting the Finding, some of which are set forth here. Under Alternative A, the Project’s
proposed specific plan and related entitlements will not be approved, existing cattle grazing and agricultural land uses would remain, and no new development would occur on the Project site. On balance, Alternative A would have fewer adverse environmental effects than the proposed Project and would avoid all of the Project’s significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. However, Alternative A would not achieve most of the Project objectives and is therefore rejected by the Board of Supervisors as infeasible.

B. Alternative B: Previously Approved Project Alternative

**Facts in Support of Finding:** An application for the Centennial project was formally submitted to the County in 2003 and over time the applicant modified the project design in response to concerns expressed by the County, other agencies, and members of the public regarding the potential impacts associated with the conceptual land use plan described in the 2003 application.

Alternative B, the Previously Proposed Project alternative, is based on the 2003 land use plan as depicted in EIR Exhibit 8-1. The proposed Project’s land use plan is depicted on EIR Exhibit 4-1 and it reflects the applicant’s revisions to the 2003 land use plan. The Project’s land use plan expands the Project site boundary, as compared to Alternative B’s 2003 land use plan, by including additional property on the east side of the Project site. This boundary expansion thus increases the overall acreage of the Project site from 11,676 acres (Alternative B) to 12,323 acres (proposed Project), as shown on EIR Table 8-1.

Alternative B would, if implemented, allow for the development of a maximum of 22,998 dwelling units on approximately 3,982.5 acres; approximately 12,233,390 square feet (sf) of employment-generating uses (office, research and development, and warehousing or light manufacturing uses) on approximately 702.1 acres; and approximately 1,986,336 sf of retail-serving centers on approximately 182.4 acres. Under Alternative B, proposed sites for civic and institutional land uses, such as schools, fire and police stations, transit centers, or a library would cover approximately 943.3 acres. Approximately 1,917.5 acres (approximately 16.42 percent) of the 11,676-acre site was proposed for active and passive recreational use (in the form of parks, commercial recreation, greenways, and slopes) and 3,829.1 acres (approximately 32.79 percent of the site) as natural open space. Alternative B also includes vehicular and non-vehicular circulation systems and proposed improvements to SR-138, Gorman Post Road, and 300th Street West.

Although the overall acreage included in Alternative B’s project site boundary is less than the acreage included in the proposed Project’s site boundary, the proposed Project reduces the overall development footprint (i.e., developed hardscape and graded open space) within the site boundary as compared to the 2003 land use plan (Alternative B), as shown on EIR Table 8-1. First, land designated for development of public rights of way (e.g., roads, greenways, internal slopes) is reduced from 2,036.7 acres (Alternative B) to 327 acres (proposed Project). Second, land designated for development of civic and institutional uses (e.g., schools, golf courses, parks, and utilities) is reduced from 943.3 acres (Alternative B) to 686 acres (proposed Project). Third, land designated for development of non-residential uses (e.g., commercial uses, business parks, employment uses) is reduced from 884.5 acres
(Alternative B) to 699 acres (proposed Project). Fourth, open spaces uses are increased from 3,829 acres (Alternative B) to 5,624 acres (proposed Project). As compared to the 2003 land use plan, the proposed Project would increase the amount of land designated for development of residential uses from 3,982.5 acres (Alternative B) to 4,987 acres (proposed Project), but the proposed Project would reduce the number of residential units by 3,665, as compared to Alternative B. Taken together, the proposed Project would have a total development footprint of 7,207 acres, whereas as Alternative B would have a total development footprint of 7,847 acres, as shown on revised Table 8-1. Thus, Alternative B would have a greater development intensity and would increase project site’s overall development footprint by approximately 640 acres, as compared to the proposed Project.

On balance, implementation of Alternative B would result in greater impacts compared to the proposed Project due to an increased intensity of development. Thus, none of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project would be reduced by this Alternative. Alternative B would result in greater impacts on all issue areas, except for Agriculture Resources. Due to the exclusion of farmlands east of 300th Street West from the Project site boundaries, this Alternative would decrease the amount of farmland that would be converted to urban uses. The Project is proposed with the objective of creating a self-contained, self-sustaining community in which people could live and work in the same community. Implementation of this Alternative would fully support this underlying goal and achieve most of the Project objectives; however, there would be greater impacts associated with the increased development under this Alternative. In addition, no significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project would be avoided, and there would be a new significant and unavoidable direct impact to water supplies.

Finding: The EIR, including Section 8.0 of the Draft EIR, and the balance of the administrative record contains facts and analysis supporting the Finding, some of which are set forth here. Implementation of Alternative B would achieve most of the Project objectives; however, there would be greater impacts associated with the increased development under this Alternative. In addition, no significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project would be avoided, and Alternative B would cause a new significant and unavoidable direct impact to water supplies. Accordingly, Alternative B is hereby rejected by the Board of Supervisors as infeasible on the basis of environmental and other considerations described above.

C. Alternative C: Additional Drainage Avoidance Alternative

Facts in Support of Finding: Under Alternative C, the Additional Drainage Avoidance Alternative, the Centennial project’s development footprint would be reduced by 37 acres to avoid certain drainages on the project site that are not being preserved as natural open space by the proposed Project. Specifically, Alternative C would reduce the project’s impact footprint to avoid some of the tributaries to Oso Canyon and the drainage channel running north and roughly parallel to SR-138 on the project site. As depicted on EIR Exhibit 8-4, under Alternative C, the impact avoidance areas would include the following: two locations in the Project’s proposed business park area south of SR-138 (one location west of 300th Street West and the other location east of Old Ridge Route); the proposed Project’s residential areas north of SR-138 and east of the proposed Project’s Institutional/Civic area;
a business park area north of SR-138 and west of the proposed Project’s Institutional/Civic area; a residential area that the Project proposes north of SR-138 near National Cement Road; residential areas that the Project proposes north of SR-138 and east and west of the main entry driveway to the site; and residential areas that the Project proposes west of the California Aqueduct. These areas cover approximately 37 acres that would not be developed under Alternative C and instead would be preserved as open space.

The main benefit of Alternative C is that it would reduce impacts to jurisdictional drainages. Jurisdictional drainages are ecologically important as they indirectly function as wildlife movement corridors, among other important ecological functions. This alternative focuses primarily on reducing impacts to drainages or wetlands with high habitat value (according to the Functional Assessment) or drainages containing connectivity with other large or high value drainages. This Alternative would reduce impacts to jurisdictional drainages by 8 acres, and would have an overall reduction on the Project impact footprint by 37 acres. Alternative C would provide 0.5 percent fewer dwelling units (92 units less) and 2 percent fewer employment-generating uses (198,634 sf/0.2 msf), as compared to the proposed Project.

Alternative C’s impacts related to air quality, libraries, parks and recreation, education, noise, cultural geotechnical resources, hydrology and flood, hazards and hazardous materials, fire safety, fire and law enforcement, dry utilities, county services, wastewater, parks and recreation, and water quality would be similar or, due to its reduced development footprint, somewhat reduced as compared to the Project, but, like the Project, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation. Like the Project, Alternative C would not result in significant impacts to mineral resources or forest resources. Alternative C is consistent with the land use designations for the site, as contained in the AVAP and would require the same land use approvals as the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, this Alternative would not disrupt or divide a community, and would allow for development to meet the future housing and employment needs in Los Angeles County, although with slightly less dwelling units and non-residential development than the Project, and is therefore consistent with regional planning efforts. As with the proposed Project, an amendment to the AVAP Highway Plan, a zone change, and CUPs would be required under this Alternative. Impacts would be similar to the Project under this Alternative.

Alternative C would have a lower residential population than the proposed Project, and thus, less potential to induce growth in the surrounding area, though, like the Project, it would still have a significant and unavoidable growth inducing impact. Also, slightly fewer affordable housing units would be provided on-site under Alternative C, and this alternative would create less demand for long-term employment opportunities when compared to the proposed Project. Neither the proposed Project nor this Alternative would exceed approved population projections. As with the proposed Project, less than significant impacts would result with respect to conformity with population projections, but a significant and unavoidable impact would result based on the substantial growth on the Project site relative to the existing setting. Displacement of housing would be less than significant, as with the proposed Project.
Alternative C reduces impacts to a number of associated functions including local wildlife movement, riparian corridor connectivity, open space connectivity, and habitat of common and special status plant and wildlife species associated with these areas. In addition, the open space preserve is larger than the proposed Project. This Alternative would result in 92 fewer dwelling units and a reduction of 198,634 sf of employment-generating land uses. Therefore, the associated population decrease and indirect impacts (e.g., light and glare; domestic pets; introduction of non-native plants and wildlife) would be incrementally decreased. Potentially significant direct impacts to biological resources from grading and ground disturbance would still include special status species, riparian communities, wetlands, and wildlife movement. All of these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels after mitigation under both the proposed Project and this Alternative. No direct significant and unavoidable biological impacts related to these thresholds for Alternative C would remain after mitigation. However, like the proposed Project, Alternative C would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to grasslands and wildlife movement. This Alternative would result in similar impacts to oak woodlands and oak trees. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in no impact related to habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans.

As with the proposed Project, impacts related to emergency access and traffic hazards can be mitigated and impacts on air traffic would be less than significant under Alternative C. No conflict with alternative transportation policies would occur under this alternative, similar to the Project. Since Alternative C provides fewer dwelling units and employment generating uses than the Project, it would result in decreased off-site vehicle trips. Because Alternative C would have lower off-site trip generation levels, impacts to freeway mainline segments, freeway ramps, and arterial highway intersections would be less. However, significant impacts to the existing transportation system and CMP highways would still occur under this Alternative. Payment of fair share fees for improvements to Caltrans facilities would be made as mitigation for the impacts of this Alternative, but it is outside the County’s control to implement these improvements. Thus, if Caltrans does not construct the necessary improvements, impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the Project.

**Finding:** The EIR, including Section 8.0 of the Draft EIR, and the balance of the administrative record contains facts and analysis supporting the Finding, some of which are set forth here. The Project is proposed with the objective of creating a self-contained, self-sustaining community in which people could live and work in the same community. Implementation of Alternative C would fully support this underlying goal; however, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality, agriculture resources, noise, population and growth-inducing impacts, traffic, climate change, visual resources, water supply, and solid waste would still occur under this Alternative, similar to the Project. As discussed above, Alternative C would slightly reduce but not avoid any of the Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts, and while it reduce impacts to jurisdictional drainages by 8 acres it would also provide 0.5 percent fewer dwelling units (92 units less) and 2 percent fewer employment-generating uses (198,634 sf/0.2 msf), as compared to the proposed Project. Moreover, Alternative C would provide fewer affordable housing units than would the Project.
As discussed in the EIR, California’s housing shortage has reached crisis levels.3 Between 1980 and 2010, the construction of new housing units in the Los Angeles metro region fell far behind the national average.4 During this period, new housing construction grew by 54 percent in the typical U.S. metro area, whereas new housing units in the Los Angeles metro area grew by just 20 percent.5 The result has been skyrocketing housing prices. In 1970, California home prices exceeded the national average by 50 percent.6 By 1980, the gap had widened to 80 percent.7 As of 2015, the average home price in California exceeds the national average by 250 percent.8 California rental prices are no better. Today, the average monthly rent in California exceeds the national average by 50 percent.9

Predictably, the impact of the housing crisis has been hardest on the region’s most vulnerable populations. Between 1990 and 2012, poverty levels in the region have increased by 69 percent, with a quarter of all children living in poverty.10 In the Los Angeles metro region, approximately 30 percent of the median household’s total income is used to pay housing costs, 7 percent more than the national average.11 However, the poorest 25 percent of Los Angeles metro area households spend, on average, 67 percent of their income on housing.12 As a result, these low-income households are forced to spend less on other essentials. According to Harvard’s Joint Center for Housing Studies, low-income households who spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing also spend 39 percent less on food than do households that spend less than 50 percent of income on housing.13 To seriously mitigate California’s housing shortage and its disproportionate impact on low income households, California must construct 100,000 additional residential units on top of the 100,000 to 140,000 housing units the state is expected to build annually, and these units must be located almost exclusively in California’s costal metro areas, including Los Angeles County.

The Southern California Association of Governments projects that, through 2040, the regional population will grow by 20 percent, resulting in a net increase of approximately four million additional residents.14 The entire North Los Angeles County Subregion, which includes Antelope Valley and the Project site, will have 245,473 households by 2020 and 331,399 households by 2040, an increase of 85,926 households over 20 years.15 The unincorporated portion of this subregion is projected to have 69,982 households in 2020

---

4 Id., p. 10
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9 Id., p. 12
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12 Id., p. 26
13 Id., p. 27
14 SCAG 2016a, p. 3
15 DRP 2017, Table 5.9-9
and 116,546 households in 2040. As explained in Draft EIR Section 5.9, Population and Housing, the County's housing element indicates that 30,145 new housing units are needed to meet future housing demand through 2021, a portion of which will be provided by the Project.

Given the well documented need for Antelope Valley employment and housing opportunities in order to accommodate projected population growth, and the comparatively minor environmental benefits of Alternative C as compared to the Project, the Board of Supervisors hereby rejects Alternative C as infeasible after taking into consideration County employment and housing policy and the fact that Alternative C would provide fewer employment and housing opportunities for all income levels as compared to the Project. The County also rejects Alternative C as infeasible because this alternative's reduction of housing and job opportunities is inconsistent with the AVAP “Rural Preservation Strategy” to direct needed housing and job growth to designated Economic Opportunity Areas (EOAs) in order to preserve the rural character of the Antelope Valley outside of EOAs.

D. Alternative D: Infrastructure Relocation Alternative

**Facts in Support of Finding:** Alternative D, the Infrastructure Relocation Alternative, was designed with the objectives of (1) reducing the need for pumping equipment and associated energy demands by relying upon gravity-based water systems; (2) improving the reliability of the water distribution system, especially during a power outage; and (3) reducing biological impacts to the Oso Creek. Alternative D proposes the same development capacity as the proposed Project, but it would relocate two of the proposed Project's water tanks and its water treatment plant (WTP) to different locations within the Project site, as depicted on EIR Exhibit 9-5. Specifically, implementation of Alternative D would relocate one water tank from the western section of the Project site to a higher elevation west of its current location and within the San Andreas Significant Ecological Area (SEA). This location would eliminate the need to grade the tank site and would rely on gravity to operate, thus avoiding the need for a hydro-pneumatic pumping system, which uses more energy and is susceptible to disruption in the event of a power outage. In addition, the second water tank, located to the north of SR-138, would be relocated to a higher elevation south of SR-138 and the Project’s proposed Business Park within the San Andreas SEA. The Project proposes to locate the WTP within the Oso Creek drainage, a sensitive habitat. Alternative D would also relocate the Project’s proposed WTP further south, outside of the creek drainage, so as to eliminate the Project’s potential impacts to the creek and sensitive habitats in the creek. Under this alternative, the WTP would be relocated to a higher elevation, as compared to the Project, thus reducing the need to pump water to higher elevations and the air and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with such pumping activities. Under Alternative D, the WTP would be relocated within the San Andreas SEA, but within an area that supports fewer biological resources than the Project’s proposed WTP site.

As with the proposed Project, development of Alternative D would be subject to the same seismic hazards (e.g., ground shaking, liquefaction), geologic hazards (e.g., landslides, landslides,
expansive soils), and hillside management standards. Mitigation would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels, similar to the Project. Impacts related to erosion, grading, and topographic changes would be greater than anticipated to occur with the proposed Project, since the development footprint would be increased to locate two water tanks at higher elevations on the site. These impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. Less than significant impacts would occur under this Alternative with respect to geologic hazards with the implementation of mitigation, similar to the Project. Implementation of Alternative D would create slightly more impervious area than the proposed Project and changes to the existing hydrological conditions on the site would be greater due to the increase in the development footprint. Slightly more urban runoff would be expected with the increase in the development area that would occur on the site. As with the proposed Project, impacts related to hydrology would be less than significant under this Alternative with mitigation. Similar to the proposed Project, impacts related to conflict with LID standards, floodplains, and standing water would be less than significant with mitigation.

Impacts associated with hazards for Alternative D would be similar to those associated with the proposed Project. The risk from existing hazards, Valley Fever, and wildlife-borne disease vectors would be similar to the proposed Project, as this Alternative would result in the same number of dwelling units and amount of non-residential development (commercial and employment-generating land uses). As with the proposed Project, impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation related to hazardous materials sites, and less than significant impacts related to airport/airstrip hazards and emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. Exposure to wildland fire risks related to location in areas designated as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and High Fire Hazard Severity Zones would be slightly more than those with the proposed Project, given the increase in the size of the development footprint on the site. The implementation of a fuel modification zone established with a Fire Management Plan would mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.

The potential impacts to surface water and groundwater quality associated with Alternative D would be slightly more than anticipated to occur from implementation of the proposed Project since Alternative D would disturb 16 acres more than the proposed Project but would result in the same development. However, the impacts under both the proposed Project and this Alternative to water quality would be less than significant with mitigation. This Alternative would result in similar impacts related to waste discharge requirements and wastewater treatment systems, as there would be the same types of land uses and number of WRFs as the proposed Project.

Alternative D would have similar impacts to agricultural resources as the proposed Project since the same farmlands would be converted to urban uses. The proposed residential development at the eastern section of the site would eliminate ongoing agricultural production on Prime Farmland but would not conflict with any Williamson Act contracts. As with the proposed Project, impacts related to the conversion of farmland would be significant and unavoidable under this Alternative. As with the proposed Project, Alternative
D would not involve the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impacts to mineral resources would occur under this Alternative. Alternative D would result in disturbance of a slightly larger area where unknown archaeological, tribal cultural, and paleontological resources or human remains may be present, as compared to the proposed Project. Impacts to cultural resources from implementation of Alternative D would be mitigated in the same manner as those for the proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant after mitigation, like the proposed Project.

Alternative D would disturb approximately 16 acres more than the proposed Project and would locate the water treatment plant and water tanks within 58 acres of the San Andreas SEA. While the WTP would be relocated to a site within the SEA, this new location is lower in biological value than the WTP and water tank locations proposed by the Project and would largely avoid more sensitive resource areas such as jurisdictional features and riparian habitat. Existing ranch and utility access roads could be used for construction access to the new water tank sites and only minor grading and access improvements would be required. However, improvements to portions of some of the access roads would impact native vegetation and would result in slight increase in quantity of impacts on vegetation and potentially special status species. Consequently, there would be a need for an increased acreage of mitigation to offset some of these impacts. All of these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels after mitigation under both the proposed Project and this Alternative.

This Alternative would result in the same development on the site. Potentially significant direct impacts to biological resources from grading and ground disturbance would still include special status species, riparian communities, wetlands, and wildlife movement. Also, the introduction of residents to the area and associated indirect impacts on biological resources (e.g., light and glare; domestic pets; introduction of non-native plants and wildlife) would be similar to the Project. All of these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels after mitigation under both the proposed Project and this Alternative. No direct significant and unavoidable biological impacts would remain after mitigation. However, like the proposed Project, Alternative D would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to grasslands and wildlife movement. This Alternative would result in similar impacts to oak woodlands and oak trees. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in no impacts related to habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

Implementation of Alternative D would result in the development of a new master planned community at the northwestern section of Los Angeles County. This Alternative is consistent with the land use designations for the site, as contained in the AVAP and would require the same land use approvals as the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, this Alternative would not disrupt or divide a community and would allow for development to meet the future housing and employment needs in Los Angeles County; it is therefore consistent with regional planning efforts. As with the proposed Project, an amendment to the AVAP Highway Plan, a zone change, and two CUPs would be required under this Alternative. Impacts would be similar to the Project under this Alternative for these thresholds. However, this Alternative would result in a greater impact related to conflict with
the SEA Ordinance and hillside management standards, based on the location of the relocated infrastructure in higher elevation sites (i.e., hillside management areas) and within 58 acres of the San Andreas SEA. This impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation.

Alternative D would have the same number of residential units and commercial and business park development but approximately 16 fewer acres of natural open space. Alternative D would have the same residential population than the proposed Project, and thus, the same potential to induce growth in the surrounding area. This Alternative would not exceed approved population projections. As with the proposed Project, less than significant impacts would result with respect to conformity with population projections, but a significant and unavoidable impact would result based on the substantial growth on the Project site relative to the existing setting. Displacement of housing would be less than significant, as with the proposed Project. This Alternative would also result in a similar, and significant and unavoidable, impact related to growth-inducing impacts.

Alternative D would provide the same number of dwelling units and employment-generating uses, both of which are the primary trip-generating land uses for the proposed Project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in the same off-site vehicle trips. With the same off-site trip generation, impacts to freeway mainline segments, freeway ramps, and arterial highway intersections would be similar to the proposed Project. Significant impacts to the existing transportation system and CMP highways would occur under this Alternative. Payment of fair share fees for improvements to Caltrans facilities would be made as mitigation for the impacts of this Alternative, but it is outside the County’s control to implement these improvements. Thus, if Caltrans does not construct the necessary improvements, impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the Project. As with the proposed Project, impacts related to emergency access and traffic hazards can be mitigated and impacts on air traffic would be less than significant. No conflict with alternative transportation policies would occur, similar to the Project.

Alternative D would involve the same construction as the proposed Project, with similar impacts and exposure to groundborne vibration resulting from construction. Impacts related to noise increases in excess of Los Angeles County standards at sensitive receptors would be significant, similar to those of the proposed Project. Mitigation would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. Off-site traffic noise would be the same when compared to the proposed Project because of the same off-site vehicular traffic generation. Noise impacts on adjacent existing residences would be significant and unavoidable under this Alternative because it is outside the County’s control to implement improvements on private properties or Caltrans right-of-way. Airport noise exposure would be similar to that of the Project and considered less than significant.

Implementation of Alternative D would result in the same demand for parks and recreational facilities since the same number of dwelling units is proposed, resulting in the same resident population. As with the proposed Project, less than significant impacts would occur with the provision of on-site parks and recreational facilities. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative D would result in a less than significant impact related to regional open space.
connectivity, as a connection to the proposed realignment of the Pacific Crest Trail would also be part of this Alternative. The demand for school facilities and services associated with Alternative D would be similar to those of the proposed Project because the same residential development is proposed. As such, schools needed to serve on-site residents would also be the same. As with the proposed Project, impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative. The demand for fire and law enforcement services associated with Alternative D would be similar to that for the proposed Project because the same amount of development is proposed. Impacts to fire and law enforcement services would be mitigated through the provision of on-site fire stations and a Sheriff’s station, similar to the proposed Project. Impacts to fire and law enforcement services would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative.

The demand for library services under Alternative D would be similar to those of the proposed Project. With the same number of residents on site, this Alternative would require the development of the same size community library as the proposed Project. Both the proposed Project and this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts after mitigation. The solid waste demands associated with Alternative D would be similar to those of the proposed Project because the same development is proposed. Also, the demand for landfill capacity would be considered significant and unavoidable because permitted landfill capacity at existing County landfills cannot be guaranteed at the time of Project buildout and through the life of the Project, which would occur beyond the required 15-year LACDPW planning horizon. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to solid waste. Alternative D would create a demand for County services and facilities but would be subject to the payment of fees for any needed services. Alternative D would also provide a maintenance yard on the site for County use for public park and facility maintenance, County-owned roadway maintenance, public right-of-way maintenance, flood-control infrastructure maintenance, and other maintenance activities. Impacts would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

Wastewater generation associated with Alternative D would be similar to the Project due to the same development. As such, impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements and wastewater facilities would also be less. Both the proposed Project and this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts with the provision of an on-site sewer system and a WRF. Demands for dry utility services associated with Alternative D would be similar to the proposed Project, except electrical demand. While the same development is proposed on site, the location of the water tanks at higher elevations would reduce the pumping needs and result in a more efficient water distribution system. This Alternative would reduce electrical power demands over those of the Project. As with the proposed Project, impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative.

Visual changes to the Project site associated with the implementation of Alternative D would be slightly less than those anticipated to occur under the proposed Project, since the water tanks would be located at higher elevations but behind ridgelines. Thus, they would be less visible from public roadways and trails. Under this Alternative, significant and unavoidable impacts would be reduced, as compared to the Project, with respect to alterations to a scenic vista, degradation of the visual quality of the site, and the creation of new sources of light
and glare due to the size and intensity of development proposed in a largely undeveloped area. Like the Project, however, these significant and unavoidable impacts would not be avoided. Under both the proposed Project and this Alternative, less than significant impacts would occur related to an AVAP-designated scenic drive.

Implementation of Alternative D would involve slightly more grading on the site with the increase in the development footprint, when compared to the Project. As with the proposed Project, this alternative would result in significant unavoidable construction-related emissions associated with CO, VOCs, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5. However, long-term operational emissions would be the less when compared to the Project due to the reduction in the need of pumping water. Back-up diesel generators would be required under the Project and under Alternative D; however, in the event of a power outage, substantially more energy and diesel emissions would be required by the Project to maintain the functioning of the water system. This Alternative would have the same land use development and would generate the same amount of vehicular traffic; therefore, vehicular emissions would not change. As with the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in significant unavoidable operational emissions associated with CO, VOCs, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5, though this unavoidable impact would be somewhat reduced as compared to the Project due to the reduced need for pumping water. Consistency with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan and exposure to odors would also represent a less than significant impact under this Alternative, like the proposed Project.

With the same development associated with Alternative D, greenhouse gas emissions from development would be similar to the Project. However, the use of less energy for water pumping based on the location of the water tanks at higher elevations would slightly reduce GHG emissions. Cumulative impacts to climate change under Alternative D would still be significant and unavoidable, as compared to the Project, though somewhat reduced due the reduced need for water pumping. This Alternative and the proposed Project would be consistent with the County’s Climate Action Plan.

**Finding:** The EIR, including Section 8.0 of the Draft EIR, and the balance of the administrative record contains facts and analysis supporting the Finding, some of which are set forth here. The Project was developed with the objective of creating a self-contained, self-sustaining community in which people could live and work in the same community. Implementation of Alternative D would fully support this underlying goal; however, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality, agriculture resources, noise, population and growth-inducing impacts, traffic, visual resources, climate change, water supply, and solid waste would still occur under this Alternative. However, Implementation of Alternative D would result in decreased impacts to visual resources, energy demands, and climate change for the reasons stated above. Although the relocation of the water treatment plant would avoid sensitive drainage areas, Alternative D would disturb approximately 16 more acres of biological resources and would locate the water treatment plant and water tanks within 58 acres of the San Andreas SEA. As a result, Alternative D would cause greater adverse environmental effects than, and would require more mitigation than, the Project. Specifically, as compared to the Project, Alternative D would (i) create more impervious area and greater alterations to the existing hydrological conditions, (ii) cause more urban runoff, (iii) increase
wildland fire risks, (iv) cause greater impacts to surface water and groundwater quality, (v)
impact more acres of SEA 17, (vi) cause greater impacts to vegetation and special status
species, (vii) cause greater conflicts with hillside management standards, and (viii) cause
greater construction-related emission impacts. Although Alternative D would reduce the
Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts visual resources, operational air quality, and
visual resources, these significant impacts would not be avoided under Alternative D.
Moreover, as discussed above, Alternative D would exacerbate the Project’s significant and
unavoidable construction-related air quality impacts, as well as several other impact
categories that could mitigated to a less than significant level. Alternative D would also cause
greater impacts to SEA 17 and create greater conflicts with respect to hillside development
standards. Though implementation of Alternative D would have some environmental
benefits, as compared to the Project, on balance it would have greater environmental effects
than the Project and it would not promote the County policy regarding Significant Ecological
Areas and hillside development standards as well as Project. Alternative D is therefore
rejected by the Board of Supervisors as infeasible.

E. Alternative E: Density Clustering/East of Aqueduct Alternative

Facts in Support of Finding: If implemented, Alternative E, the Density Clustering/East of
Aqueduct Alternative, would increase the density of development on the east side of the
California Aqueduct and 300th Street West, by decreasing development in the easternmost
and westernmost portions of the site, as depicted on EIR Exhibit 8-6. The proposed Project
development footprint would be reduced by approximately 656 acres under this Alternative,
while maintaining the same number of dwelling units (19,333 units), employment-
generating uses (10,097,208 sf/10.10 msf), and other land uses. Alternative E reflects an
approximate 4 percent increase (from approximately 46 percent to 50 percent) in conserved
natural open space which does not include parks, greenways, and other types of urban open
space.

Under Alternative E, on the west side of the Aqueduct, all development except for the Cement
Plant Road realignment would be transferred to the central portion of the site. This includes
1,574 dwelling units and 87,120 sf of Commercial uses. The 44-acre WTP proposed west of
the Aqueduct would be relocated by converting 44 acres of Low-Density Residential land use
to Utility, extending the existing U-designated area along the northeastern border of the
Project site. This conversion would require the transfer of 147 low-density dwelling units,
which would be readily accommodated throughout the remainder of Village 5. Additionally,
relocation of the WTP to the east side of the Aqueduct would require a pipeline to be installed
from the Aqueduct turnout, located slightly north of the proposed WTP location, across the
Aqueduct and to the WTP site. However, the new bridge crossing to land uses on the west
side of the Aqueduct would be eliminated under this Alternative. On the east side of 300th
Street West, the Low Density Residential-designated lands would be designated as Very Low
Density Residential under this Alternative, resulting in a net reduction of 603 dwelling units.
These units and 108,900 sf of Commercial uses would be transferred to the central portion
of the site. Specifically, all 2,177 transferred dwelling units (not including the 147 units in
Village 5) would be accommodated in Village 3—the town center—and all or most
transferred Commercial uses (196,020 sf) would instead be accommodated in the Centennial
 Commerce District (CCD) along SR-138 without changing the conceptual land use plan in these areas.

As with the proposed Project, development of Alternative E would be subject to the same seismic hazards (e.g., ground shaking, liquefaction), geologic hazards (e.g., landslides, expansive soils), and hillside management standards. Impacts due to ground rupture related to the two unnamed faults on the Project site and erosion, grading, and topographic changes would be less than those anticipated to occur with the proposed Project due to the transfer of land uses on the west side of the California Aqueduct (except the Cement Plant Road realignment) and associated 656-acre reduction in the development footprint. Less than significant impacts would occur under this Alternative with respect to geologic hazards with the implementation of mitigation, similar to the Project. Implementation of Alternative E would create less impervious area than the proposed Project and changes to the existing hydrological conditions on the site would be less that the Project due to the transfer of land uses on the west side of the California Aqueduct (except the Cement Plant Road realignment) and associated 656-acre reduction in the development footprint. Incrementally less urban runoff would also be expected with the decrease in development on the site. As with the proposed Project, impacts related to hydrology would be less than significant under this Alternative with mitigation. Similar to the proposed Project, impacts related to conflict with LID standards, floodplains, inundation, and standing water would be less than significant with mitigation.

Impacts associated with hazards for Alternative E would be similar to those associated with the proposed Project. The risk from existing hazards, Valley Fever, and wildlife-borne disease vectors would be similar to the proposed Project, as this Alternative would result in the same number of dwelling units and amount of non-residential development. As with the proposed Project, impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Similar to the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation related to hazardous materials sites, and less than significant impacts related to airport/airstrip hazards and emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. Exposure to wildland fire risks related to location in areas designated as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZs) and High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (HFHSZs) would be less than those with the proposed Project, given the decrease in development proposed on the site. The implementation of a fuel modification zone established with a Fire Management Plan would mitigate impacts to a less than significant level, as with the proposed Project.

The potential impacts to surface water and groundwater quality associated with Alternative E would be less than those anticipated to occur from implementation of the proposed Project since Alternative E would disturb 656 acres less than the proposed Project. However, this Alternative would result in development of the same types and quantity of land uses as the proposed Project within the reduced footprint. The impacts under both the proposed Project and this Alternative to water quality would be less than significant with mitigation. This Alternative would result in similar impacts related to waste discharge requirements and wastewater treatment systems, as there would be the same types of land uses and number of WRFs as the proposed Project. This Alternative would have similar impacts to agricultural resources as the proposed Project since the same farmlands would be converted to urban
uses. The proposed residential development at the eastern section of the site would eliminate ongoing agricultural production on Prime Farmland, but would not conflict with any Williamson Act contracts. As with the proposed Project, impacts related to the conversion of farmland would be significant and unavoidable under this Alternative. As with the proposed Project, Alternative E would not involve the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impacts to mineral resources would occur under this Alternative.

Alternative E would result in disturbance of a smaller area and impacts on unknown archaeological, tribal cultural, and paleontological resources or human remains would be less than the proposed Project. The significant cultural resource sites west of the Aqueduct would not be directly impacted by grading activity. These sites would be located within open space areas under this Alternative; there would be significant indirect impacts to these sites, same as the proposed Project. The location of cultural sites to the east of the Aqueduct would still be developed under this Alternative, and result in the same impacts as the Project. It is anticipated that cultural resource-related impacts from implementation of Alternative E would be mitigated in the same manner as those for the proposed Project. Impacts related to cultural resources would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative, like the proposed Project.

Alternative E would disturb approximately 656 acres less than the proposed Project, and would increase the acreage of open space and preserved lands by approximately 4 percent compared to the proposed Project (from approximately 46 percent to approximately 50 percent). Under this Alternative, no different areas or additional acres would be impacted that would have the potential to result in new or more significant biological resources impacts, despite an overall reduction in the development footprint. The reduced impact area would result in an incremental comparable reduction in impacts to various biological resources including vegetation types, potentially suitable habitat for special status plant and wildlife species, and jurisdictional drainages. Thus, there would be less mitigation required to offset Alternative E impacts. Furthermore, the additional preservation area would increase the buffer area between the development footprint and other on- and off-site preserved lands thereby reducing indirect impacts to biological resources. Consequently, no additional impacts would occur and no additional mitigation would be required with Alternative E.

Potentially significant direct impacts to biological resources from grading and ground disturbance would still include special status species, riparian communities, wetlands, and wildlife movement. All of these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels after mitigation under both the proposed Project and this Alternative. No significant and unavoidable biological impacts related to these thresholds for Alternative E would remain after mitigation. However, like the proposed Project, Alternative E would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to grasslands and wildlife movement. This Alternative would result in similar impacts to oak woodlands and oak trees. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in no impact related to habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans.
As with the proposed Project, implementation of Alternative E would result in the development of a new master planned community at the northwestern section of Los Angeles County. This Alternative is consistent with the land use designations for the site, as contained in the AVAP and would require the same land use approvals as the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative would not disrupt or divide a community, and would allow for development to meet the future housing and employment needs in Los Angeles County; it is, therefore, consistent with regional planning efforts. As with the proposed Project, an amendment to the AVAP Highway Plan, a zone change, and CUPs would be required under this Alternative. Impacts would be similar under this Alternative as the same land use approvals would be required, and this Alternative would equally allow for development to meet planned growth. Because this Alternative has land dedicated to public parks, roads and infrastructure facilities, it could result in lower costs for public infrastructure categories that correlate with acreage (e.g., road maintenance), and could result in higher costs for public infrastructure categories that correlate with intensity of uses (e.g., sports playfields in parks).

Alternative E would have the same number of residential units and commercial and business park development within a smaller development footprint, by approximately 656 acres. Alternative E would have the same residential population than the proposed Project, and thus, the same potential to induce growth in the surrounding area. As with the proposed Project, less than significant impacts would result with respect to conformity with population projections, but a significant and unavoidable impact would result based on the substantial growth on the Project site relative to the existing setting. Displacement of housing would be less than significant, similar to the proposed Project. This Alternative would also result in a similar, and significant and unavoidable, impact related to growth-inducing impacts as compared to the Project.

Alternative E would provide the same number of dwelling units and employment-generating uses, both of which are the primary trip-generating land uses for the proposed Project. Therefore, this Alternative would result in the same off-site vehicle trips, although the transfer of commercial development would result in reduced crossings across 300th Street and SR-138. With the same off-site trip generation, impacts to freeway mainline segments, freeway ramps, and arterial highway intersections would be similar to the proposed Project. Increased density may also influence on-site travel mode selection (e.g., reduce car trips within the Project site area).

This Alternative would not result in a significant change to how Project-related traffic accesses SR-138, nor would it change the overall distribution of Project-related traffic. While the amount of traffic generated by this Alternative would be identical to the proposed Project, there would be a corresponding increase to the volume of traffic on the central and western intersections with SR-138. However, the overall increase to these roadways would be minor and would be accommodated by augmenting the capacity of these roadways and their intersections with SR-138. These augments would be feasible within the limits of the Conceptual Land Use Plan and associated grading plan. Therefore, significant impacts to the existing transportation system and CMP highways would occur under this Alternative, similar to the proposed Project. Payment of fair share fees for improvements to Caltrans
facilities would be made as mitigation for the impacts of this Alternative, but it is outside the County's control to implement these improvements. Thus, if Caltrans does not construct the necessary improvements, impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the Project. As with the proposed Project, impacts related to emergency access and traffic hazards can be mitigated and impacts on air traffic would be less than significant. No conflict with alternative transportation policies would occur, similar to the Project.

Alternative E would involve less grading on the site commensurate with the 656-acre reduction in the development footprint, and noise and groundborne vibration that would result from construction would also be less. However, there would be no receptors in the area with less noise and vibration on the west side of the Aqueduct. Noise generation related to building construction would be similar to the proposed Project, as the same amount of development is proposed. Therefore, impacts related to noise increases in excess of Los Angeles County standards at sensitive receptors would still be significant, similar to those of the proposed Project. Mitigation would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. Off-site traffic noise would be the same when compared to the proposed Project because of the same vehicular traffic generation. Noise impacts on adjacent existing residences would be similar, and would remain significant and unavoidable under this Alternative because it is outside the County's control to implement improvements on private properties or Caltrans right-of-way. Airport noise exposure would be similar to that of the Project and would be considered less than significant.

Implementation of Alternative E would result in the same demand for parks and recreational facilities since the same number of dwelling units is proposed, resulting in the same resident population. However, the transfer of development to the west of the Aqueduct eliminates 13.1 acres of Park Overlay and 5.6 acres of the Recreation/Entertainment land use designation. This Alternative would also provide on-site parks and recreation amenities that would meet and exceed County and State parkland standards, when considering both the park acreage and acreage equivalencies (e.g., public park development costs, private recreation facilities) and result in a less than significant impact. However, this Alternative would result in a higher population per acre of parkland than the proposed Project. The higher population per acre of parkland would require more efficient use of parkland space and amenities, with the potential for both lower costs (e.g., from developing and maintaining fewer acres) partly offset by the potential for increased costs (e.g., from more active maintenance required for high-use park areas such as sports playfields). Alternative E would result in a less than significant impact related to regional open space connectivity, as a connection to the proposed realignment of the Pacific Crest Trail would also be part of this Alternative.

The demand for school facilities and services associated with Alternative E would be similar to those of the proposed Project because the same residential development is proposed. However, the transfer of development to the west of the Aqueduct eliminates 11 acres of School Overlay (a K-5 elementary school), which would have to be provided to the east side of the Aqueduct. Any future school development within the Project site would require coordination with and agreement of the affected school districts, as described in the mitigation program. Therefore, as with the proposed Project, impacts would be mitigated to
a less than significant level under this Alternative. The demand for fire and law enforcement services associated with Alternative E would be similar to that for the proposed Project because the same amount of development is proposed. Impacts to fire and law enforcement services would be mitigated through the provision of on-site fire stations and a Sheriff’s station, similar to the proposed Project. Emergency response times would be slightly improved given the smaller development footprint of this Alternative. Impacts to fire and law enforcement services would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative.

The demand for library services under Alternative E would be similar to those of the proposed Project. With the same number of residents on site, this Alternative would require the development of the same size community library as the proposed Project. Both the proposed Project and this Alternative would result in less than significant impact after mitigation. The solid waste demands associated with Alternative E would be similar to those of the proposed Project because the same development is proposed. Also, the demand for landfill capacity would be considered significant and unavoidable because permitted landfill capacity at existing County landfills cannot be guaranteed at the time of Project buildout and through the life of the Project, which would occur beyond the required 15-year LACDPW planning horizon. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to solid waste. Alternative E would create a demand for County services and facilities but would be subject to the payment of fees for any needed services.

Alternative E would also provide a maintenance yard on the site for County use for public park and facility maintenance, County-owned roadway maintenance, public right-of-way maintenance, flood-control infrastructure maintenance, and other maintenance activities. Impacts would be less than significant, same as the Project.

The water demands associated with Alternative E would be less than the proposed Project because the elimination of development to the west of the Aqueduct would reduce the amount of landscaping and its associated irrigation demands. As with the proposed Project, direct impacts to water supplies would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative, and there would be less than significant impacts to groundwater supplies. However, as with the proposed Project, significant unavoidable cumulative impacts to water supplies would result from Alternative E. Wastewater generation associated with Alternative E would be similar to the Project due to the same development. As such, impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements and wastewater facilities would also be less.

Both the proposed Project and this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts with the provision of an on-site sewer system and a WRF. Demands for dry utility services associated with Alternative E would be similar to those of the proposed Project because the same development is proposed. As with the proposed Project, impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative.

Visual changes to the Project site associated with implementation of Alternative E would be reduced to the west of the Aqueduct, with the realigned Cement Plant Road remaining as the only land use change. However, under the proposed Project and this Alternative, significant and unavoidable impacts would result with respect to alterations to a scenic vista; degradation of the visual quality of the site; and the creation of light and glare due to the size
and intensity of development that would be proposed in a largely undeveloped area. Under both the proposed Project and this Alternative, less than significant impacts would occur related to AVAP-designated scenic drives (e.g., I-5, Gorman Post Road, SR-138, Old Ridge Road [Highway N-2], and Three Points Road). This Alternative would have decreased light and glare impacts, due to the decrease in the development footprint, when compared to the proposed Project. However, this impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Implementation of Alternative E would involve less grading on the site commensurate with the 656-acre reduction in the development footprint. However, the SCAQMD thresholds are based on daily construction emissions, and this Alternative would implement the same daily construction activities as the Project. Therefore, as with the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in significant unavoidable construction-related emissions associated with CO, VOCs, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5. Because increased density may result in further mode shifts (e.g., reduce use of cars and increased walking or biking) within the Project site itself, this Alternative could result in a corresponding decrease in air emissions from avoided on-site vehicle trips. However, since the same land uses and trip generation would occur, the primary vehicular-related emissions occur from offsite trips, operational emissions would be similar but slightly lower than the proposed Project, and would continue to result in significant unavoidable operational emissions associated with CO, VOCs, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5. Consistency with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan and exposure to odors would remain a less than significant impact under this Alternative.

With the same development associated with Alternative E, greenhouse gas emissions from development would be similar to the Project. Cumulative impacts to climate change under Alternative D would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the Project. Greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle use would be slightly lower based on projected mode shifts (i.e., reduced use of fossil-fired vehicles) for on-site trips as described in Air Quality, above.

Finding: The EIR, including Section 8.0 of the Draft EIR, and the balance of the administrative record contains facts and analysis supporting the Finding, some of which are set forth here. Implementation of Alternative E would result in similar or slightly reduced effects to most of the population-driven impacts (e.g., noise, traffic, public services, and utility demands) as the proposed Project since the same development, and related population, is proposed on site. However, Alternative E would result in decreased impacts to grading-driven impacts (e.g., biological resources, cultural resources, and visual resources) and would reduce some on-site automobile-driven impacts (e.g., air quality, greenhouse gas emissions).

The Project was developed with the objective of creating a self-contained, self-sustaining community in which people could live and work in the same community. Implementation of this Alternative would fully support this underlying goal; however, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality, agriculture resources, noise, population and growth-inducing impacts, traffic, visual resources, climate change, water supply, and solid waste would still occur under this Alternative, similar to the Project, though unavoidable impacts to agriculture resources, visual resources, climate change, and air quality would be somewhat reduced due to this Alternative’s smaller development footprint, though none of
these significant and unavoidable impacts would be avoided under Alternative E. Moreover, as compared to the Project, Alternative E could result in higher costs for certain public infrastructure improvements that correlate with higher intensity of uses, such as parkland. Also, since this alternative eliminates Project development west of the California Aqueduct with the exception of planned improvements to Cement Plant Road, Alternative E would not provide a planned regional trail extension north of Quail Lake. Similarly, Alternative E would not provide a second vehicle crossing over the California Aqueduct, which could limit emergency evacuation options for project residents.

If approved, Alternative E would eliminate the Project’s proposed Village Nine, and Village Eight’s Low Density Residential-designated lands located east of 300th Street would instead be designated as Very Low Residential, as explained on Draft EIR page 8-18. Thus, Alternative E would provide approximately 865 fewer acres of land designated for Low Density Residential uses, as compared to the proposed Project. Although Alternative E would provide the same number of residential units as the proposed Project, applicable land use designations would restrict most of these units to either medium/high density attached residential units or very low density detached units, with substantially fewer low density detached units included in the community’s overall housing mix. Accordingly, Alternative E, would provide an unbalanced range of housing types by reducing the supply of low density single family detached residential units that are typically attractive to middle income families. This result could dissuade both middle income workers (and on-site employers hoping to hire them) from relocating to the Project site. Moreover, Alternative E’s lack of balanced housing choice would be inconsistent with General Plan Housing Element Policy 3-1, which seeks to promote mixed income neighborhoods and increase housing choices for all economic segments of the population.

In addition, Alternative E could lead to higher housing cost for those families looking to purchase high density housing in Village Three. Under Alternative E, all of the units planned for Village Nine and approximately 603 units in Village Eight would be accommodated in Village Three’s multifamily Medium Density, High Density, and Very High Density designations. According to a recent report prepared by housing experts at the University of California, Berkley (UCB Report), high-rise and even mid-rise (e.g., six story) residential buildings are far more costly to build on a per square foot basis than single family homes – three to five times higher – and are thus infeasible in most California markets. Even less costly multi-family units such as quadplexes (four units in a two-story building) and stacked flats (one or two units per floor, generally limited to four stories) – are approximately 30 percent more costly than single family homes on a per square foot basis. Thus, Alternative E would likely result in higher sales prices for Village Three’s attached dwelling units.

The UCB Report also indicates that Southern California counties faced a larger negative fiscal impact for compact multi-family residential development than is the case with lower density
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development. Thus, Alternative E could result in fiscal losses to the County or otherwise reduce or eliminate the fiscal surplus projected by the Project. Finally, it should be noted that, in adopting the AVAP and its “Rural Preservation Strategy,” the County has made a policy choice to maximize development in designated Economic Opportunity Areas (EOAs) so as to generate property tax revenues and developer fees needed to help fund new infrastructure and public facilities needed to serve the AVAP planning area without sacrificing the rural character of the Antelope Valley outside of EOAs, as discussed in Final EIR, response to Comment F.8-20. Alternative E would be inconsistent with this policy choice, however, by limiting the type and extent of development that could occur in the West EOA.

In summary, although Alternative E would reduce some of the Project’s significant and unavoidable environmental effects, it would not reduce any such effects to less-than-significant levels. Moreover, it would (i) not provide a secondary evacuation route across the California Aqueduct, (ii) increase maintenance costs of certain categories of public infrastructure, such as parks, (iii) provide an unbalanced mix of housing options, (iv) increase housing costs for multifamily residential units, (v) have a negative fiscal impact on the County, and (vi) be inconsistent with certain County housing and planning policies. The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects Alternative E as infeasible on the basis of such considerations.

F. Alternative F: Central EOA Development Alternative

Facts in Support of Finding: Alternative F, the Central Economic Opportunity Area Development alternative, assumes that the Project would not be constructed and operated in the AVAP’s West Economic Opportunity Area (West EOA), but instead would be constructed and operated in the AVAP’s Central Economic Opportunity Area (Central EOA). The 23,930-acre Central EOA is an irregularly shaped area located generally between the northern boundary of the City of Lancaster and the Los Angeles County-Kern County border. It is traversed by SR-138 in an east-west direction, and by SR-14 and Sierra Highway in a north-south direction. Alternative F assumes that the same types and numbers of land uses, public facilities, and other amenities as the proposed Project (see Table 4-3 in Section 4.0, Project Description) would be developed within an approximate 12,323-acre, contiguous portion of the Central EOA.

Due to this distance from the nearest known fault, impacts related to seismic hazards (e.g., fault rupture, ground shaking, ground failure) would be less under Alternative F when compared to the proposed Project. Topographically, the Central EOA is relatively flat with a slope generally towards the east-northeast (i.e., towards Rosamond Lake). As such, the risk of landslides is reduced when compared to the proposed Project. There may be liquefaction and/or other soil engineering constraints present within the Central EOA, but it is expected these would be mitigated with appropriate design and construction methods. As with the
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proposed Project, there would be less than significant geology and soils impacts through compliance with applicable regulations.

Implementation of Alternative F would create a similar extent of pervious and impervious areas as the proposed Project. Because there are less defined drainage channels within the Central EOA compared to the Project site, impacts related to changes in drainage patterns would be less than the proposed Project. However, the amount of storm water runoff generated would be similar to the Project and would be managed through compliance with LID standards and other regulations. As with the proposed Project, impacts related to hydrology, including storm drainage capacity, would be less than significant under this Alternative with mitigation.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map designates an approximate one-mile-wide floodplain for this drainage and essentially the entirety of the Central EOA north of SR-138 as within an “A” zone, which has a one percent annual chance of flooding. Similar to the proposed Project, impacts related to floodplains would be less than significant with mitigation. Similar to the proposed Project, impacts related to inundation and standing water would be less than significant with mitigation.

Impacts associated with hazards for Alternative F would be similar to those associated with the proposed Project, as both locations are within the Antelope Valley. Specifically, the risk from Valley Fever and wildlife-borne disease vectors would be similar to the proposed Project, as this Alternative would result in the same number of dwelling units and amount of non-residential development requiring ground disturbance in an area with a potential for Valley Fever spores. The precise location and nature of existing hazards within the Central EOA are not known. It is documented that a portion of Edwards Air Force Base (EAFB) is a federally listed Superfund site and is undergoing remediation. However, the extent of groundwater contaminant plume is mapped as being more than 23 miles to the east-northeast of the Central EOA (DTSC 2016). Therefore, this would not represent a hazard for the EOA. For all hazards, impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level, same as the proposed Project.

The southwestern portion of the Central EOA is within the Airport Influence Area Boundary of the Fox Airfield, and land use compatibility zones C, D, and E overlap the EOA. Therefore, there would be greater impacts associated with hazards due to proximity to a public airport. However, through compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations and/or avoidance of the Fox Airfield’s Airport Influence Area in the hypothetical placement of the alternative location within the EOA, there would be less than significant impacts with this mitigation. As noted above, EAFB is also adjacent to the Central EOA; however, the Central EOA is not within an area with any land use compatibility restrictions (Perry 2016). Therefore, there would be less than significant impacts related to airport/airstrip hazards, similar to the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related emergency response or emergency evacuation plans.

The majority of the Central EOA is designated as a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zones, with the remainder not designated as a fire hazard zone. Therefore, exposure to wildland fire risks
would be reduced under this Alternative compared to the proposed Project. The implementation of a fuel modification zone established with a Fire Management Plan would mitigate impacts to a less than significant level with the proposed Project. Alternative F would not require implementation of fuel modification.

The potential impacts to surface water and groundwater quality associated with Alternative F would be similar to the proposed Project because the same development area and land uses would be implemented. However, the Project site would not have ready access to the Project's water supplies or banking infrastructure, this alternative would have a greater impact on regional water supplies relative to the proposed Project. Impacts under both the proposed Project and this Alternative to water quality would be less than significant with mitigation. This Alternative would result in similar impacts related to waste discharge requirements and wastewater treatment systems, as there would be the same types of land uses and number of WRFs as the proposed Project.

The Central EOA contains approximately 469 acres of Prime Farmland, 132 acre of Farmland of Statewide Important, 69 acres of Unique Farmland, and 622 acres of Grazing Land. Dependent on the placement of the contiguous 12,323-acre site within the larger Central EOA, this Alternative has the potential to convert up to 670 acres of Farmland. This Alternative could result in less conversion of Prime Farmland compared to the proposed Project (642 acres), but would result in a similar amount of Farmland whose loss is considered significant under CEQA. As with the proposed Project, conversion of Grazing Land is not considered a significant impact. Therefore, impacts related to the conversion of farmland would be also be significant and unavoidable under this Alternative.

As with the proposed Project, Alternative F would not involve the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impacts to mineral resources would occur under this Alternative.

Alternative F would result in disturbance of the same development footprint acreage, where unknown archaeological, tribal cultural, and paleontological resources or human remains may be present, as with the proposed Project. Impacts to cultural resources from implementation of Alternative F would be mitigated in the same manner, or in a different but appropriate manner depending on the resources, as those for the proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

In general, the impact on some biological resources would be reduced under Alternative F. For example, the Central EOA is expected to contain fewer jurisdictional drainages due to the flatter terrain with fewer topographic changes; this impact would be less than significant after mitigation, same as the proposed Project. Oak trees and oak woodlands are not likely to be present on the Central EOA, which may indicate impacts to oak trees and oak woodlands would be reduced. Other special status vegetation types (such alkaline sink) or associated plants, however, are known to be present in the Central EOA but not the Project site. Due to the fairly extensive distribution in the Central EOA, these resources would likely be impacted by Alternative F. As a result, impacts would increase in some regard to those resources that are different from the Project site. Consequently, there would be a need for
different mitigation areas to offset these impacts. It is expected that these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels after mitigation under this Alternative, same as the proposed Project. With regard to cumulative impacts to special status vegetation types, it is expected this impact would be less than the proposed Project and would be less than significant with mitigation based on the existing disturbance of the lands surrounding the alternative location. Additionally, this Alternative would result in a reduced impact to wildlife movement compared to the proposed Project, based on the continuity of the terrain immediately surrounding the Central EOA.

The Central EOA is anticipated to have a much lower amount of future development than the West EOA, even when considering buildout of the entire 23,930 acres within the Central EOA, based on the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS as well as the AVAP land use designations and zoning. The majority of the Central EOA has Rural Land designations and an associated agricultural zoning. Alternative F is not consistent with the pattern of land use designations in the Central EOA, as contained in the AVAP. Therefore, this is a new significant impact of this Alternative. Implementation of Alternative F would require a General Plan amendment and a zone change for the entirety of the 12,323-acre footprint within the Central EOA. Like the proposed Project, with adoption of appropriate land use approvals, there would be a less than significant impact. This Alternative would not involve development within an SEA, like the proposed Project, and would not include hillside management areas. Therefore, Alternative F would not conflict with applicable land use criteria, similar to the Project.

Based on the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, the maximum growth within the Central EOA is estimated at 24,015 people, 8,233 jobs, and 9,505 households (i.e., dwelling units) (Stantec 2016b). Therefore, this alternative would exceed the regional growth projections for this EOA by 33,135 people, 15,442 jobs, and 9,828 dwelling units. Therefore, development of the equivalent land use plan within the Central EOA would be inconsistent with the adopted RTP/SCS, which is the region’s approved land use and transportation plan pursuant to the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (Senate Bill [SB] 375). This inconsistency would represent a new significant and unavoidable impact compared to the proposed Project. Furthermore, the approximate 11,607 acres remaining in the Central EOA with development of the Project’s land uses on 12,323 acres, would still be available for development. This would hypothetically result in even higher total development within the Central EOA of the AVAP. In terms of land use compatibility, and as discussed further under relevant topics below, there are two air traffic facilities proximate to the site, the General William J. Fox Airfield (Fox Airfield) immediately to the south and EAFB immediately to the northeast. There would be greater land use and planning impacts under this Alternative, and a new significant and unavoidable impact.

Additionally, this Alternative would have a greater potential to induce growth in the surrounding area because the restrictions to development present proximate to the Project site, including topography and presence of public lands, are absent at this alternative location. Therefore, this Alternative would result in a new significant and unavoidable impact with respect to conformity to population projections, and a greater significant and unavoidable impact with respect to growth-inducing impacts. As with the Project, there
would be a significant and unavoidable impact based on the substantial growth on the alternative location relative to the existing setting.

There is existing residential and non-residential (primarily the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant and Lancaster Landfill and Recycling Center) development within the Central EOA. In order to develop a contiguous 12,323-acre site, it is expected that existing households in the scattered residences within the Central EOA would have to be displaced. The proposed Project would result in displacement of one household, which was concluded not be substantial and therefore less than significant. Implementation of this Alternative would likely result in displacement of a greater number of existing households. As such, this would be a greater impact than the proposed Project, but would be also less than significant with implementation of appropriate regulations.

Alternative F would generate the same number of off-site vehicle trips as the proposed Project, but these trips would be distributed on SR-138 (in the EOA vicinity), SR-14, Sierra Highway, and local streets within and proximate to the Central EOA. As discussed above under Land Use, Entitlements, and Planning, development of an equivalent land use plan within the Central EOA is inconsistent with the approved 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. As such, it is expected that accommodating the number of off-site vehicle trips would require substantial transportation capacity improvements to the local and regional network beyond that anticipated by regional plans. Construction and use of transportation capacity improvements not anticipated as part of the RTP/SCS would result in greater air quality and GHG emissions than expected and thereby reduces the ability of the County and the State to achieve its GHG reduction targets under AB 32, as implemented through SB 375.

As with the proposed Project, significant impacts to the existing transportation system and CMP highways would occur under this Alternative. Payment of fair share fees for improvements to Caltrans facilities would be made as mitigation for the impacts of this Alternative, but it is outside the County’s control to implement these improvements. Thus, if Caltrans does not construct the necessary improvements, impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the Project.

Impacts on air traffic would be greater than the proposed Project due to the proximity of the General William J. Fox Airfield (Fox Airfield) approximately 1.25 miles to the south at the nearest point. The southwestern portion of the Central EOA is within the Airport Influence Area Boundary of the Fox Airfield, and land use compatibility zones C, D, and E overlap the EOA. These zones represent limitations on land use development, due to flight paths, noise, accidents, risks, and other issues, to maintain compatibility with the airport operations. Although there would be greater constraints related to air traffic than the proposed Project, through compliance with FAA regulations and/or avoidance of the Fox Airfield’s Airport Influence Area in the hypothetical placement of the alternative location within the EOA, there would be less than significant impacts, same as the proposed Project. EAFB is also adjacent to the Central EOA. EAFB was contacted to request its Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ), if applicable, and/or other information on land use compatibility planning. The EAFB staff reports the Central EOA is not within an area with any land use compatibility restrictions (Perry 2016). It is assumed this is due to the distance between the active EAFB
operations and the Central EOA. As such, there would be less than significant impacts related to EAFB.

As with the proposed Project, impacts related to emergency access and traffic hazards can be mitigated. No conflict with alternative transportation policies would occur, similar to the Project.

Implementation of Alternative F would involve the same grading and construction activity, and associated criteria pollutant emissions, as the proposed Project. The entirety of the Central EOA is located within the AVAQMD. Because the AVAQMD thresholds are based on annual construction emissions, with implementation of mitigation (i.e., use of Tier 4 construction equipment) emissions would be less than significant for both the average construction year and peak construction year. Therefore, this alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable construction-related impacts associated with CO, VOCs, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions.

This Alternative would have the same land use development and would generate the same amount of vehicular traffic; therefore, vehicular emissions would not change. As with the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in significant unavoidable operational emissions associated with CO, VOCs, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 pursuant to AVAQMD thresholds. Consistency with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan would represent a less than significant impact under this Alternative, similar to the proposed Project. Based on the presence of the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant, which has large open basins as part of its facilities, it is unclear whether exposure to odors would also be a less than significant impact under this Alternative.

Alternative F would involve the same construction as the proposed Project, with the same noise impacts and exposure to groundborne vibration resulting from construction. Impacts related to noise increases in excess of Los Angeles County standards at sensitive receptors, including existing residences within and immediately adjacent to 12,323-acre alternative location within the Central EOA, would likely be significant, similar to those of the proposed Project. Mitigation would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. Off-site traffic noise would be the same when compared to the proposed Project because of the same vehicular traffic generation. Noise impacts on existing residences along roadways that would have much higher capacity would likely also be significant and unavoidable under this Alternative because it is outside the County’s control to implement improvements on private properties or Caltrans right-of-way. Airport noise exposure would be greater than the Project due to the proximity of Fox Airfield; however, as discussed above under “Traffic, Access, and Circulation”, through compliance with FAA regulations and/or avoidance of the Fox Airfield’s Airport Influence Area in the hypothetical placement of the alternative location within the EOA, there would be less than significant impacts, similar to the proposed Project.

Visual changes to the Project site associated with the implementation of Alternative F would be greater than those anticipated under the proposed Project because the Central EOA is more visible from public roadways, and from a farther distance because of the flat topography of the EOA and surrounding areas. Like the proposed Project, impacts with
respect to alterations to a scenic vista and degradation of the visual quality of the site would be significant and unavoidable. This Alternative would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to creation of new sources of light and glare. The AVAP identifies scenic drives on roadways that are two miles from the Central EOA boundary at the nearest point (i.e., 90th Street West). Under both the proposed Project and this Alternative, less than significant impacts would occur related to a scenic highway corridor since the site is planned for development in the AVAP, though not at the intensity envisioned under the Conceptual Land Use Plan, and based on the distance to the scenic drives.

Implementation of Alternative F would result in the same demand for parks and recreational facilities since the same number of dwelling units is proposed, resulting in the same resident population. As with the proposed Project, less than significant impacts would occur with the provision of on-site parks and recreational facilities. This Alternative would also provide on-site trails that may connect to existing County or regional trails; however, this alternative site is not proximate to regional open space (e.g., National Forests, realigned Pacific Crest Trail) in the same manner as the Project site. Regardless, this would remain a less than significant impact, similar to the proposed Project.

The demand for school facilities and services associated with Alternative F would be similar to those of the proposed Project because the same residential development is proposed. As such, schools needed to serve on-site residents would also be the same. This Alternative would require school services from the Lancaster Elementary School District, Westside Union Elementary School District and the Antelope Valley Union High School District. As with the proposed Project, impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative through school facilities and funding agreements with the affected school districts.

The demand for fire and law enforcement services associated with Alternative F would be similar to that for the proposed Project because the same amount of development is proposed. Impacts to fire and law enforcement services would be mitigated through the provision of on-site fire stations and a Sheriff's station, similar to the proposed Project. Impacts to fire and law enforcement services would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative. The demand for library services associated with Alternative F would be similar to those of the proposed Project. With the same number of residents, this Alternative would require the development of the same size community library as the proposed Project. Both the proposed Project and this Alternative would result in less than significant impact after mitigation.

The solid waste demands associated with Alternative F would be similar to those of the proposed Project because the same development is proposed. Also, the demand for landfill capacity would be considered significant and unavoidable because permitted landfill capacity at existing County landfills cannot be guaranteed at the time of Project buildout and through the life of the Project, which would occur beyond the required 15-year LACDPW planning horizon. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to solid waste.
Alternative F would create a demand for County services and facilities but would be subject to the payment of fees for any needed services. Alternative F would also provide a maintenance yard on the site for County use for public park and facility maintenance, County-owned roadway maintenance, public right-of-way maintenance, flood-control infrastructure maintenance, and other maintenance activities. Impacts would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

The water demands associated with Alternative F would be similar to those of the proposed Project because the same amount of development is proposed. Unlike the Project site, there is no existing water supply infrastructure (i.e., water bank) and associated water rights to support development of the proposed master-planned community. Therefore, this Alternative would result in greater direct impacts than the proposed Project. It is expected there would not be feasible mitigation to accommodate the water demands of the Conceptual Land Use Plan without the existing water resources associated with the Project site, resulting in a new significant and unavoidable impact. Also, as with the proposed Project, significant unavoidable cumulative impacts to water supplies would result from Alternative F.

Wastewater generation associated with Alternative F would be similar to the Project due to the same development. As such, impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements and wastewater facilities would also be less. Both the proposed Project and this Alternative would result in less than significant impacts with the provision of an on-site sewer system and WRFs. Demands for dry utility services associated with Alternative F would be similar to those of the proposed Project because the same development is proposed. As with the proposed Project, impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level under this Alternative.

With the same development associated with Alternative F, greenhouse gas emissions from development would be similar to the Project. As discussed above under “Land Use, Entitlements, and Planning”, development of an equivalent land use plan within the Central EOA is inconsistent with the approved 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, which is the region’s approved land use and transportation plan pursuant to SB 375). Accordingly, development of a master planned community on lands not anticipated as part of the RTP/SCS thereby reduces the ability of the County and the State to achieve its GHG reduction targets under AB 32, as implemented through SB 375. Therefore, Alternative F would result in impacts related to climate change would be greater under Alternative F, and would result in a greater significant and unavoidable impact related to climate change impacts.

**Finding**: Implementation of Alternative F would result in similar impacts as the proposed Project related to land resources, geotechnical, hydrology and flood, water quality, air resources (operation only), noise, cultural resources, parks and recreation, hazards, fire and law enforcement services, other public services, dry utilities, wastewater, and education. This Alternative would also result in decreased impacts related to air resources (construction only) and wildland fire risk. Regarding biological resources, this Alternative would result in similar impacts related to sensitive plant and wildlife species (impact mitigated) and habitat conservation plans (no impact), and would result in reduced impacts related to sensitive vegetation communities, wetlands, oak trees and oak woodlands, and
wildlife movement. This Alternative would also avoid significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to sensitive vegetation communities and wildlife movement, as it is anticipated these impacts would be cumulatively less than significant with mitigation.

However, Alternative F would result in increased impacts related to land use and planning; population, housing, and employment and growth-inducing impacts; traffic, access, and circulation; visual resources; water resources; and climate change. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality, agriculture resources, noise, traffic, visual resources, climate change, water supply, and solid waste. Significantly, Alternative F is not consistent with the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS as it would exceed the regional growth projections for the Central EOA by 33,135 people, 15,442 jobs, and 9,828 dwelling units. This represents a significant and unavoidable impact that would not occur under the Project and conflicts with regional plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change. Indeed, Alternative F would exacerbate regional climate change impacts as compared to the Project. Thus, while Alternative F has some environmental benefits as compared to the Project, these benefits are, on balance, outweighed by its new significant and unavoidable environmental effects and its conflicts with the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and in light of these considerations is hereby rejected as infeasible by the Board of Supervisors.

G. Environmentally Superior Alternative

**Facts in Support of Finding:** CEQA requires that an EIR identify the environmentally superior alternative. Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR) identifies the following factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR: (1) failure to meet most of the basic Project objectives, (2) infeasibility, or (3) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. These factors are considered in the selection of the environmentally superior alternative.

The analysis of the potential impacts associated with the proposed Project and the alternatives addressed in this EIR indicate that Alternative A, the No Project Alternative, has the least environmental impact since no development is proposed on site. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives. Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines states “If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (14 CCR 15126.6).

Alternative B would meet most of the Project Objectives but would result in greater impacts on most issues due to the increase in development proposed on a smaller site. It would also not avoid any of the significant impacts of the Project. The currently proposed Project is an amended proposal from a 2003 application submitted to the County of Los Angeles, as described in the NOP dated March 2004. Based on the AVAP community outreach, environmental review, and County approval process, the Project was redesigned to be consistent with the 2015 AVAP. The current Project has 3,665 fewer dwelling units and 4.12 million sf less of commercial and business park development, on a development footprint that is approximately 640 acres less than the earlier proposed project. The proposed Project
is a significantly better and environmentally superior design compared to the earlier proposal.

Alternative C would meet the Project Objectives and would reduce impacts to major drainages on the site as well as other environmental factors due to the reduction in dwelling units (92 fewer units) and commercial and institutional development (198,634 sf less). This Alternative would reduce both its grading-driven impacts (e.g., biological resources, cultural resources, visual resources) and population-driven impacts (e.g., air quality, climate change, noise, traffic, water supply, public services and utility demands). However, it would not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project.

Alternative D would meet the Project Objectives and would relocate water tanks and the water treatment plant to improve the water system and reduce energy demands for water distribution. It would also reduce its visual impacts, but would increase impacts on biological resources, with 58 acres of the San Andreas SEA disturbed. Since this Alternative would not change the development on the site, it would not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project.

Alternative E would meet the Project Objectives and would result in decreased impacts to grading-driven impacts (approximately 656 fewer graded acres), increased preservation of open space, as well as reduced impacts to visual resources. This Alternative would result in the same or similar impacts to population-driven impacts and would not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project.

Alternative F would not meet three of the five Project Objectives, and would result in additional significant and unavoidable impacts to related to land use, population projections, and water supply and greater significant and unavoidable impacts related to growth-inducing impacts and climate change. However, Alternative F would avoid significant and unavoidable impacts to sensitive vegetation communities and wildlife movement, as it is anticipated these impacts would be cumulatively less than significant with mitigation.

Based on the analysis for each Alternative above, although no alternative would entirely avoid any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project, Alternative E, Density Clustering/East of Aqueduct is considered the environmentally superior alternative to the Project in relation to some impact topics. Alternative E would result in a reduced grading footprint of approximately 656 acres; would have a corresponding increase in open space; and would meet all the Project Objectives.

Finding: The EIR, including Section 8.0 of the Draft EIR, and the balance of the administrative record contains facts and analysis supporting the Finding, some of which are set forth here. Based on the analysis for each Alternative above, although no alternative would entirely avoid any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project, Alternative E, Density Clustering/East of Aqueduct is considered the environmentally superior alternative to the Project in relation to some impact topics. Alternative E would result in a reduced grading footprint of approximately 656 acres; would have a corresponding increase in open space; and would meet all the Project Objectives.
However, as discussed above, Alternative E would not avoid any of the Project’s significant and unavoidable environmental effects. Moreover, as compared to the Project, Alternative E could result in higher costs for certain public infrastructure improvements that correlate with higher intensity of uses, such as parkland. Also, since this alternative eliminates Project development west of the California Aqueduct with the exception of planned improvements to Cement Plant Road, Alternative E would not provide a planned regional trail extension north of Quail Lake. Similarly, Alternative E would not provide a second vehicle crossing over the California Aqueduct, which could limit emergency evacuation options for project residents.

In summary, although Alternative E would reduce some of the Project’s significant and unavoidable environmental effects, it would not reduce any such effects to less-than-significant levels. Moreover, it would (i) not provide a secondary evacuation route across the California Aqueduct, (ii) increase maintenance costs of certain categories of public infrastructure, such as parks, (iii) provide an unbalanced mix of housing options, (iv) increase housing costs for multifamily residential units, (v) have a negative fiscal impact on the County, and (vi) be inconsistent with certain County housing and planning policies. The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects Alternative E, the Environmentally Superior Alternative, as infeasible on the basis of such considerations.

H. Alternatives that were Considered but Rejected.

During public review of the EIR, some commenters suggested that the EIR analyze an alternative to the Project that would substantially reduce Project density beyond that contemplated by Alternative C (see EIR Comments F.5-11, F.5-9, ADD-F.2-48). The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects as infeasible a Project alternative that would substantially reduce Project density (e.g., reduce density by 25%) on the basis that such alternative is infeasible and would not substantially reduce the Project’s significant effects for the reasons set forth in Responses to Comments F.5-11, F.5-9, and ADD-F.2-48. One commenter suggested a Project alternative that relies more on higher-density mixed commercial/residential development on existing disturbed land (see EIR Comments F.8-72). The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects such alternative as infeasible for the reasons set forth in Response to Comment F.8-72. One commenter suggested a Project alternative that maintains a contiguous habitat linkage from project-adjacent aqueduct overcrossings to Highway 138 and to open space south of the highway (see EIR Comments F.5-13 and ADD-F.2-49). The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects such alternative because the EIR considered alternatives that would maintain habitat linkages from the north to the open space south of Highway 138 (see, e.g., Alternative E) and because such alternative would not substantially reduce the Project’s significant environmental effects, as discussed in Response to Comments F.5-13 and ADD-F.2-49. Two alternatives were considered in the EIR but not carried forward for analysis; namely, the Alternative Site Within or Near Tejon Ranch Alternative, and the Public Input Alternative. The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the Alternative Site Within or Near Tejon Ranch Alternative because such alternative would not substantially reduce the Project’s significant effects and because it is infeasible for the reasons set forth on Draft EIR pages 8-12 and 8-13. The Board of Supervisors hereby rejects the Public Input Alternative
as infeasible for the reasons set forth on Draft EIR pages 8-13 and Response to Comment F.5-11.

8. FINDINGS REGARDING GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines provides the following guidance on growth-inducing impacts: a project is identified as growth inducing if it “could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.

While the Project does include the construction of new infrastructure facilities and provisions for new access to the area north of SR-138, the infrastructure facilities are not sized to accommodate growth beyond that which is proposed for the Centennial Project. No new electrical production plants or natural gas facilities are part of the proposed Project and no new electrical/gas production facilities are required to support the development of the proposed Project, although 50% of the Project’s total electric energy demand (i.e. household, business, civic/institutional, recreational, and public facilities) must be met by onsite renewable energy. This renewable energy generation would be used by the Project; therefore, the Project would not provide any additional power/gas supplies or eliminate a power-related obstacle to growth.

Water supplies are limited in the proposed Project area. The Project will utilize several water supplies and on- and off-site water banking facilities to meet potable demand. Available supplies include groundwater and imported water return flows in accordance with the approved Antelope Valley adjudication Judgment and Physical Solution and State Water Project (SWP) supplies secured for Project use and imported to the site under an agreement with the Antelope Valley – East Kern Water Agency (AVEK). The Project is designed to have a balance between demand and supply, and will not generate “extra” potable water that could be used to support additional growth in the area. Also, the Antelope Valley adjudication Judgment and Physical Solution limits the amount of growth in the area due to limited water supplies.

While the Project does propose two wastewater reclamation facilities (WRFs), they are designed to accommodate the proposed Project only and would not treat wastewater from the surrounding area. Due to limited wastewater treatment facilities in the Project’s surrounding area and due to the restricted size of wastewater reclamation plants proposed as part of the Project, growth is not anticipated to be induced as a result of the wastewater reclamation plants associated with the Project.

SR-138 provides the main access from the Lancaster/Palmdale area to I-5. The SR-138 is planned for expansion by Caltrans, as discussed in Section 5.10, Traffic, Access and Circulation, and is not related to the proposed Project. While new roads are a part of the infrastructure supporting the proposed Project, these roads are internal to the Project site. The roads would provide new access in an area (the proposed Project); however, they are limited to the boundaries of the Project site and are not sized to support regional traffic flows. Except for providing access to the SR-138, the Project roads would not provide access
to other areas outside the Project boundaries. At the Project site, the construction of roads, water treatment and delivery systems, sewers, two wastewater reclamation facilities, and utilities would not be sized to accommodate growth beyond that which is proposed for the Centennial Project. However, future nearby landowners could propose to connect to or build upon the Project’s infrastructure to serve future development in the surrounding area. Such proposals would be subject to environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA, and any approvals of future development would be at the discretion of the lead agency.

Housing being built as part of the Project will only support the anticipated needs of this new community. New housing will bring in a new population base. This population will require support services such as fire and police protection, libraries, schools and employment opportunities. The Project will be adding fire and police stations, libraries, and schools to support the anticipated population associated with the Project. These services are scaled such that these services will support the anticipated population only. Additional population in areas nearby or surrounding the Project would require additional support services. Thus, the Project will not provide services to support additional growth beyond what is expected for the Project. However, nearby landowners could benefit from the proximity of new services available at Centennial, which could, in turn, prompt them to seek approvals for additional development. Such proposals would be subject to environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA and any approvals of future development would be at the discretion of the lead agency.

The Project will increase the population within the boundaries of the Project site. The total anticipated increase in population generated by development of the Project (i.e., 57,150 people) represents approximately 4.81 percent of the projected population increase (1,188,600 persons) for the County as a whole between 2020 and 2040, and would represent approximately 23.38 percent of the SCAG growth projections for the North Los Angeles County Subregion for the same period. The Project is also consistent with the population and housing projections included in the AVAP, where 311,920 new residents and 81,441 new dwelling units are expected within the unincorporated areas from 2013 to 2035.

The Project would accommodate a projected demand for residential development in the North Los Angeles County Subregion. Development allowed by the proposed Project would also include shopping, entertainment, recreation, institutional, and health care uses. These uses would serve the residential development on the site and the existing residential uses near the site. The increased employment opportunities and businesses in the area could, in turn, induce growth locally and/or regionally to support visitors to the area that are not residents of the Centennial Project.

Long-term growth, should it occur, would primarily be in the form of an economic response to the presence of an increased resident population and employment opportunities that would occur on the Project site and that, in turn, could incrementally increase the area’s demand for local goods and services. As the proposed Project would result in the introduction of residents and its associated demand for goods and services and since the Project would create new employment opportunities in the Project’s commercial and business park areas, Project implementation would have the potential to induce regional
economic growth. Although precise contours of future growth that might be induced by the Project are difficult to predict given the number of variables at play (e.g., uncertainty about the nature, extent and location of such potentially induced growth) and the development restrictions imposed under the AVAP’s Rural Preservation Strategy, the existence of the Project has the potential to induce additional development proposals within the West EOA or other areas available for development which could result in a significant adverse indirect growth inducing impact of the Project. However, to the extent a future development proposal would require an AVAP amendment or other discretionary authorization, the Regional Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors would retain their authority to deny any such approval in accordance with applicable law.

9. FINDINGS REGARDING RECIRCULATION OF THE DRAFT EIR

The Board of Supervisors adopts the following findings with respect to whether to recirculate the Draft EIR. Under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, recirculation of an EIR is required when “significant new information” is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review but prior to certification of the Final EIR. The term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.

(4) The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5.)

Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR. The above standard is “not intend[ed] to promote endless rounds of revision and recirculation of EIRs.” (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112, 1132.) “Recirculation was intended to be an exception, rather than the general rule.” (Ibid.)

The Board of Supervisors recognizes that the Final EIR contains additions, clarifications, modifications, and other changes to the Draft EIR. Some comments on the Draft EIR either
expressly or impliedly sought changes to proposed mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR as well as additional mitigation measures. As explained in the Final EIR (Text Revisions), some of the suggestions were found to be appropriate and feasible and were adopted in the Final EIR. Where changes have been made to mitigation measures, these changes do not change the significance of any conclusions presented in the Draft EIR.

CEQA case law emphasizes that “‘[t]he CEQA reporting process is not designed to freeze the ultimate proposal in the precise mold of the initial project; indeed, new and unforeseen insights may emerge during investigation, evoking revision of the original proposal.’” (Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 736-737; see also River Valley Preservation Project v. Metropolitan Transit Development Bd. (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 154, 168, fn. 11.) “CEQA compels an interactive process of assessment of environmental impacts and responsive project modification which must be genuine. It must be open to the public, premised upon a full and meaningful disclosure of the scope, purposes, and effect of a consistently described project, with flexibility to respond to unforeseen insights that emerge from the process. In short, a project must be open for public discussion and subject to agency modification during the CEQA process.” (Concerned Citizens of Costa Mesa, Inc. v. 33rd Dist. Agricultural Assn. (1986) 42 Cal.3d 929, 936 (internal citations omitted).) Here, the changes made to the Draft EIR in the Final EIR are exactly the kind of revisions that the case law recognizes as legitimate and proper.

The Board of Supervisors finds that none of the revisions to the Draft EIR made by, or discussion included in, the Final EIR involves “significant new information” triggering recirculation because the changes do not result in any new significant environmental effects, substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, or feasible project alternatives that would clearly lessen the environmental effects of the project. Similarly, no documentation produced by, or submitted to, the County and relied on by the County after publication of the Final EIR, including but not limited to the Late Comments described above, identifies any new significant effect, substantial increase in the severity of any environmental effect, or feasible project alternatives that would clearly lessen the environmental effects of the project. All project modifications were either environmentally benign or environmentally neutral, and all additional documentation relied on by the County merely clarifies or amplifies conclusions in the EIR. These therefore represent the kind of common changes that occur and supplemental information that is received during the environmental review process as it works towards its conclusion. Under such circumstances, the Board of Supervisors hereby finds that recirculation of the EIR is not required.

10. SECTION 21082.1(c)(3) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3), the Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the Final EIR reflects that independent judgment of the lead agency.