



Los Angeles County  
Department of Regional Planning

*Planning for the Challenges Ahead*



Richard J. Bruckner  
Director

December 22, 2015

TO: SEATAC

FROM: Diane Aranda, Principal Planner  
Special Projects Section

**SUBJECT: ENTRADA NORTH (NOT PART of NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)  
PROJECT NO. R2013-02833-(5)  
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 071377  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 201300151  
OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 201300036  
PARKING PERMIT NO. 201300010  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW NO. 201300241  
AGENDA ITEM NO. 2**

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

Entrada North proposes to develop a mixed-use subdivision of a 456-acre site including 1,150 multi-family dwelling units, 2,624,400 square feet of commercial retail and office uses, 270-room hotel, 45,000 square-foot public facility, 268 acres of open space lots, and an outdoor amphitheater near Six Flags Magic Mountain at Magic Mountain Parkway. Entrada North also includes 22 acres of infrastructure improvements external to the subdivision map along with other infrastructure improvements internal to the subdivision map. The Board of Supervisors, as part of Landmark Village and Mission Village project approvals, approved a portion of the external map improvements associated with Entrada North. The Entrada North project is separated into two related project sites, Site A located south of the Santa Clara River at the junction of The Old Road and Magic Mountain Parkway, and Site B located north of the Santa Clara River at the junction of The Old Road and SR 126. The southerly Site A is hilly and of diverse biological make-up. The northerly Site B is largely comprised of flat previously farmed land along the Santa Clara River and not-to-be-developed Santa Clara River open space acreage (with the exception of some required bank stabilization). Approximately, 222-acres (46%) of the Entrada North Project Site overlaps the Santa Clara River SEA (SEA No. 23) with 9.5-acres of Project development impact within the SEA (2.1-acres of new development impact and 7.4-acres of previously disturbed area). In unincorporated Los Angeles County any proposed development that takes place in an SEA is subject to an SEA Conditional Use Permit and a review of biological resources and project impacts by the SEA Technical Advisory Committee (SEA).

**PROJECT DISCUSSION**

At the September 15, 2015 SEATAC meeting, SEATAC concluded that further explanation be provided regarding the following: 1) the bat survey may be inadequate, as it was conducted only during the spring and summer and therefore does not include migrants; 2) Some areas may meet County standards for recognizing oak woodland per CEQA Section 21083.4 and other areas may not but are still considered sensitive per CEQA as sensitive vegetation. In addition, there are several classifications cited that cause confusion because of terms used such as woodland and forest, that are derived independently of the County's interpretation of CEQA

Section 21083.4; 3) provide more detail and certainty on oak mitigation so that less is left to future decisions subsequent to project approval, such as potential locations, recipient habitats, details of site selection etc.; 4) the term %unfunctional,+as used in several mitigation measures, is not well defined. Performance standards need to include additional criteria besides five-year monitoring of plant cover that can better demonstrate ecological health of the restored areas. Include irrigation details and possible drawbacks; 5) Develop best management practices for mitigation to be followed to provide better guidance and more certainty. Consider bonding of mitigation; 6) Provide more detail about source materials for restoration plantings. Reconsider whether active restoration is even necessary in the river where natural recruitment is prevalent and introduction of foreign material may be harmful; 7) Provide permanent weed management as mitigation; weed management alone may provide recruitment opportunity for natives sufficient to mitigate much of the project impact, rather than active planting approaches and should be considered; 8) Sterilize mulching equipment prior to use for on-site native vegetation. Incorporate proper storage, handling, and application methods to minimize fire risk; 9) Incorporate best management practices for the management of emerging pests (shothole borer/fusarium) in restored and landscaped areas; 10) Provide greater detail on the treatment of runoff originating from the Project Site, in terms of both water quality and volume; include the water quality technical report in future submittals. 11) Provide a comparison of water quality and volumes originating from the site from current agricultural and proposed conditions; 12) Indicate entities that will hold the conservation lands and how funding for management of those lands will be managed. Define thresholds that will trigger management activities; identify funding allocation (e.g., endowment) for long-term management; 13) SEATAC does not advocate for moving species into intact habitat areas as mitigation against take due to construction impacts. Indicate that moving animals is in compliance with regulatory guidelines but that it is not expected to alleviate take (barring references to the contrary). Consider moving prior to construction and into restoration areas to minimize disruption to existing populations; 14) revising awkward wording relating to butterfly survey results; 15) United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) Critical Habitat designation for arroyo toad did not include upland habitat; however, much of the species'life history is spent in upland areas and thus the analysis of impacts to arroyo toad based on avoidance of Critical Habitat is unfounded; 16) Clarify what has been authorized regarding take of arroyo toad in the Natural Rivers and Management Plan (NRMP), how take is assessed for this project and for the overall NRMP area, how this project will be covered, and how losses in the SEA can be compensated for outside of the SEA; 17) provide analysis of impacts to upland pond turtle habitat (including flood refugia and upland breeding habitat). Calculate the on-site and off-site loss of pond turtle breeding habitat for this and other nearby Newhall projects; 18) the north/south corridor aligned with Castaic Creek is neglected in discussions of wildlife movement. Address this corridor and analyse potential project impacts to it.

This will be the second SEATAC review of the Entrada North project as preparation of a Draft EIR progresses. The attached revised Biological Technical Report includes baseline biological resource information based on a comprehensive series of data collected from the 1980s to present and a project-specific biological impact analysis. It is anticipated that project-specific written comments from SEATAC members due prior to the January 11, 2016 SEATAC meeting will be provided to the Department of Regional Planning by the January 5, 2016 deadline (send to: daranda@planning.lacounty.gov).

The revised **October 2015 Biological Technical Report** and the **November 2015 Response to SEATAC Comments** and associated figures for the Entrada North Site have been forwarded to the Committee for review and discussion at the January 11, 2016 meeting.

SZD:DA  
12/22/15