Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning

Project title: Plum Canyon Condominiums / Project No. R2014-02680-(5) / Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 073065, Conditional Use Permit No. 201400126, Environmental Assessment No. 201400215.

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Contact Person and phone number: Tyler Montgomery, (213) 974-6433

Project sponsor's name and address: KB Home, 25152 Springfield Court, Suite 180, Valencia, CA 91355

Project location: Plum Canyon Road, between La Madrid Drive and Farrell Road, Santa Clarita Valley
APN: 2812-097-007 *USGS Quad*: Mint Canyon

Gross Acreage: 14.5 acres

General plan designation: N/A

Community/Area wide Plan designation: CG—General Commercial

Zoning: C-2 (Neighborhood Business)

Description of project: The applicant requests to create one commercial lot and one residential condominium lot with 175 condo units on 14.5 gross (12.4 net) acres. The applicant is also requesting a conditional use permit ("CUP") for the development of residential townhomes in the C-2 (Neighborhood Business) Zone on the proposed Lot 1 (10.4 acres). The second proposed commercial lot (Lot 2) would have an area of 1.9 acres and remain undeveloped for the time being. The project would require approximately 111,214 cubic yards of cut, 106,725 cubic yards of fill and the export of approximately 4,489 cubic yards of material.

The proposed multi-family residential development would include 175 three-story townhome style condominiums units in 41 separate buildings connected by a series of drive aisles. Maximum height of the buildings would be 35 feet. Each of the 41 buildings would contain either 4 or 5 separate units, and each unit would have its own enclosed two car garage. A total of 350 private parking spaces and 71 guest parking spaces would be provided throughout the project.

The primary project access driveway would be along Plum Canyon Road; secondary access would be provided along La Madrid Drive. A third access would be provided to Farrell Road (proposed Skyline Ranch Road). Two stormwater detention basins totaling 7,500 square feet and two open space park areas totaling 15,000 square feet would also be provided.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site is a vacant, graded commercial lot that was created as part of Tract 46018-11 in 2004. The site is surrounded by single-family residences on sloping terrain to the north and east and single-family detached condominiums to the west, across Plum Canyon Road. These lots were created and developed as part of the aforementioned Tract Map. Undeveloped hilly terrain

located to the south is designated for single-family residences under Tract 46018, although this phase of the tract map has yet to be finalized or recorded. Vegetation on the project site consists only of some sparse grasses.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Public Agency	*Approval Required*
Department of Public Works	*Final Map, Building, Grading , and Encroachment Permits*

Major projects in the area:

Project/Case No.	*Description and Status*
TR 46018	*Tract Map for development of 2,500+ single-family residential units, commercial, and public facilities lots. Recorded in multiple phases between 2002 and 2004; some phases still pending*

Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Agencies

- ☒ None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
  - ☐ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- ☒ SCAQMD
- ☒ Saugus Union School District
- ☒ William S. Hart Union High School District

Regional Significance

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

Trustee Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- ☐ State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- ☐ State Lands Commission
- ☐ University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ DPW:
  - Land Development Division (Grading, Drainage, & Road)
  - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
  - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)
  - Traffic and Lighting Division
  - Environmental Programs Division
  - Waterworks Division
  - Sewer Maintenance Division
- ☒ Fire Department
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
- ☐ Sanitation District
- ☒ Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Toxics Epidemiology Program
- ☐ Sheriff Department
- ☒ Parks and Recreation
- ☒ Subdivision Committee
- ☐ Other

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Agriculture/Forest	☐ Hazards/Hazardous Materials	☐ Public Services
☒ Air Quality	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Recreation
☒ Biological Resources	☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities/Services
☐ Energy	☒ Noise	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
☒ Geology/Soils		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_____ _____
Signature (Prepared by) Date

_____ _____
Signature (Approved by) Date

1. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is near Plum Canyon Road, which is not officially designated as a scenic highways (Source: Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan). There are no significant ridgelines adjacent to the subject property. The proposed project is a level, previously graded located within an established residential community. The proposed structures' maximum heights of 35 feet and their location at the foot of a hillside will not adversely affect a scenic vista.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no riding or hiking trails within a mile of the project site, and the site would not be visible from any trail (Source: GIS-NET Trails Layer).

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings near a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The residential development would be compatible with the residentially developed neighborhood and does not impact scenic resources. There are no oak trees on site. Vegetation on the project site consists of some sparse grasses. No historic buildings exist on the site. The proposed project would result in less than significant aesthetic impacts.

d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Single-family residential and condominium lots of a similar size and scale currently exist in all directions. The approval ensures consistency with applicable County zoning and General Plan standards and requirements.

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is a level, previously graded located within an established residential community. The proposed structures' maximum heights of 35 feet and their location at the foot of a hillside will not create a substantial source of shadows, light, or glare.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not comprised of any farmland. The construction of residential buildings in an already disturbed, urbanized area will not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland (Source: Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, California Department of Conservation).

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not zoned for agricultural uses. The project site is not currently used for agricultural purposes and it is not designated as an Agricultural Opportunity Area or under a Williamson Act contract.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There is no forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production within the vicinity of the project site.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There is no forest land within the vicinity of project site.

e) 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 use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There is no forest land or farmland within the vicinity of the project site, and the project would not result in changes to the environment that would result in the loss of either type of land.

3. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The construction of 175 residential condominiums on the project site would not require an amendment to the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) projections of the existing SCAQMD air quality plan. As a result, the impact of the project on the air quality plan would be less than significant.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☒	☐	☐

In order to estimate the amount of emissions generated by the project during and after construction, a simulation was prepared using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The simulation, dated September 5, 2014, was prepared by Rincon Associates and assumed simultaneous development of 43,500 square feet of restaurant and retail uses within the commercial zone as a worst-case scenario. The results are summarized below and indicate that the project, during the construction phase, could exceed the recommended SCAQMD threshold for reactive organic gasses (ROGs), which are ozone precursors. Because the area covered by the SCAQMD is continually in a state of non-attainment for ozone, this could be a potentially significant impact. As a result, a mitigation measure would require interior and exterior paints to utilize interior and exterior paints with the least amount of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) possible—generally less than 50g/L for interior paints and zero for exterior paints.

c) 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)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

In order to estimate the amount of emissions generated by the project during and after construction, a simulation was prepared using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The simulation, dated September 5, 2014, was prepared by Rincon Associates and assumed simultaneous development of 43,500 square feet of restaurant and retail uses within the commercial zone as a worst-case scenario. The results are summarized below and indicate that the project, during the construction phase, could exceed the recommended SCAQMD threshold for reactive organic gasses (ROGs), which are ozone precursors. Because the area covered by the SCAQMD is continually in a state of non-attainment for ozone, this could be a potentially significant impact. As a result, a mitigation measure would require interior and exterior paints to utilize interior and exterior paints with the least amount of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) possible—generally less than 50g/L for interior paints and zero for exterior paints.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The nearest residences are approximately 100 feet from the project site. The project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to dust, as indicated by the output of the CalEEMod simulations for particulate matter. Further, best management practices for dust control, including periodic watering, are required by SCAQMD Rule 403. However, during the construction phase, the project could potentially exceed significance thresholds for ROGs,

which are ozone precursors. As a result, the applicant shall implement the mitigation measures indicated below, which shall reduce this impact to a level that is less than significant.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project of construction of 175 residential condominiums would not create objectionable odors that would be perceptible to a substantial number of people. The proposed project would not violate AQMD Rule 402.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The air pollutants that are regulated by the Federal and California Clean Air Acts fall under three categories, each of which are monitored and regulated:

- Criteria air pollutants;
- Toxic air contaminants (TACs); and,
- Global warming and ozone-depleting gases.

In 1970, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identified six "criteria" pollutants they found to be the most harmful to human health and welfare. They are:

- Ozone (O_3);
- Particulate Matter (PM);
- Carbon Monoxide (CO);
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2);
- Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2); and,
- Lead (Pb).

The Federal government and the State of California have established air quality standards designed to protect public health from these criteria pollutants. Among the federally identified criteria pollutants, the levels of ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide in Los Angeles County continually exceed federal and state health standards and the County is considered a non-attainment area for these pollutants.

In response to the region's poor air quality, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) & the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) were created. The SCAQMD and the AVAQMD are responsible for monitoring air quality as well as planning, implementing, and enforcing programs designed to attain and maintain state and federal ambient air quality standards in the region. The SCAQMD implements a wide range of programs and regulations, most notably, the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The SCAQMD jurisdiction covers approximately 10,743 square-miles and includes all of Los Angeles County except for the Antelope Valley, which is covered by the Antelope AVAQMD.

Sensitive receptors are uses such as playgrounds, schools, senior citizen centers, hospitals or other uses that would be more highly impacted by poor air quality. AQMD Rule 402, which states "A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals."

In order to mitigate the emission of ROGs during construction to a less-than-significant level, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

AQ-1 **Architectural Coatings.** The proposed project shall use interior and exterior paints with the least amount of VOCs practical for the purpose needed. In general, interior paint with VOC content of less than 50 g/L shall be used, and zero-VOC paints shall be used wherever feasible.

The CalEEMod emission simulation outputs for the project are provided below:

Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Emissions

Land Use	Maximum Any Construction Year (lbs/day)				
	ROG	NO_x	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Proposed Project	115.3	79.2	52.4	21.4	12.8
SCAQMD Regional Thresholds	*75*	*100*	*550*	*150*	*55*
Threshold Exceeded by Proposed Project	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Estimated Operational Emissions

Land Use	Estimated Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Proposed Project	22.4	41.5	187.5	0.4	25.0	7.2
SCAQMD Thresholds	*55*	*55*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Threshold Exceeded by Proposed Project	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The project site is relatively flat and disturbed with some short grasses. There are no species of concern in the area identified by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), although an identified natural community of Riparian Coastal Scrub is located to the south of the project site, across Farrell Road and along a drainage course. This community is described as a young secessional stage of southern Riparian Forest that includes dominant species in the southern riparian forest and mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolia*). The project site has already been graded, and the applicant will be required to obtain an approved drainage concept and Low Impact Development plan for further development of the site. This makes it unlikely that the site's development would alter its drainage in such a way as to significantly affect the Riparian Coastal Scrub community. Nesting birds occur all over the county and the project shall be compliant with the California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW) codes related to Nesting Birds. The project may impact native bird species if grading or other disturbance activities occur between December 1 and August 31. A mitigation measure requiring adequate nesting bird surveys for disturbance activities occurring within this period shall be required, which will mitigate the environmental impacts to a less-than-significant level.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site consists of a level, previously disturbed area is not located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer Area, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA). There are no oak trees, oak woodlands, wetlands, or waters of any kind located on the project site.

c) 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 & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site does not contain either Federal or State-protected wetlands, drainages, or waters.

d) 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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is not located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer Area, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA). There are no oak trees or oak woodlands located on the project site. The residential subdivision is located in developed areas and is surrounded by paved roads and/or residences in all directions. Therefore, the project would not interfere with connectivity to wildlife and plant linkage areas or wildlife linkage corridors or rivers or significant ridgelines.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch 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.)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

There are no oak trees, oak woodlands, Joshua trees, or Junipers on the subject property.

f) Conflict with any 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)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

There are no Wildflower Reserve Areas, SEAs, or SERAs on the subject property. Since there are no oak trees or oak woodlands on the subject property, there is no conflict with the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not in, or within, proximity to any Local Coastal Program, Significant Ecological Areas, a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or a federal Endangered Species Act Habitat Conservation Plan. The nearest conserved area is a CA Fish and Game conservation area at 0.3 miles to the east-northeast. The Cruzan Mesa Vernal Pools Significant Ecological Area at 0.3 miles to the east is designated for protection under the Skyline Ranch Project and under the Plum Canyon Project.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Native bird species have the potential to nest on the project site between December 1 and August 31. In order to mitigate any disturbance activities to a less-than-significant level, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

BR-1 Nesting Bird Surveys. Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat shall be prohibited from December 1 through August 31 unless a biological monitor acceptable to the Department of Regional Planning surveys the project area prior to disturbance to confirm that disturbance to habitat will not result in the failure of nests on-site or immediately adjacent to the area of disturbance. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat, any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as equipment noise exceeding 60dB, or direct artificial night lighting.

Commencing one month previous to the onset of disturbance, weekly surveys shall be conducted on the subject property within 500 feet of disturbance areas. The final survey shall be no more than three (3) days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active nest is discovered on-site or can be reasonably deduced to exist immediately adjacent to the site, the monitor shall demarcate an area to be avoided by disturbance activities until the active nest is vacated for the season and there is no evidence of further nesting attempts. This demarcated area will incorporate a buffer area surrounding the active nest that is suitable in size and habitat type to provide a reasonable expectation of breeding success for nesting birds (typically 500 feet for raptors and 300 feet for other birds). Limits of avoidance shall be demarcated with flagged fencing. The biological monitor shall record the results of the surveys and results of the recommended protective measures described above and submit the records to the applicant, CDFW, and the Department of Regional Planning, to the satisfaction of the Director of the latter department. This shall occur prior to approval of grading and/or construction permits, then continuing during construction.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site does not contain historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 and there is no record of national or state-designated historical resources on the project site.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site does not contain known archaeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 and would not result in any significant ground disturbance, as the majority of the site has already been graded.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The project site does not contain paleontological resources or sites, unique geological features, or rock formations. However, in the event that cultural remains are found, a mitigation measure will require work to cease and for the Director of Regional Planning to be contacted to determine the next appropriate measures for preserving them.:

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

There is no record of human remains on the project site, and the majority of the site has previously been graded. In the event that human remains are discovered as a result of site disturbance, a mitigation measure be incorporated to ensure that the permittee shall suspend construction, contact the County Coroner, and leave the resource of human remains in place until a qualified archaeologist can examine and determine appropriate measures.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Because the majority of the project site has previously been graded, it is unlikely that paleontological, cultural, or archeological remains will be discovered during development of the project. However, to guard against the possibility of such an occurrence, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

CR-1 Cultural Remains. Should cultural resource remains be encountered during land modification activities, work shall cease, and the Los Angeles County Director of Regional Planning contacted immediately to determine appropriate measures to mitigate adverse impact to the discovered resources. If human remains are discovered within the boundaries of the project area, then the procedures described in Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code shall be followed. These procedures require notification of the County Coroner. If the County Coroner determines that the discovered remains are those of Native American ancestry, then the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be notified by telephone within 24 hours; Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code describes the procedures to be followed after the notification of the NAHC.

6. ENERGY

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is subject to all components of the Green Building Program: Green Building, Low-Impact Development, and Drought Tolerant Landscaping.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Appendix F, Section 1 of the CEQA Guidelines requires evaluation of energy efficiency only for Environmental Impact Reports. The environmental determination for this project is a mitigated negative declaration.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒

There is no fault trace within the project site. Therefore, people or structures on the project site will not be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects (Source: California Geological Survey, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones Map).

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is located more than five miles from the nearest recorded fault trace. There is no fault trace within the project site. Therefore, people or structures on the project site will not be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects (Source: California Geological Survey, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones Map).

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The southeastern portion of the project site is located within a designated soil liquefaction area (Source: California Geological Survey). However, the project will be required to follow the requirements for construction on such soils, as mandated by the Department of Public Works. In particular, the project site will be over-excavated and re-compacted. Compaction of the soils and other requirements would reduce the impact associated with expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.

iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The northern portion of the project site is located within an identified landslide zone. (Source: California Geological Survey). However, all slopes on or near the project site were either removed or reconstructed as manufactured slopes during the development of Tract 46018 between 2002 and 2015. As a result, the impact of landslides on the project site would be less-than-significant.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The project site will be over-excavated and re-compacted, subjecting the site to ground-disturbing activities (e.g., excavation, grading, foundation construction, the installation of utilities, etc.) that would require approximately 111,214 cubic yards of cut, 106,725 cubic yards of fill and the export of approximately 4,489 cubic yards of material. The re-compaction activities would expose soils for a limited time, allowing for possible erosion; however, the applicant's conformance with the erosion control-related requirements of the project grading permit will reduce erosion impacts to less-than-significant levels. No grading activities will be allowed to commence on the site until LACDPW conducts a thorough review of the project geotechnical and grading reports and issues a grading permit for the project. With respect to soil erosion during Project operations, the potential is relatively low due to the fact that Lot 1 of the Project Site would be entirely paved, developed, or landscaped; as noted, Lot 2 would remain in its current, vacant state pending potential future commercial development of that parcel. Lot 2 will need to be stabilized during its interim vacant use to avoid excessive erosion of dirt surfaces. The use of vegetation and groundcover would act as an effective mitigation to soil erosion by impeding direct contact between precipitation/irrigation and on-site soils. This shall be added as a mitigation measure in order to lessen the impact to less-than-significant levels.

c) 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

On-site soils are expansive and shall be mitigated per the recommendations of the applicant's Soils Report. In particular, the project site will be over-excavated and re-compacted, subjecting the site to ground-disturbing activities (e.g., excavation, grading, foundation construction, the installation of utilities, etc.) that would require approximately 111,214 cubic yards of cut, 106,725 cubic yards of fill and the export of approximately 4,489 cubic yards of material. Compaction of the soils and other measures would reduce the impact associated with expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.

d) 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

On-site soils are expansive and shall be mitigated per the recommendations of the applicant's Soils Report. In particular, the project site will be over-excavated and re-compacted, subjecting the site to ground-disturbing activities (e.g., excavation, grading, foundation construction, the installation of utilities, etc.) that would require approximately 111,214 cubic yards of cut, 106,725 cubic yards of fill and the export of approximately 4,489 cubic yards of material. Compaction of the soils and other measures would reduce the impact associated with expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project will not be utilizing onsite wastewater treatment systems, as public sewers are available.

f) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site does not contain any areas of slope with grades greater than 25 percent that are proposed for development. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or any other hillside design standards.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972 prohibits the location of most structures for human occupancy across the traces of active faults, and lessens the impacts of fault rupture. The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act requires the California Geological Survey to prepare Seismic Hazard Zone Maps that show areas where earthquake induced liquefaction or landslides have historically occurred, or where there is a high potential for such occurrences. Liquefaction is a process by which water saturated granular soils transform from a solid to a liquid state during strong ground shaking. A landslide is a general term for a falling, sliding or flowing mass of soil, rocks, water and debris. The County General Plan prohibits new developments, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Act, within fault traces until a comprehensive geological study has been completed.

In order to mitigate the potential effects of the project regarding loss of topsoil, liquefaction, and expansive soils to less-than-significant levels, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

GS-1 **Commercial Lot Vegetation.** Upon the completion of grading activities on the project site, Lot 2 shall be planted with appropriate native, drought-tolerant ground cover in order to mitigate the potential loss of topsoil through erosion. Such ground cover shall be approved by the Director of Regional Planning, in consultation with staff biologists, prior to final CUP approval.

GS-2 **Soil Recompaction.** In order to adequately mitigate potential impacts of the project site's areas of expansive soil and liquefaction, soil from the project site shall be overexcavated and recompacted to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

In order to estimate the amount of emissions generated by the project during and after construction, a simulation was prepared using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The simulation, dated September 5, 2014, was prepared by Rincon Associates and assumed simultaneous development of 43,500 square feet of restaurant and retail uses within the commercial zone as a worst-case scenario. The project would generate annual emissions of 2,142 metric tons of CO_2E (carbon dioxide equivalent), which is less than the 3,000 metric tons per year SCAQMD recommended threshold of significance for a project of this type. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

In order to estimate the amount of emissions generated by the project during and after construction, a simulation was prepared using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The simulation, dated September 5, 2014, was prepared by Rincon Associates and assumed simultaneous development of 43,500 square feet of restaurant and retail uses within the commercial zone as a worst-case scenario. The project would generate annual emissions of 2,142 metric tons of CO_2E (carbon dioxide equivalent), which is less than the 3,000 metric tons per year SCAQMD recommended threshold of significance for a project of this type. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The residential subdivision project does not include the routine transportation, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or the use of pressurized tanks. During the construction phase of the project, the project may have included minimal use of hazardous materials, such as solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils. Current local, state, and Federal laws relating to the use, storage, and disposal of these materials make it unlikely that the project would have a significant effect on the environment.

b) 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 residential subdivision project does not include the routine transportation, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or the use of pressurized tanks. During the construction phase of the project, the project may have included minimal use of hazardous materials, such as solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils. Current local, state, and Federal laws relating to the use, storage, and disposal of these materials make it unlikely that the project would have a significant effect on the environment.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The residential subdivision project does not include the routine transportation, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or the use of pressurized tanks. During the construction phase of the project, the project may have included minimal use of hazardous materials, such as solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils. Current local, state, and Federal laws relating to the use, storage, and disposal of these materials make it unlikely that the project would have a significant effect on the residences located within one-quarter mile of the project site.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not included on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database of clean-up sites and hazardous waste permitted facilities (Source: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/).

e) For a project 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, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere, with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is not within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access. The project site is located in an urbanized area with easy access to arterial roads and has been reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Fire Department for adequate emergency access.

iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The Fire Department has determined that the existing water pressure would be adequate to meet fire flow standards for the proposed development.

iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is not located in proximity to land uses with a potential for dangerous fire hazard. The project site is surrounded by other residential uses. The proposed project would be required to comply with all of the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Code.

i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed use does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The proposed project of a residential and commercial subdivision does not entail the regular use of large amounts any hazardous or highly flammable materials or substances.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site will be connected to an existing municipal wastewater system. In unincorporated Los Angeles County, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Low-Impact Development Ordinance, as well as the requirements of the County's MS4 Permit (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System), in order to control and minimize potentially polluted runoff. Because all projects are required to comply with these requirements in order to obtain construction permits and certificates of occupancy, the proposed project would not impact any nonpoint source requirements.

b) 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site would be served by a public water system and would not make use of local groundwater.

c) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The site is relatively level and does not contain any existing drainage courses. The construction of the residences and the subdivision of the lot will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on-site or off-site. The project will be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements, as well as the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance. The project proposes approximately 111,214 cubic yards of cut, 106,725 cubic yards of fill and the export of approximately 4,489 cubic yards of material.

d) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The site is relatively level and does not contain any existing drainage courses. The construction of the residences and the subdivision of the lot will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on-site or off-site. The project will be

required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements, as well as the provisions of the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance. The project proposes approximately 111,214 cubic yards of cut, 106,725 cubic yards of fill and the export of approximately 4,489 cubic yards of material.

e) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project does not propose any water features that could accumulate standing water.

f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed construction of residences will be subject to the County's Low Impact Development Ordinance to minimize or reduce runoff, and the developer will be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements.

g) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed construction of residences will be subject to the County's Low Impact Development Ordinance to minimize or reduce runoff, and the developer will be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements.

h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project will be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance.

i) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is located inland from the coastal portions of Los Angeles County and connects to the municipal storm drain system. Since the proposed is subject to the County's Low Impact Development Ordinance, adherence to the requirements would prevent any substantial amount of nonpoint sources of pollutants.

The project site is not located in the vicinity of a State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB")-designated Area of Special Biological Significance identified on the SCRCB website, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/docs/asbs/asbs_areas/asbs_swqpa_publication0

3.pdf

j) 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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project does not entail the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems.

k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The proposed project will be connected to the existing public water and sewer systems

l) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The southeast corner of the project site is within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by a Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") Flood Insurance Rate Map ("FIRM"). Upon approval of the most recent version of the underlying Tract Map (TR 46018) in 2012, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) was issued by FEMA. This letter indicated that the portion of the Flood Zone extending approximately 2,500 feet from Plum Canyon Road would be eligible for removal from the FEMA database if certain flood mitigation facilities were constructed. These facilities are requirements for the development of future phases of TR 46018 and include a debris basin and the diversion of the downstream floodway into an underground culvert. At present, the stream has been diverted into an underground culvert for only half of its proposed length. However, this is the portion adjacent to the project site, beginning approximately 1,400 feet from Plum Canyon Road and 850 feet upstream of the project site. Because the improvements have not been completed, FEMA has not issued a final Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for the Flood Zone. The project will be required to comply with all County drainage standards and improvements, including those of the underlying Tract No. 46018-11, that impact the project. Compliance with all of the County drainage requirements will render the effect of the floodway to a less-than-significant impact.

m) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The southeast corner of the project site is within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by a Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") Flood Insurance Rate Map ("FIRM"). Upon approval of the most recent version of the underlying Tract Map (TR 46018) in 2012, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) was issued by FEMA. This letter indicated that the portion of the Flood Zone extending approximately 2,500 feet from Plum Canyon Road would be eligible for removal from the FEMA database if certain flood mitigation facilities were constructed. These facilities are requirements for the development of future phases of TR 46018 and include a detention basin (completed) and the diversion of the downstream floodway into an underground culvert. At present, the stream has been diverted into an underground culvert for only half of its proposed length. However, this is the portion adjacent to the project site, beginning approximately 1,400 feet from Plum Canyon Road and 850 feet upstream of the project site. Because the improvements have not been completed, FEMA has not issued a final Letter of

Map Revision (LOMR) for the Flood Zone. However, the fact that the floodway has been completely channelized and undergrounded at a point 850 feet upstream of the project site renders its effect less than significant.

n) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no levees or designated dam inundation areas in the vicinity of the project site.

o) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is not located within a seiche or landslide zone, or within a tsunami inundation area.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project construction and subdivision of a 175-unit condominium community in a residential area and would not result in a physical division of an established community. The project does not require the construction of new freeways or rail lines or flood control channels, and the project will conform to the existing street grid. The design will also incorporate numerous pedestrian and vehicular connections into and through the site.

b) 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 property is within the General Commercial land use category of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. The Plan states that properties with this land use designation are suitable for both commercial and multiple-family residential uses, upon issuance of appropriate permits. The proposed project of 175 dwelling units and one commercial lot is consistent with the land use category, as the maximum residential density for the project site is 18 dwelling units per acre. The proposed density for the condominium lot is 16.6 dwelling units per acre.

c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is located within the C-2 (Neighborhood Business) Zone. Townhomes, apartment houses, and single-family residences are permitted within the C-2 Zone upon the issuance of a conditional use permit ("CUP"), which the applicant is requesting.

d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site does not contain any area exceeding 25 percent in slope and is not subject to the requirements of the Hillside Management Ordinance. The project site is also not located within any Significant Ecological Area.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, as the project site is not identified as a mineral resource area on the Los Angeles County Natural Resource Areas map.

b) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site, as the project site is not identified as a mineral resource area on the Los Angeles County Natural Resource Areas map.

13. NOISE

Would the project result in:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The Acoustical Analysis prepared for the applicant by Rincon Consultants 2014 concludes that traffic noise from adjacent Plum Canyon Road will not create a significant impact to future residents of the project site. New stationary sources of noise, such as mechanical HVAC equipment, would be installed for the proposed uses. This equipment would be required to comply with County Code Section 12.08.530, which prohibits operation of any air conditioning or refrigeration so that its noise exceeds 55 dBA at any neighboring property.

The project entails the subdivision, construction, and operation of 175 residential condominium units in a commercial zone. The project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas. Any noise generated by the proposed project would be similar to ambient noise levels in the area, which is developed with single-family residences and condominiums at similar densities.

Construction will require remedial grading that will generate substantial noise levels due to heavy duty equipment. The following table shows typical noise levels associated with equipment that would used for the construction of the proposed project. Noise levels associated with these activities would temporarily affect the sensitive residential receptors near the project site. Based on a standard 6 dBA attenuation per doubling of distance from a point source, the table illustrates the noise levels that would occur with construction of the proposed project at the nearby sensitive receptors. The nearest residences to the east are uphill and about 100 feet from the nearest equipment activity, while the nearest residences across Plum Canyon Road are about 130 feet from the nearest construction equipment activity. As indicated, the construction noise level at the exterior of the eastern residences could be approximately 83 dBA.

Typical Construction Noise Levels

Equipment	Typical Level (dBA) 100 Feet from the Source	Typical Level (dBA) 200 Feet from the Source	Typical Level (dBA) 300 Feet from the Source
Large Bulldozer	79	73	70
Paver	83	77	74

Jackhammer	82	76	73
Truck	82	76	73
Front End Loader	79	73	70

Source: Harris Miller, Miller & Hanson Inc. May 2006 for the Federal Transit Administration.

Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440 prohibits construction between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. of any day, and at any time on Sundays and legal holidays. Required compliance with these time restrictions would limit construction noise to times when people are generally less sensitive to noise and reduce the effect of construction equipment noise. The Noise Control Ordinance further states that the contractor shall conduct construction activities in such a manner that the maximum noise levels at affected buildings will not exceed those listed in the following table. All mobile and stationary internal-combustion-powered equipment and machinery is required to be equipped with suitable exhaust and air-intake silencers in proper working order.

County of Los Angeles Construction Equipment Noise Restrictions

	Single-Family Residential	Multi-Family Residential	Commercial[1]
Mobile Equipment: Maximum noise levels for nonscheduled, intermittent, short-term operation (less than 10 days) of mobile equipment:			
Daily, except Sundays and legal holidays, 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM	75 dB(A) Leq	80 dB(A) Leq	85 dB(A) Leq
Daily, 8:00 PM to 7:00 AM and all day Sunday and legal holidays	60 dB(A) Leq	64 dB(A) Leq	70 dB(A) Leq
Stationary Equipment: Maximum noise level for repetitively scheduled and relatively long-term operation (periods of ten days or more) of stationary equipment:			
Daily, except Sundays and legal holidays, 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM	60 dB(A) Leq	65 dB(A) Leq	70 dB(A) Leq
Daily, 8:00 PM to 7:00 AM and all day Sunday and legal holidays	50 dB(A) Leq	55 dB(A) Leq	60 dB(A) Leq

[1] *Refers to residential structures within a commercial area. This standard does not apply to commercial structures.*

Because project construction activities could exceed the 75 dBA Leq limitation and would be a substantial source of noise for the residences to the east, noise associated with short-term construction activities is potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. Implementation of the mitigation measures below would reduce, avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts to sensitive receptors.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

As indicated above, the construction noise level at the exterior of the eastern residences could be approximately 83 dBA. Because project construction activities could exceed the 75 dBA Leq limitation and would be a substantial source of noise for the residences to the east, noise associated with short-term construction activities is potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. Implementation of the mitigation measures below would reduce, avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts to sensitive receptors.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project entails the subdivision, construction, and operation of 175 residential condominium units in a commercial zone. The project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas. Any noise generated by the proposed project would be similar to ambient noise levels in the area, which is developed with single-family residences and condominiums at similar densities.

d) 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? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

As indicated above, the construction noise level at the exterior of the eastern residences could be approximately 83 dBA. Because project construction activities could exceed the 75 dBA Leq limitation and would be a substantial source of noise for the residences to the east, noise associated with short-term construction activities is potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. Implementation of the mitigation measures below would reduce, avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts to sensitive receptors.

e) For a project 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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Noise generated by construction equipment during the construction phase of the project may result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. Construction activities will be conducted according to best management practices, including maintaining construction vehicles and equipment in good working order by using mufflers where applicable, limiting the hours of construction, and limiting the idle time of diesel engines. Noise from construction equipment will be limited by compliance with the Noise Control Ordinance and County Code Section 12.12, as well as the following mitigation measures, which shall be incorporated into the project's Mitigation Monitoring Program:

N-1 **Construction Equipment.** If electrical service is available within 150 feet, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools. Internal combustion engines shall be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. No internal combustion engine shall be operated on the project site without the manufacturer-recommended muffler. All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

N-2 **Additional Construction Noise Controls.** For all mobile construction equipment operating within 250 feet of adjacent residential receptors east and west of the project site, and for all stationary construction equipment operating on the project site, additional noise attenuation techniques shall be employed to ensure that noise remains within levels allowed by the County of Los Angeles noise restrictions. Such techniques may include, but are not limited to, the use of sound blankets on noise generating equipment and the construction of temporary sound barriers between construction sites and affected uses. Temporary noise barriers used during construction activity shall be made of noise-resistant material sufficient to achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of STC 25 or greater, based on sound transmission loss data taken according to ASTM Test Method E90. Such a barrier may provide as much as a 10 dBA insertion loss, provided that it is positioned as close as possible to the noise source or to the receptors. To be effective, the barrier must be long and tall enough to completely block the line-of-sight between the noise source and the receptors. The gaps between adjacent panels must be filled-in to avoid having noise penetrate directly through the barrier.

N-3 **Neighbor Notification.** Provide notification to commercial and residential occupants adjacent to the project site at least 24 hours prior to initiation of construction activities that could significantly affect outdoor or indoor living areas. This notification shall include the anticipated hours and duration of construction and a description of noise reduction measures. The notification shall include a telephone number for local residents to call to submit complaints associated with construction noise. The notification shall be posted on Plum Canyon Road adjacent to the project site, and shall be easily viewed from adjacent public areas.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. Although 175 new residential units are proposed, such growth is well within the population projections of the area within the Southern California Association of Governments ("SCAG") Regional Transportation Plan and is consistent with the County General Plan Housing Element. In addition, the project site is located in an urbanized area and would not require the extension of roads or utility infrastructure.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project would not displace existing housing, including affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The site is currently vacant, and the applicant proposes to construct 175 residential units.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project would not displace existing housing, including affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The site is currently vacant, and the applicant proposes to construct 175 residential units.

d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project would not exceed official regional or local population projections. The proposed 175 residential will not exceed this projection. The project is consistent with the density permitted by the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan for General Commercial areas. The creation of 175 additional senior housing units should not alter the growth rate of the population beyond that projected in the County General Plan or result in a substantial increase in demand for additional housing or create a development that significantly reduces the ability of the county to meet housing objectives set forth in the General Plan's Housing Element. Such growth is well within the population projections of the area within the Southern California Association of Governments ("SCAG") Regional Transportation Plan and those of the General Plan Housing Element.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Los Angeles County Fire Department has reviewed the proposed project and cleared it for public hearing. The nearest Los Angeles County Fire Station (#128) is located approximately 800 feet to the south. The project site is within a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone of a State Responsibility Area.

Sheriff protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project would not create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial adverse physical impacts. The project site is approximately five (5) miles northeast of the Santa Clarita Valley Sheriff's Station. The proposed project will add new permanent residents to the project site but not enough to substantially reduce service ratios.

Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is within the Saugus Union School District and the William S. Hart Union High School District. The project would create an additional 175 residential units, which would increase the school-age population to some extent. The applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to the local school districts prior to final map approval, which would result in a less-than-significant impact to school facilities.

Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project has a park land obligation of 1.43 acres or $236,469 in-lieu fees per Los Angeles County Code Section 21.28.140. The park obligation for this project will be met by the payment of $236,469 in-lieu fees by the applicant to the Department of Parks and Recreation. The project includes open space and private recreational use areas to serve on-site residents—not for public use. The nearest public park is David March Park, which is located approximately one mile to the west in the City of Santa Clarita.

Libraries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project will generate 175 residential units, and thus increase the population. However, the developer would be required to pay a library mitigation fee, per Section 22.72.030 of the County Code.

Other public facilities? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project is not perceived to create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial adverse physical impacts for any other public facility.

16. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Project residents would be expected to use existing neighborhood and regional parks, but such use is not expected to result in substantial physical deterioration of those facilities. The project does include open space and recreational use areas to serve on-site residents. The project has a park land obligation of 1.43 acres or $236,469 in-lieu fees per Los Angeles County Code Section 21.28.140. The park obligation for this project will be met by the payment of $236,469 in-lieu fees by the applicant to the Department of Parks and Recreation prior to final map recordation. The project includes open space and private recreational use areas to serve on-site residents The nearest public park is David March Park, which is approximately one mile to the west in the City of Santa Clarita. There is also an 8.67-net-acre public park proposed as part of the final phase of the underlying residential tract, TR46018-11, although it is unknown when this would be constructed.

b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project does include open space and recreational use areas to serve on-site residents, although these facilities are relatively small in nature and would not be open to the general public. The 175 dwelling units that would be created by the project are not enough to require the construction of significant new recreational facilities in the area.

c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project would not serve to separate any open space from residents or any other open space.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The growth proposed by the project is accounted for in the Baseline Growth Forecast of the 2008 Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP"), which provided the basis for developing the land use assumptions at the regional and small-area levels that established the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan Alternative.

A Traffic Memorandum (Linscott Law & Greenspan, Engineers, 2014) has been prepared and submitted for the project. This memorandum analyzed the possible effect of the proposed residential development and assumed a fast food use and 40,000 square feet of retail for the residual commercial lot in comparison to the approved use of the entire existing Lot 219 for commercial purposes. This memorandum determined that the currently proposed uses would result in a decrease of 4,400 future average daily trips, a minor increase of six (6) trips in the morning peak hour, and a decrease of 460 trips in the evening peak hour. Given that the local circulation system was originally designed to accommodate the larger volumes associated with the commercial use of the site, the proposed residential and residual commercial uses would not significantly affect the local circulation system.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐

A Traffic Memorandum ("TCM")(Linscott Law & Greenspan, Engineers, 2014) has been prepared and submitted for the project. The TCM outlinesthe traffic considerations related to underlying Tentative Tract Map No. 46018-11, Lot 219. The proposed modification would alter the land use from 150,000 square feet of commercial use to 40,000 square feet of commercial use and 175 condominiums. Based on the Traffic and Lighting letter dated May 4, 2015, the proposed modification will result in trip generation characteristics similar to those associated with the original tentative Tract Map No. 46018-11 Lot 219. All requirements and mitigations previously approved for tract Map No. 46018-11(outlined in the DPW letter dated January 8, 2004) are still applicable to that project.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is not located near a public or private airstrip and will not encroach into air traffic patterns.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project does not entail creating sharp curves or dangerous intersections or incompatible uses. Therefore, there will be no increased hazards due to design features.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed subdivision, construction, and operation of 175 residential condominiums would not block or provide inadequate emergency access for the project itself or make existing emergency access to off-site properties inadequate. Emergency access has been reviewed and cleared by the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

A bus stop for City of Santa Clarita Transit is located approximately 200 feet from the project site, at the corner of Heller Circle and Maitland Lane. The proposed project is consistent with the County's Healthy Design Ordinance, as there are numerous five-foot-wide pedestrian pathways into and through the site, as well as a perimeter pathway around the residential area. There would also be direct pedestrian connections between the residential area, private recreational areas, and the future commercial area. There are no specific bicycle parking requirements for single-family residences, although any future commercial development on the site would be required to provide such facilities. According to the Los Angeles County 2012 Bicycle Master Plan, there is a proposed class II bike lane along Plum Canyon Road, immediately adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would not interfere with any designated bikeways, pedestrian, or transit facilities.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The subdivision, construction, and operation of 175 residential condominiums is not expected to exceed treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. All public wastewater disposal (sewer) systems are required to obtain and operate under the terms of an NPDES (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System) permit, which is issued by the local Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Because all municipal wastewater treatment facilities are required to obtain NPDES permits from the RWQCB, any project which would connect to such a system would be required to comply with the same standards imposed by the NPDES permit. As such, these connections would ensure the project's compliance.

b) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Wastewater generated by the proposed project will drain to an existing 15" public sewer main in Plum Canyon Road. A sewer area study (dated 06/18/2015) has been conducted and it determined that existing sewer mains downstream of the proposed project have sufficient capacity to accept additional wastewater. Wastewater generated in Santa Clarita Valley is treated at the Saugus and Valencia wastewater reclamation plants. Sewage increase due to proposed project would be less than significant and further capacity analysis of wastewater reclamation plants is not necessary. The conclusions of the sewer area study have been reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works.

c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project will comply with the most recently approved hydrology and all drainage and grading plans prior to building permit to ensure that the project would not create drainage system capacity problems, and that no construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities is required. The project will comply with the County's Low Impact Development Ordinance ("LID") as part of the approved hydrology to comply with storm water quality runoff requirements.

d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected	☐	☐	☒	☐

water demands from other land uses?

The applicant shall comply with all requirements stipulated by the local water purveyor. The Santa Clarita Water District (SCWD) of Castaic Lake Agency issued a Will-Serve Letter to the applicant that will expire on December 23, 2016. It shall be the applicant's sole responsibility to renew the aforementioned Will Serve Letter upon expiration and abide by all requirements of the water purveyor.

e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The subdivision, construction, and operation of 175 residential condominiums building will not significantly impact the availability of adequate energy supplies and should not create energy utility capacity problems or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities. In addition, any future construction will be subject to the Cal Green building standards, which is required to provide energy saving measures to further reduce the amount of energy consumed by the proposed project.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Development at the proposed density at this location is planned for under the existing Los Angeles County Regional Waste Management Plan. Due to the relatively small scale of the proposed project, the proposal to subdivide, construct, and operate 175 residential condominiums should not significantly impact solid waste disposal capacity.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 requires the County of Los Angeles to attain specific waste diversion goals. In addition, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 mandates that expanded or new development projects to incorporate storage areas for recycling bins into the existing design. The project will include sustainable elements to ensure compliance with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. It is anticipated that these project elements will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations to reduce the amount of solid waste. The project will not displace an existing or proposed waste disposal, recycling, or diversion site.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As analyzed in the Initial Study sections above, the proposed project will have no impact or less than significant impact in all these areas upon implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project does not achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals. The proposed use and density complies with the existing and proposed General Plan, General Plan Housing Element, and Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project does not have cumulative impacts. The proposed project will not be an inducement to future growths, as the project does not require additional infrastructure beyond that necessary to serve the project. The Traffic Memorandum prepared for the project also indicates that cumulative traffic effects would be less than significant. There are no impacts that are cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The project will require mitigation measures regarding air quality, geology/soils, and noise in order for its impacts on human beings in these areas to be less than significant. These measures are delineated in the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program document. No other substantial adverse effects on human beings were identified. Therefore, the overall impact of the project on humans would be less than significant with appropriate mitigation.