CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE MISSION VILLAGE PROJECT (A PORTION OF THE NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

Los Angeles County Project No. 04-181-(5)
consisting of:
Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105
SEA Conditional Use Permit No. 200500080
Conditional Use Permit No. 200500081
Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032
Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043
Parking Permit No. 200500011
Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001

State Clearinghouse No. 2005051143
(for environmental documents)

County of Los Angeles, Regional Planning Commission

May 2011

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE MISSION VILLAGE PROJECT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE

The Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") hereby certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report ("EIR"), identified below, for the Mission Village project ("project"). The Commission further certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code §§21000 *et seq.*, the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§15000 *et seq*. ("CEQA Guidelines"), and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Commission. In certifying the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, the Commission hereby adopts these "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project."

The Mission Village project implements the second phase of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). The Specific Plan was adopted by the Board on May 27, 2003. The Specific Plan will guide the long-term development of the 11,999-acre Newhall Ranch community, comprising a broad range of residential, mixed-use, and non-residential land uses within five villages, located within the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area in northwestern unincorporated Los Angeles County.

The Mission Village project's potentially significant environmental effects were identified and analyzed in the Mission Village Draft EIR, Vols. I-XX (October 2010), and the Mission Village Final EIR, Vols. I-VII (May 2011) (collectively, "Final EIR").

Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091 require that a public agency prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Specifically, CEQA Guidelines section 15091 states, in part, that:

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

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

(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such

changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

If significant impacts cannot be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level, the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the benefits of the project against its significant unavoidable environmental impacts when determining whether to approve the project. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081; CEQA Guidelines, § 15093.) If the benefits of a project outweigh the significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, the adverse effects may be considered "acceptable" with adoption of a statement of overriding considerations. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b); CEQA Guidelines, § 15093.)

The Final EIR for the Mission Village project identified potentially significant effects. However, the Commission finds that the inclusion of certain specified mitigation measures as part of the project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those effects to less-than-significant levels. Those impacts, which are not reduced to less-than-significant levels, are identified and overridden due to specific project benefits. (*See* **Section 8.0, Statement of Overriding Considerations**, below). Therefore, in accordance with CEQA, Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, and the CEQA Guidelines, sections 15091 and 15092, the Commission certifies the Final EIR for the Mission Village project, adopts these findings, the statement of overriding considerations, and the attached Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and approves the Mission Village project. In certifying the Final EIR and approving the Mission Village project, the Commission finds that the project is consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

The Commission further adopts the following related project approvals to facilitate implementation and development of the Mission Village project: (i) Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105; (ii) Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080; (iii) CUP No. 200500081; (iv) Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032; (v) Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043; (vi) Parking Permit 200500011; and (vii) Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001.

1.2 ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT OF FINDINGS

Section 1.0 contains a summary description of the Mission Village project and background facts relative to the environmental review process. **Section 2.0** identifies the significant impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level (even with all feasible mitigation measures having been identified and incorporated into the project), while **Section 3.0** identifies the potentially significant impacts of the project that would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. **Section 4.0** identifies the project's potential environmental impacts that were determined not to be significant. **Section 5.0** focuses on significant cumulative impacts, which cannot be reduced to less than significant. **Section 6.0** focuses on significant cumulative impacts that have been reduced through mitigation

to less-than-significant levels. **Section 7.0** discusses the feasibility of the project alternatives, and **Section 8.0** presents the statement of overriding considerations.

1.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project applicant, The Newhall Land and Farming Company ("Newhall"), proposes to develop the Mission Village project site, located primarily within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The project site consists of 1,854.6 gross acres, generally located within the northeastern corner of Newhall Ranch in western unincorporated Los Angeles County, south of the Santa Clara River and State Route 126 (SR-126), and west of Interstate 5 (I-5). The Mission Village project site includes proposed development of the approximate 1,261.8-acre tract map site; approximately 39.1 acres of the tract map site are located outside the Specific Plan boundary. To facilitate development of the Mission Village tract map site, several off-site components, which are described in detail below, would be developed on an additional approximately 592.8 acres of land. For purposes of this document, the "tract map site" refers to the location of the Mission Village development site itself, and the "project site" includes the tract map site and the site of the off-site components.

1.3.1 Project Components

The land uses included as part of the Mission Village tract map site are consistent with the approved Specific Plan, which designates the tract map site for single- and multi-family residential, mixed-use, commercial land uses and various public facilities. The project would include the construction of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family homes, and 3,704 multi-family units, including attached and detached condominiums, age qualified and apartment units), up to 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial uses, a 9.5-acre elementary school, fire station, public library, bus transfer station, parks, and private recreational facilities, trails, and road improvements. More specific detail about each of these components is presented below:

- ***Single-Family Residential Component:*** A total of 351 single-family units would be located along private and public streets, with lot sizes ranging from approximately 4,000 to 42,000 square feet at a density of 1 to 8.9 dwelling units per acre.

- ***Multi-Family Residential Component:*** A total of 3,704 multi-family units would be built at a density of 4.7 to 55 dwelling units per acre. These units are typically characterized as detached condominium, townhomes, live/work units, duplex, or condominium/apartment-style buildings.

- ***Mixed-Use/Commercial Component:*** Up to 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial areas would be constructed on approximately 57.4 acres of land in two general locations on the project site. The mixed-use/commercial areas are planned in the eastern portions of the site along Commerce Center Drive, i.e., the Village Center, Neighborhood E and Neighborhood C. Supporting commercial uses likely to be found in the mixed-use areas include food service, grocery, banking, dry cleaners, merchandise sales, food sales, and various professional offices, as well as live/work units. 704,100 square feet of the mixed use/commercial uses planned for Mission Village would be located in the Village Center in a

"main street" setting. The 704,100 square feet includes 66,400 square feet of commercial uses that may be integrated vertically with residential uses located in the Village Center.

- ***Elementary School Component:*** A 9.5-acre elementary school site would be built in Area A for development of an elementary school. The school is planned to consist of a main school building with modular classrooms and adjacent playing field.

- ***Community Park/Recreation Components:*** The project includes a 20-acre Community Park along the eastern side of the proposed Commerce Center Drive near the eastern site boundary. The Community Park would include tot lots, ball fields, tennis or basketball courts, turf areas, vehicular parking, restrooms facilities, and other improvements as identified in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. One of the Specific Plan Neighborhood Parks also would be developed on the project site, which would contain approximately 5 acres of usable parkland.

- ***Recreation Areas:*** A 6.9-acre private Community Recreation Center would be provided as a Newhall Ranch wide amenity, and may contain such amenities as a 25,000-square-foot recreational building, pool, spa, wading pool, shade overhead structure, play courts, and/or restroom building. Parking would be provided both off street and on street. Located next to the Community Recreation Center is a private park that will function as a village green in the Village Center to provide opportunities for both passive and active recreation as well as allocation for community functions, such a farmers market. Additionally, in Neighborhood C, the age-qualified area, a private neighborhood recreation area would be developed on a total of 4.6 acres. This facility would provide recreational activities for those residents living in Neighborhood C. The amenities may include a 25,000-square-foot recreational building, pool, spa, wading pool, shade overhead structure, and/or play courts. Finally, in addition to the small recreation lot in area A7, separate smaller satellite neighborhood recreation centers would be situated throughout various neighborhoods in Mission Village. These may contain facilities for passive uses or active uses such as tot lots, play courts, and/or pools.

- ***Fire Station:*** The project includes a 1.5-acre fire station site located south of Magic Mountain Parkway on the easterly side of Westridge Parkway. This site will accommodate up to a 13,500-square-foot fire station plus ancillary buildings.

- ***Library:*** The project includes a 3.3-acre library site located in the Village Center. Specific Plan mitigation requires that the developer provide funding for the library, including the site, construction, furniture, fixtures, equipment and materials, and that the total library building square footage not exceed 0.35 net square foot per person.

- ***Bus Transfer Station:*** The project includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of the project. The site would facilitate local bus service and provide connection points for express bus operation.

- ***Open Space:*** The Mission Village project includes approximately 693 acres of open space, parks, recreation areas, and trails distributed throughout the project site and adjacent to the Santa Clara River.

- ***Spineflower Preserve:*** Included within the 693 acres of Open Space are three spineflower preserves comprising 85.8 acres situated in the northeast portion of the project site, and connected to open space to provide enhanced connectivity. The boundaries of the preserve have been delineated in consultation with the County and the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG"), and have been configured to ensure the continued existence of the species in perpetuity.

- ***Trails and Paseos:*** The Mission Village project would provide an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off site to the north) via the extension of other local trails, and paseos. These trails and paseos fulfill the intent of the Specific Plan's Master Trails Plan and implement the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality. The Mission Village Trails Plan includes approximately 18,900 linear feet of community trails, 12,900 linear feet of local trails, and 9,200 linear feet of pathways. The pathways would adjoin major roadways and certain residential collector streets, and be separated from vehicular traffic by a landscaped parkway. The Mission Village Trails Plan will ensure that each residential neighborhood and community service area is linked to one or more pedestrian and bicycle trails or paseos.

- ***Site Access and Circulation:*** The Mission Village project-level circulation system is consistent with and implements the mobility objectives of the Specific Plan's approved Master Circulation Plan. The Specific Plan's Master Circulation Plan was designed as a flexible mechanism by which necessary circulation modes of travel within the Specific Plan area could be integrated with existing regional road networks. The Specific Plan's mobility objectives were found by the County to be consistent with the transportation goals and objectives of the County of Los Angeles General Plan and Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan. Regional access to Mission Village would be provided by I-5, which is located approximately one mile to the east of the project site; and SR-126, which is located to the north of the project site. The project circulation plan would provide a system of arterials, residential and commercial collectors, residential public streets, and private drives. Commerce Center Drive and Magic Mountain Parkway would be the major arterial roadways through the Mission Village project, and both would be extended to provide regional access to and from the project site to SR-126 and I-5, respectively. The Magic Mountain Parkway extension would require the construction of off-site roadway improvements, and would proceed westerly from its existing terminus at The Old Road for a distance of approximately 5,000 feet before intersecting with the project site. The extension of Commerce Center Drive would proceed southerly from its current terminus at SR-126, over the Santa Clara River, into the project site, and includes construction of the Commerce Center Drive Bridge.

- ***Commerce Center Drive Bridge:*** The Mission Village project includes construction of the Commerce Center Drive Bridge, which would connect the existing north terminus of Commerce Center Drive at SR-126 with the proposed southern extension of Commerce Center Drive and would serve central portions of Newhall Ranch. The bridge would span the width of the Santa Clara River, equating to a roadway segment of approximately 1,300 feet in length and 120 to 129 feet in width. Bridge supports would consist of concrete piers or columns spaced approximately 100 feet apart. In addition, abutments and bank stabilization

(including gunite and riprap) would be placed on either side of the bridge to protect against erosive/scouring forces.

- ***Drainage/Flood Control:*** The project includes the Mission Village Drainage and Water Quality Plan ("Water Quality Plan"), which includes a comprehensive series of drainage, flood control, and water quality improvements designed to protect development and preserve the Santa Clara River. The plan incorporates methodologies that exceed the ongoing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit requirements and conforms to the drainage and water quality requirements of the Specific Plan. Project Design Features ("PDFs") incorporated into the project to address water quality and hydrologic impacts include site design, low impact development ("LID"), source control, treatment control, and hydromodification control Best Management Practices ("BMPs"). As part of the proposed project, LID BMPs will be implemented that retain runoff from the 0.75 inch water quality design storm. On-site surface run-off would be intercepted in retention and/or biofiltration BMPs to the extent feasible. Excess runoff would be conveyed to a network of storm drains that lead to a series of regional infiltration/biofiltration facilities prior to discharge into the Santa Clara River. As part of the proposed project, an off-site regional infiltration/biofiltration facility covering approximately 9 acres in size would be constructed in the northeast portion of the project site, within the boundaries of the Entrada subdivision; two debris basins would be constructed along the southerly tract boundary within VTTM No. 61996 (Legacy Village), which would be removed with construction of Legacy Village; and four debris basins would be constructed within the eastern portion of the Utility Corridor, which will be constructed as part of the off-site improvements. Additional drainage-related improvements that would be implemented as part of the project include conveying water through underground pipes and installing energy dissipaters. In addition, the tributaries located on the Mission Village site would be stabilized and/or modified to convey seasonal flows by buried storm drain. For example, the Lion Canyon drainage would be stabilized with drainage treatments, including grade stabilizing measures, to maintain sediment equilibrium and protect the channel bed and banks from hydromodification impacts.
- ***Bank Stabilization:*** Where necessary, the Mission Village project would construct buried bank stabilization, turf reinforcement mats, or similar bank stability protection in order to retain and enhance the Santa Clara River's significant riparian vegetation and habitat, allow the River to continue to function as a regional wildlife corridor, and provide flood protection pursuant to County standards. Approximately 2,150 linear feet of bank stabilization would be constructed as part of the Mission Village project on the south side of the Santa Clara River. This would include approximately 600 linear feet along the southerly abutment of the Commerce Center Drive Bridge that may not be completely buried. An additional approximately 1,200 linear feet of soil cement bank stabilization, designed to protect the previously approved Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"), would be constructed downstream of the tract map site. The bank stabilization related to the WRP was approved and analyzed at a project-level with the Newhall Ranch EIR. Additionally, the project includes the installation of Turf Reinforcement Mat ("TRM") or a similar bank stability protection along 16,000 linear feet of the utility corridor west of the Mission Village tract map site, and the construction of buried bank stabilization between the Santa Clara River and the Old Road, north of the existing Valencia WRP. This bank stabilization was approved with the Santa Clara River Natural River Management Plan ("NRMP") and was

analyzed within the certified Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement ("EIR/EIS") prepared for the NRMP. Finally, the project includes the installation of various stormwater outlet structures both within the tract map site and off site. The off-site outlet structures and energy dissipaters would be located at the outlet of Chiquito Canyon Creek, San Martinez Grande Creek, and other minor drainages and culverts across SR-126.

- ***Utility Corridor:*** The Utility Corridor consists of off-site and on-site utility infrastructure for the Mission Village project. The corridor would provide new utilities as well as relocated existing facilities to serve the project. The utilities include a gravity sewer, pressure sewer force main, potable water, recycled water, agricultural water, electrical power telephone cable television, and natural gas. Various utilities, including potable water, recycled water, well and pipeline, gravity sewer, gas, electrical power, telephone, and cable television, would extend from the utility corridor north across SR-126 to serve Newhall Ranch development on the north side of SR-126. The Utility Corridor alignment would run parallel to SR-126 from the approved Newhall Ranch WRP near the Los Angeles County/Ventura County line eastward to I-5, and then south past the existing Valencia WRP to the Round Mountain water tank site.

- ***Southern California Edison Substation:*** Southern California Edison ("SCE") may require construction of a 16 kV Substation to serve the Mission Village project. There are two alternative locations for the proposed substation, both outside the boundaries of Mission Village and both approximately 1.5 acres in size. Alternative one would be located almost entirely within Newhall Ranch in the Potrero Valley portion of the approved Specific Plan, with a small portion of the grading encroaching into the Legacy Village project (VTTM 061996). The second alternative would be located partially within Newhall Ranch in the Potrero Valley portion of the approved Specific Plan and Legacy Village (VTTM 061996) project site. Access to these sites would be provided along the existing Newhall Ranch agriculture roads. Electric service to Mission Village would be provided through 16,400 feet of temporary utility poles/lines that cross Newhall Ranch and that would be converted to permanent facilities during the buildout of Newhall Ranch. The utility poles/lines would be located along or near existing agricultural roads in order to take advantage of the area's existing topography and to minimize impacts.

- ***Potable Water:*** The Valencia Water Company ("VWC") would provide potable water to the project. Water demand would be met by drawing groundwater from the Alluvial aquifer from newly constructed replacement wells located within the Valencia Commerce Center that have been approved and permitted by the California Department of Public Health ("DPH"). These wells replaced older wells used for irrigation that are no longer active, as they were permanently closed as directed by DPH. In August 2004, Valencia received an amended water supply permit from DPH for approval and construction of four domestic water supply wells. Two of the four replacement wells are needed for the project, and the additional wells will be used to meet future demands when needed.

  The wells will operate by delivering water to VWC's existing Zone I system and then would be pumped into Zones II and III to meet the demands of the Mission Village project. The project would be located primarily within VWC's Zone II and Zone III water pressure zones. The portion of Mission Village lying within VWC Zone II would be served by a proposed

4.0-million-gallon reservoir tank, which would be located partially on site and partially off site just south of the project boundary within VTTM 61996 (Legacy Village), and a second proposed 4.0-million-gallon reservoir tank located off-site at the existing Westridge Tank site adjacent to Westridge Parkway. Both reservoir tanks would be constructed as part of the project. The two new reservoirs would receive water via a new pump station and 18-inch pipeline constructed along the extension of Commerce Center Drive. Connections also are planned with the existing Zone II water system along Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway. The project Zone III service areas would be served by an existing 3.3-million-gallon reservoir located within the Westridge community, southeast of the Mission Village project site. Connection to the project site would be provided by an existing Zone III line located in Westridge Parkway.

- ***Recycled Water:*** The Mission Village project would use recycled water for landscape irrigation purposes and other allowable uses. Currently, recycled water is available only from the Valencia WRP, located along The Old Road east of the project site. The long-range plan is for the future Newhall Ranch WRP and the Valencia WRP to serve the recycled water needs within Newhall Ranch. The Mission Village site would be located within Valencia Water Company's ("VWC") Zone I, Zone II, and Zone III recycled water pressure zones. Water storage facilities for Zone I would be provided by 500,000 gallons of storage to be located at the Newhall Ranch WRP pump station. In addition, the existing 3.3-million gallon Round Mountain reservoir tank, currently being used for potable water, would be converted to a non-potable recycled water tank. A 2.5-million gallon storage tank would be constructed along the southerly tract map boundary, partially on-site and partially within VTTM 61996 (Legacy Village), to meet the storage requirements for Zone II. Zone II would require a pump station located at Commerce Center Drive and SR-126 to pump recycled water from Zone I to Zone II; Zone II would require a pump station to pump water from Zone II to Zone III. To augment recycled water supplies within Zone II, two connections are planned to the Castaic Lake Water Agency ("CLWA") existing Zone II recycled water system located in Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway, with reducing stations within the project to serve lower zones.

- ***Wastewater:*** The Mission Village project's wastewater/sewer plan is consistent with, and implements, the Specific Plan's approved Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan. The project-level wastewater/sewer collection system consists of gravity sewers, forced mains, and a pump station. The long-range plan is for the Newhall Ranch WRP to be constructed to serve uses within the Specific Plan area, including Mission Village, although due to gravitational limitations, a small amount of wastewater generated by the Mission Village project (approximately 0.2 million gallons per day) would need to be treated at the existing Valencia WRP. The Newhall Ranch WRP's capacity is 6.8 million gallons per day ("mgd"), with a maximum flow of 13.8 mgd. A new County sanitation district has been formed to operate the WRP. In the interim prior to availability of the Newhall Ranch WRP, several options are available to treat wastewater generated by the proposed project.

  One option, is to construct an initial phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP to serve the Mission Village project, with buildout of the WRP occurring over time as demand for treatment increases. Under this scenario, a network of sewer collectors, sewers pumps, and force mains would collect and convey effluent to an interceptor sewer pipeline in the utility corridor. The

interceptor sewer will convey effluent to the west in the proposed utility corridor (parallel to the SR-126 right-of-way), where it would connect to the Newhall Ranch WRP.

The second option, is to construct a lift or pump station within the utility corridor in one of three potential locations, either near the northerly abutment of the proposed Commerce Center Drive bridge, or within the Landmark Village site near Long Canyon Road, or near the Newhall Ranch WRP. In either scenario, the wastewater would be pumped to the existing Valencia WRP (District No. 32), which is located approximately 0.5 mile east of the project site along The Old Road. Wastewater from the Mission Village project would continue to be pumped to the Valencia WRP until the first phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP is constructed. Under this scenario, a sanitary sewer force main would be constructed in the proposed utility corridor located south of SR-126 right-of-way, and extend along Henry Mayo Drive and would connect to an existing CSDLAC pump station near the intersection of The Old Road and Henry Mayo Drive. The existing CSDLAC pump station may require upsizing.

In the event the Commerce Center Drive Bridge is not completed at the time it becomes necessary to treat wastewater flows and, therefore, the bridge cannot support pipelines to convey effluent flows, an interim pump station would be constructed near the intersection of "GG" Street and Commerce Center Drive on the westerly side of Commerce Center Drive that would pump effluent to the existing Valencia WRP. Under this scenario, a pipeline from the interim pump station on the project site to the Valencia WRP would be constructed along Commerce Center Drive and the Magic Mountain Parkway Extension. The pipeline would connect with an existing line at the intersection of The Old Road and Magic Mountain Parkway. The existing pipeline would convey effluent to the Valencia WRP.

Under an Interconnection Agreement with the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District ("SCVSD"), the Valencia WRP can temporarily treat wastewater for up to 6,000 Newhall Ranch dwelling units until such time as the Newhall Ranch WRP is constructed and operational. The Interconnection Agreement was developed to establish a logical plan for the development and administration of the new Newhall Ranch County Sanitation District ("NRSD") and its infrastructure, and it sets conditions under which the first 6,000 homes in Newhall Ranch may temporarily discharge wastewater to the existing Valencia WRP. The conditions include payment of the standard connection fee (fair share of the cost of the existing infrastructure) and transfer of title of the 22-acre Newhall Ranch WRP site to the NRSD. Newhall Ranch residents also would pay the SCVSD an annual service charge to recover the full cost of treating their wastewater at the Valencia WRP. Temporary treatment of wastewater at the Valencia WRP would not eliminate the need for the developer to construct the Newhall Ranch WRP and to finance the new sewerage system; instead, the temporary treatment of wastewater at the existing Valencia WRP is a practical engineering decision based on the need to build up an adequate, steady flow of wastewater before starting up the Newhall Ranch WRP.

- ***Magic Mountain Parkway Extension*:** As part of the project, Magic Mountain Parkway will be extended from its existing terminus just east of the project boundary to provide a westward thoroughfare through the project site. Improvements also will be made to the existing portion of the roadway lying within VTTM No. 53295 (Entrada), from The Old Road to the existing terminus. As part of the Magic Mountain Parkway improvements, Media Center Drive also will be realigned.

- ***Grading:*** Project site grading would require the removal and recompaction of a maximum of 28.9 million cubic yards of existing material in a balanced cut and fill operation. Included in this 28.9 million cubic yards is grading for the off-site Magic Mountain Parkway extension (approximately 900,000 cubic yards of cut and 500,000 cubic yards of fill, the excess to be used as fill in Mission Village), the utility corridor (approximately 618,000 cubic yards cut/fill), and Alternate 2 of the SCE Substation. Project grading would be consistent with, and would implement, the Specific Plan's approved Conceptual Grading Plan and the applicable Specific Plan Design Guidelines for grading and hillside management.

  Grading specific to the Mission Village project includes mass grading for the development areas, along with fine grading for development pads. Mass grading would consist of rough grading operations that would provide for major roads and infrastructure, including off-site improvements, establish drainage patterns, and create building pads for the various land uses within the project site. Remedial grading and custom grading may also be required depending upon future site specific soils and geotechnical investigations. Graded slopes would be landscaped and irrigated pursuant to County grading and erosion control requirements. VTTM No. 61105 depicts the project's ultimate grading contours as shown on the project grading plan.

  Off-site grading is required at several locations to construct the off-site project components. Specifically, the project would require off-site grading of the utility corridor, roadway extensions (Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway/Commerce Center Drive; grading to occur within VTTM No. 53295 [Entrada]), portions of a water quality basin, and portions of a water tank site. Off-site grading also would be necessary in the event SCE requires construction of a 16 kV substation to serve the Mission Village project. A limited amount of off-site grading also will be conducted along the southerly boundary of the tract map site with VTTM No. 61996 (Legacy Village) in order to tie the proposed grades into natural grades. Additionally, it is anticipated that limited portions of the re-grading and stabilization work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage would take place outside of the Mission Village tract map site, within the future Homestead portion of Lion Canyon.

  The project-related grading may occur in several phases, including partial grading within the tract map site. The limit of the grading phase would be established to achieve a balanced earthwork for that grading phase and may extend beyond the limits of a particular final unit map boundary to achieve a phased grading balance.

Project buildout currently is estimated to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand at buildout.

For these reasons, it is necessary to maintain a certain degree of planning flexibility within the multi-family and commercial planning areas of the proposed project. This flexibility includes, for instance, the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build

detached housing units rather than attached units; alter dwelling unit type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway entries and drive alignments; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. Importantly, however, the total dwelling unit count and commercial square footage shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps would not be exceeded; that is, project buildout would not exceed 4,055 dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet.

For example, the Village Center planning area is proposed as a mixed use center, comprised of residential, retail, and office uses, combined both horizontally and vertically. In light of potential changes in future market conditions, shifting demand may make it necessary to alter the location, orientation, or intensity of uses, thereby resulting in the relocation of housing units and commercial square footage to other areas within the Village Center. To the extent any such revision would alter the environmental impacts analysis, such revisions are addressed within the EIR. However, any such relocation would not result in an increase in the proposed 2,146 residential units for the Village Center area, nor an increase in the proposed 704,100 commercial square feet for this area.

1.3.2 Associated Project Approvals

The following project approvals also need to be secured to authorize build-out of the Mission Village project:

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105: Approval of VTTM No. 61105, as revised December 15, 2010, is requested to subdivide the Mission Village site into a total of 621 lots, including:

(a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 commercial sq. ft.) and 1 continued care retirement lot, for development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

(b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

(c) 143 open space lots;

(d) 2 public park (active) lots;

(e) 4 private recreation lots;

(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

(h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

(i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private and bridge roadways).

- ***SEA Conditional Use Permit ("CUP")* No. RCUP200500080.** The project applicant is requesting a project-level SEA CUP to provide the County with the regulatory framework for determining if the Mission Village project within the approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundaries is consistent with both the adopted Specific Plan and previously approved program-level SEA CUP No. 94-087-(5).

- ***Conditional Use Permit No. RCUP200500081:*** The project applicant is requesting a CUP to authorize development of 73 second dwelling units, and a continued care retirement community; grading and construction associated with the extension of Westridge Parkway and Commerce Center Drive; the grading and development of project-related off-site improvements, including the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, utility corridor, water quality basin, electrical substation, and water tanks; and, on-site grading and development of project-related infrastructure (including water tanks and utilities).

- ***Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043:*** An Oak Tree Permit is required under Zoning Code section 22.56.2050, *et seq*., for the removal of 143 oak trees located on the project site, including 8 heritage trees. In addition, 50 oak trees would be impacted by encroachment, including 2 heritage trees. The removal and encroachment is necessary to enable the construction of the project due to site constraints such as topography and drainage. The County Forester has recommended approval of the subject permit, subject to recommended conditions of approval, including replacement trees to be provided at a ratio of 2:1 and 10:1 for heritage oak trees.

- ***Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032:*** Construction of the Magic Mountain Parkway extension would result in the removal of 11 oak trees (including 3 heritage trees), and the encroachment into the protected zones of 2 additional oak trees; the removal and encroachment of these trees is not included within Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043. The County Forester has recommended approval of the subject permit, subject to recommended conditions of approval, including replacement trees to be provided at a ratio of 2:1 and 10:1 for heritage oak trees.

- ***Parking Permit No. 200500011:*** The parking permit would authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center.

- ***Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001:*** The Substantial Conformance determination is made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front, side, and/or rear yard setbacks under certain circumstances); and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width).

1.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of the Mission Village project is to implement the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, including the Specific Plan's Master Circulation Plan; Master Trails Plan; Conceptual Backbone Drainage, Water and Sewer Plans; public facilities/services (*e.g.*, fire, police/sheriff, schools, libraries); Resource Management Plan; Hillside Preservation and Grading Plan; and Parks, Recreation, and Open Area Plan. The project objectives, which are consistent with the Specific Plan objectives, include the following:

LAND USE PLANNING OBJECTIVES

1. Create a new community with interrelated villages within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan to allow for residential, mixed-use, and commercial development, while preserving significant natural resources, important landforms and open areas.

2. Avoid leapfrog development and accommodate projected regional growth in a location that is adjacent to existing and planned infrastructure, urban services, transportation corridors, and major employment centers.

3. Cluster development within the site to preserve regionally significant natural resource areas and sensitive habitat, and major landforms.

4. Provide development and transitional land use patterns that do not conflict with surrounding communities and land uses.

5. Establish land uses that permit a wide range of housing densities, types, styles, prices, and tenancy (for sale and rental).

6. Designate sites for needed public facilities, such as schools, fire stations, libraries, and parks.

MOBILITY OBJECTIVES

1. Design a mobility system which includes alternatives to automobile use.

2. Provide a safe, efficient, and aesthetically attractive street system with convenient connections to adjoining regional transportation routes.

3. Provide an efficient street circulation system that minimizes impacts on residential neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas.

4. Establish a diverse system of pedestrian and bicycle trails, segregated from vehicle traffic, to serve as an alternative to automobile use.

PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN AREA OBJECTIVES

1. Provide for the recreational use of open areas that is compatible with the protection of significant natural resources.

2. Provide Neighborhood and Community Parks and improvements which satisfy park dedication requirements and meet the recreational needs of local residents.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES

1. Implement the Specific Plan's Resource Management Plan as it relates to the Mission Village project.

2. Protect wetland, endangered or threatened species in the Santa Clara River.

3. Preserve the site of the historical Asistencia (San Fernando Mission Annex).

4. Preserve significant stands of oak trees.

5. Promote water conservation through design guidelines that encourage use of drought-tolerant and native plants.

1.5 INITIAL STUDY AND NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Preliminary environmental review of the Mission Village project was conducted by the County's Department of Regional Planning. In the Initial Study/Notice Of Preparation ("IS/NOP"), the County stated that the project may have a potentially significant effect on several environmental impact categories, including: (a) hazards (geotechnical, flood, fire, and noise); (b) resources (water quality, air quality, biota, cultural resources, mineral resources, agricultural resources, and visual resources/aesthetics); (c) services (traffic/access, sewage disposal, education, fire/sheriff, and utilities); and (d) other categories (general, environmental safety/hazardous materials, land use, and demand for new recreation facilities).

In May 2005, the County circulated the IS/NOP to responsible agencies, trustee agencies, regional agencies, County reviewing agencies, and other agencies, organizations, and interested persons for the 30-day review period required under CEQA, ending on June 30, 2005. The IS/NOP requested that the agencies, organizations, and others provide the County with specific details about the scope and content of the environmental information to be contained in this Draft EIR, as it related to each entity's area of statutory responsibility. In addition, to facilitate local participation, the County held a scoping meeting on June 9, 2005 at the Rancho Pico Junior High School, in Stephenson Ranch, California, to present the project and to solicit suggestions from the public and other agencies on the scope and content of the Draft EIR.

In response to the IS/NOP and scoping meeting, comment letters and other input were received from interested agencies, organizations, and others. Based on the results of the County's IS/NOP and scoping efforts, the following topics were evaluated in the Final EIR:

1. Geology and Soils;
2. Hydrology;
3. Biota;
4. Visual Qualities;
5. Traffic/Access;
6. Noise;
7. Air Quality;
8. Water Service;
9. Wastewater Disposal;
10. Solid Waste Disposal;
11. Sheriff Services;
12. Fire Protection Services;
13. Education;
14. Parks and Recreation;
15. Library Services;
16. Agricultural Resources;
17. Utilities;
18. Mineral Resources;
19. Environmental Safety;
20. Cultural/Paleontological Resources;
21. Floodplain Modification;
22. Water Quality; and
23. Global Climate Change

1.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

CEQA provides a lead agency with the flexibility to prepare different types of EIRs, and to employ different procedural means to focus environmental analysis on the issues appropriate for decision at each level of environmental review. (Pub. Resources Code, §21093, subd. (a).) The certified Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR ("Program EIR")[1] addressed the Specific Plan at the "program" level of detail, acknowledging that further environmental review would be required in connection with preparation of project-specific tentative subdivision maps. The Program EIR also contained a separate project-level environmental analysis for the Newhall Ranch WRP, so the County could issue final approval of the WRP.

Because the Mission Village project implements a part of the Specific Plan, and because the certified Program EIR assessed the significant environmental effects associated with development of the entire Specific Plan area, the Final EIR for the project tiered from the certified Program EIR in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21093, subdivision (a), and CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c). In this way, the EIR focused on site-specific issues relating to the project and allowed the County, as the lead agency, to concentrate on issues that are ripe for decision and exclude from consideration issues already decided or not ripe for decision.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) initially was made available for public comment for a 45-day period, from October 8, 2010 through November 21, 2010. On November 10, 2010, the Commission subsequently extended the comment period to January 4, 2011, for a total comment period of 99 days. Copies of the Draft EIR were available for public review at the following locations: (i) Castaic Library, 27971 Sloan Canyon Road, Castaic, California 91384; (ii) County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, Special Projects, Room 1362, 320

[1] The Program EIR includes the Final Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP, certified on March 23, 1999, and the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, certified on May 27, 2003. The Newhall Ranch Program EIR is incorporated by reference, and available for public review and inspection upon request to the County's Department of Regional Planning.

West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012; (iii) Newhall County Library, 22704 West 9th Street, Newhall, California 91321; and (iv) Valencia County Library, 223743 West Valencia Boulevard, Valencia, California 91355.

In addition to the public comment period identified in the paragraph above, the Commission conducted duly noticed public hearings in the matter of the Mission Village project, which were held on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011. The project was presented to the Commission at the public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented requesting that the public review period be extended; as noted above, the Commission extended the public review period for a total comment period of 99 days. Additionally, at the November 10, 2010 hearing, an initial list of comments on the project was provided by the Commission for the applicant and staff to respond to at the continued public hearing.

On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserves, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units. The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. The environmental effects of the revised project are addressed in the Final EIR.

On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued draft conditions of approval and recommended approval of the map.

At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

In response to the Commission's comments raised during the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the following information was provided:

(i) *Development Thresholds Within Specific Plan*. The Specific Plan allows for Density Transfers by and among the five Specific Plan Villages with certain limitations. VTTM No. 61105 is consistent with the Specific Plan's density transfer provisions.

(ii) *River Setbacks.* Consistent with the Specific Plan, residential and commercial development will be set back from the Santa Clara River (CDFG jurisdictional line) by a distance ranging between 220 feet and 970 feet. Only necessary infrastructure (i.e., water quality basins, bridge abutments, storm drain outlets, and channel stabilization) will be constructed within the setback areas. No further setbacks are required.

(iii) *Trail Width Adjustment*. Pursuant to the substantial conformance provisions of Specific Plan Section 5.2, the applicant's request to adjust the Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted in that the 8-foot width will be sufficient in size to accommodate pedestrians and the recreational use of bicycles.

(iv) *Setback Modifications*. Pursuant to the substantial conformance provisions of Specific Plan Section 5.2, the applicant's request for setback modifications in the Village Center, which is the "urban core" of Mission Village, is warranted as it is consistent with other mixed-use neighborhoods that combine housing, employment, retail, cultural, and recreational activities in a walkable environment.

(v) *Oak Tree Mitigation*. County Code Title 22, Chapter 22.56, Part 16 authorizes the replacement of oak trees proposed for removal or relocation with indigenous trees at a ratio of at least two to one as a condition to issuance of an oak tree permit. The County Forester recommends approval of the requested permit, subject to conditions requiring the applicant to provide a specified number of mitigation trees. Accordingly, the applicant will mitigate impacts to oak trees by in-kind planting. For each tree removed, consistent with County ordinances, a minimum of two 15-gallon replacement trees will be planted for non-heritage oaks and ten for heritage oaks, resulting in a greater number of oak trees on site.

(vi) *Trailhead*. VTTM No. 61105 includes approximately 500 feet of the regional river trail within its boundaries near the northerly abutment of Commerce Center Drive; the trails that comprise the project area are primarily local in nature. VTTM No. 53108 (Landmark Village) includes a trailhead and, with limited access to the regional river trail, a second trailhead in Mission Village under these circumstances is not necessary.

(vii) *Pile-Driving Alternative*. Conventional pile driving machinery will be replaced with alternative machinery and/or methods that will reduce noise levels substantially and, thereby, eliminate significant and unavoidable construction-related noise impacts.

(viii) *Upland Infiltration*. EIR technical reports have concluded there is no need to set aside land area for artificial recharge of the Saugus Formation, which underlies primarily the upland portion of the Specific Plan site, or the alluvium deposits, which comprise the Santa Clara River bottom. This conclusion is based on numerous reasons, including that the Saugus Formation is generally recharged in the east to central portion of the basin, well east of the Specific Plan area

(groundwater flow in the basin is generally east to west), and the alluvium groundwater is rising and expressed as stream flow. Nonetheless, the project will facilitate infiltration as impervious areas within Mission Village will be minimized by incorporating landscaped areas and open space into the project. Approximately 681 acres of the 1,262-acre Mission Village project will be natural river corridor, open space, spineflower preserve, or parks. As to the Specific Plan area overall, approximately 70 percent (8,335 acres) of the Specific Plan will remain undeveloped Open Areas. Additionally, project design features include low impact development ("LID") Best Management Practices ("BMPs") that promote the retention and infiltration of the first 0.75 inch storm.

In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed. The Final EIR includes all comments and responses to comments received on the Draft EIR, additional technical appendices, and other information. County staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. For purposes of these findings, the "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR").

Following release of the Final EIR, the Commission conducted a public hearing on May 18, 2011 regarding the project approvals and associated Final EIR, as described above.

The custodian of the record of proceedings is the County's Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1362, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The Mission Village project's record includes, but is not limited to:

- The Final EIR for the project;
- All reports, project application materials, memoranda, maps, letters, and other planning documents, including attachments, related documents, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in those materials, prepared by the EIR consultant, the project applicant, the County, and Commission staff relating to the EIRs;
- Any minutes and transcripts of all public meetings and public hearings relating to the project;
- All notices issued by the County to comply with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, or any other law governing the processing and approval of the project;
- Matters of common knowledge to the County, which include, but are not limited to: (i) the Los Angeles County General Plan; (ii) the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan; and (iii) the Los Angeles County Subdivision and Planning and Zoning Codes, as amended;
- Any other written materials relevant to the County's compliance with CEQA, and its decision on the merits of the project, including documents that have been released for public review, and copies of reports, studies or other documents relied on in any environmental documentation for the project and either made available to the public during the public comment period or included in the County's files; and

- Regulatory approval documents governing long-term implementation of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP, including the Specific Plan and all Newhall Ranch certified environmental documentation, which is cited, incorporated by reference, or relied upon in the Mission Village Final EIR.

2.0 FINDINGS FOCUSING ON SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

This section identifies the significant unavoidable impacts that require a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued by the Commission upon approval of the Mission Village project. Based on the analysis contained in the Final EIR, the following impacts to biota, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources have been determined to fall within this "significant unavoidable impact" category. In addition to the identification of significant unavoidable impacts, the discussion, below, identifies significant impacts resulting from the project to biota, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources, which have been mitigated to less than significant based upon the identified mitigation measures.

2.1 VISUAL QUALITIES

2.1.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The Specific Plan Program EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant unavoidable impacts relating to visual qualities and aesthetics due to the conversion of open space to an urban landscape. These changes were determined to be visible from three view corridors (*i.e.*, the Santa Clara River/SR-126 corridor; the Chiquito Canyon corridor; and the I-5 corridor), which include a total of eight viewsheds. Two additional viewsheds, outside of the three view corridors, also were identified as being subject to impacts. These particular impacts were determined to be unavoidable due to the absence of feasible mitigation to avoid or mitigate the view change.

The Mission Village project would significantly alter the visual characteristics of the Santa Clara River/SR-126 visual corridor, the Interstate 5 (I-5) visual corridor, Airport Mesa, and the scenic vistas visible from various vantage points surrounding the project site. While the Mission Village project, for the most part, is not removing or replacing prominent visual features, the images of residential development, roadways, bridges, and other human activity would be a significant change from the existing site characteristics, which could be viewed as a substantial adverse effect. Such development would also introduce sources of outdoor illumination that do not presently exist. Outdoor lighting, such as streetlights and traffic signals, are essential safety features in development projects that include construction of new streets and intersections, and such lighting cannot be eliminated if the proposed project is implemented. Chapters 3 and 4 of the Specific Plan contain Development Regulations and Design Guidelines, respectively, that apply to the Mission Village project. These regulations and guidelines address grading, lighting, fencing, landscaping, signage, architecture, and site planning for subsequent subdivisions within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Despite such features, the identified significant visual impacts would still result from the change in the visual character of the site from rural to urban. There is no feasible mitigation beyond that already adopted as part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR to reduce the identified impacts to a level below significant. Consequently, such

significant visual impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, as found in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR.

2.1.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to avoid or mitigate the visual quality impacts attributable to the Mission Village project to a less-than-significant level. However, the following feasible mitigation measures would substantially lessen the identified significant visual quality impacts as identified in the Final EIR:

2.1.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.7-1 In conjunction with the development review process set forth in Chapter 5 of the Specific Plan, all future subdivision maps and other discretionary permits which allow construction shall incorporate the Development Guidelines (Specific Plan, Chapter 3) and Design Guidelines (Specific Plan, Chapter 4), and the design themes and view considerations listed in the Specific Plan. *(Mission Village Vesting Tentative Tract Map 61105 and the applicable related discretionary permits incorporate the Specific Plan Development and Design Guidelines consistent with the requirements of the Specific Plan and this mitigation measure.)*

SP 4.7-2 In design of residential tentative tract maps and site planning of multifamily areas and Commercial and Mixed-Use land use designations along SR-126, the following Design Guidelines shall be utilized:

- Where the elevations of buildings will obstruct the views from SR-126 to the south, the location and configuration of individual buildings, driveways, parking, streets, signs and pathways shall be designed to provide view corridors of the river, bluffs, and the ridge lines south of the river. Those view corridors may be perpendicular to SR-126 or oblique to it in order to provide for views of passengers within moving vehicles on SR-126.
- The Community Park between SR-126 and the Santa Clara River shall be designed to promote views from SR-126 of the river, bluffs, and ridge lines to the south of the river. (This requirement is not applicable to Mission Village.)
- Residential site planning guidelines set forth in Section 4.3.1, Residential and Architectural Guidelines, set forth [in] Section 4.4.1, Residential, shall be employed to ensure that the views from SR-126 are aesthetically pleasing and that views of the river, bluffs, and ridge lines south of the river are preserved to the extent practicable.
- Mixed-Use and the Commercial site planning guidelines set forth in Section 4.3.2 and Architectural Guidelines set forth Section 4.4.2 shall be incorporated to the extent practicable in the design of the Riverwood Village Mixed-Use and Commercial land use designations to ensure that

the views from SR-126 are aesthetically pleasing and to preserve views of the river, bluffs, and ridge lines south of the river. (This requirement is not applicable to Mission Village.)

- Landscape improvements along SR-126 shall incorporate the Landscape Design guidelines, set forth in Section 4.6 in order to ensure that the views from SR-126 are aesthetically pleasing and to preserve views of the river, bluffs, and ridge lines south of the river. *(This requirement is not applicable to Mission Village.)*

(To the extent the requirements of this mitigation measure apply to the Mission Village project, the Mission Village site plan has been designed to retain view corridors consistent with the measure's requirements.)

2.1.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures are recommended beyond those already incorporated into the Specific Plan and its related environmental documentation.

2.1.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will substantially lessen the visual quality impacts attributable to the Mission Village project. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which would mitigate, in part, the significant visual quality impacts attributable to the project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified visual quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* **Section 8.0**, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable visual quality impacts of the project.

2.2 AIR QUALITY

2.2.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The Specific Plan's construction and operational emissions were considered significant and unavoidable due to the absence of feasible mitigation to reduce the emission levels below applicable thresholds of significance issued by the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD"). However, it is noted that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, including the Mission Village project, has been designed to reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled ("VMT"), as compared to more conventional, non-village designs. Further, the Specific Plan and the project are consistent with the applicable air quality management plan.

Implementation of the Mission Village project would generate both construction and operational air pollutant emissions. Construction-related emissions would be generated by on-site stationary sources, on- and off-road heavy-duty construction vehicles, and construction worker vehicles. Operation-related emissions would be generated by on-site and off-site stationary sources and by mobile sources. During project construction, emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC), oxides of nitrogen (NO_X), respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}), and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) would exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD. The analysis of localized significance threshold (LST) impacts suggests that PM_{10} emissions would exceed the limitations in SCAQMD Rule 403 and that the nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) concentrations would exceed the LST thresholds. At project buildout, operational emissions of VOC, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would exceed SCAQMD thresholds, primarily due to emissions from mobile sources and use of consumer products.

Population growth attributed to the project is consistent with the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and therefore is within growth forecasts contained in the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (2004 RTP) prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The 2004 RTP forms the basis for the land use and transportation control portions of the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (2007 AQMP). Because the project is within the growth forecasts for the region, it would, consequently, be consistent with the 2007 AQMP, indicating that it would not jeopardize attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards in the Santa Clarita Valley or throughout the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB).

A health risk assessment also was prepared to evaluate the potential effects of project-related exposures to diesel particulate matter emitted by construction equipment. The assessment determined that the maximum anticipated cancer risks associated with the construction of the proposed project are 3.4, 1.2, and 0.3 in 1 million at maximally impacted residential, workplace, and student receptors, respectively. These cancer risk levels are below the threshold of significance of 10 in 1 million. The assessment also determined that the potential chronic health hazard impacts would be well below the adopted significance threshold. As to operational impacts, the proposed project would not result in substantial emissions of toxic air contaminants and, therefore, no significant impacts would occur. Therefore, potential health impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project are less than significant.

Mitigation measures would reduce construction-related and operational-related emissions to the maximum extent feasible. However, no feasible mitigation exists that would reduce the project's construction-related emissions of VOC, NO_X, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$ to below the SCAQMD's recommended thresholds of significance. Additionally, no feasible mitigation exists to reduce the project's operational emissions of VOC, NO_X, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$ to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the project's construction-related and operation-related emissions would be considered significant and unavoidable.

2.2.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to avoid or mitigate all of the air quality-related impacts attributable to the Mission Village project to a level below significant. However, the following feasible mitigation measures would substantially lessen the identified significant air quality impacts as identified in the Final EIR:

2.2.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

Certain mitigation measures adopted to reduce air quality impacts associated with the Specific Plan are omitted as they already have been satisfied by the project applicant. Those mitigation measures are as follows: SP 4.10-1 through SP 4.10-5. Other Specific Plan mitigation measures are omitted because they are replaced by mitigation measures specific to the project (i.e., MV 4.7-15 replaces SP 4.10-6, MV 4.7-16 replaces SP 4.10-7, and MV 4.7-21 replaces SP 4.10-9.)

SP 4.10-8 The applicant of future subdivisions shall implement all rules and regulations adopted by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD which are applicable to the development of the subdivision (such as Rule 402 - Nuisance, Rule 461 - Gasoline Transfer And Dispensing, Rule 1102 - Petroleum Solvent Dry Cleaners, Rule 1111 – NOX Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired, Fan-Type Central Furnaces, Rule 1138 - Control Of Emissions From Restaurant Operations, Rule 1146 - Emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen from Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters) and which are in effect at the time of occupancy permit issuance.

SP 4.10-10 All non-residential development of 25,000 gross square feet or more shall comply with the County's Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") Ordinance (Ordinance No. 93-0028M) in effect at the time of subdivision. The sizes and configurations of the *Specific Plan's* non-residential uses are not known at this time and the Ordinance specifies different requirements based on the size of the project under review. All current provisions of the ordinance are summarized in Appendix 4.10 of the *Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR*.

SP 4.10-11 Subdivisions and buildings shall comply with Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations* which are current at the time of development.

SP 4.10-12 Lighting for public streets, parking areas, and recreation areas shall utilize energy efficient light and mechanical, computerized or photo cell switching devices to reduce unnecessary energy usage.

SP 4.10-13 Any on-site subterranean parking structures shall provide adequate ventilation systems to disperse pollutants and preclude the potential for a pollutant concentration to occur.

SP 4.10-14 The sellers of new residential units shall be required to distribute brochures and other relevant information published by the SCAQMD or similar organization to new homeowners regarding the importance of reducing vehicle miles traveled and related air quality impacts, as well as on local opportunities for public transit and ridesharing.

2.2.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's air quality impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

Construction Mitigation Measures

The following recommended mitigation measures would reduce construction-related emissions to some extent; however, the resultant benefit of the mitigation measures presently cannot be quantified because certain specific details of project construction are unknown at this time. For example, alternative fuels and construction equipment that can operate on such fuels is still under development and currently in limited supply; however, it may be more plentiful in the future, resulting in potentially more benefit. Moreover, while the following mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to the maximum extent feasible, no additional feasible mitigation exists that would reduce these emissions to a sufficient degree that the construction-related emissions would be below the SCAQMD's emission-based thresholds of significance. For these same reasons, implementation of these mitigation measures would not be likely to reduce the impacts relative to the localized significance thresholds to less than significant levels. Therefore, construction-related emissions for the proposed project would be considered significant and unavoidable.

MV 4.7-1 The project applicant shall require that prior to the commencement of construction its contractors shall develop a Construction Traffic Emission Management Plan to minimize emissions from vehicles including, but not limited to, scheduling truck deliveries to avoid peak hour traffic conditions, consolidating truck deliveries, and prohibiting truck idling in excess of 5 minutes.

MV 4.7-2 The project applicant shall require that its contractors suspend the use of all construction equipment during first-stage smog alerts.

MV 4.7-3 The project applicant shall require that its contractors maintain construction equipment by conducting regular tune-ups according to the manufacturers' recommendations.

MV 4.7-4 The project applicant shall require that its contractors use electric welders to avoid emissions from gas or diesel welders.

MV 4.7-5 The project applicant shall require that its contractors reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour or less.

MV 4.7-6 The project applicant shall require that its contractors water active sites at least three times daily during dry weather.

MV 4.7-7 The project applicant shall require that its contractors replace ground cover as quickly as possible.

MV 4.7-8 The project applicant shall require that its contractors schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours (e.g., between 7:00 PM and 6:00 AM and between 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM).

MV 4.7-9 The project applicant shall require the contractor to provide temporary controls, such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow.

MV 4.7-10 The project applicant shall require the contractor route construction trucks away from congested streets and sensitive receptor areas (e.g., residences, schools, hospitals, etc.).

MV-4.7-11 The project applicant shall install shaker plates at construction site exits, to minimize dirt track out and dust generation.

MV-4.7-12 The project applicant shall operate street sweepers that comply with SCAQMD Rules 1186 and 1186.1 on roads adjacent to the construction site in a nearly continuous manner so as to minimize dust emissions. Paved parking and staging areas shall be swept daily.

MV 4.7-13 The project applicant shall all on-site construction equipment to meet U.S. EPA Tier 2 of higher emissions standards according to the following:

April 2010 through December 31, 2011: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) shall meet Tier 2 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with the BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 2 or Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.

January 1, 2012, through December 31, 2014: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) shall meet Tier 3 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with the BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.

Post-January 1, 2015: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) shall meet Tier 4 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with the BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.

MV 4.7-14 An information sign shall be posted at the entrance to each construction site that identifies the permitted construction hours and provides a telephone number to call and receive information about the construction project or to report complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation. Any reasonable complaints shall be rectified within 24 hours of their receipt.

MV 4.7-15 [Replaces Mitigation Measure SP 4.10-6] The applicant shall implement all rules and regulations adopted by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD which are applicable to the development of the subdivision (such as Rule 402 – Nuisance,

Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust, Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings) and which are in effect at the time of development. The purpose of Rule 403 is to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of man-made fugitive dust sources by requiring actions to prevent, reduce, or mitigate fugitive dust emissions. Rule 403 applies to any activity or man-made condition capable of generating fugitive dust such as the mass and remedial grading associated with the project as well as weed abatement and stockpiling of construction materials (i.e., rock, earth, gravel). Rule 403 requires that grading operations either (1) take actions specified in Tables 1 and 2 of the Rule for each applicable source of fugitive dust and take certain notification and record keeping actions, or (2) obtain an approved Fugitive Dust Control Plan. A complete copy of the SCAQMD's Rule 403 Implementation Handbook, which is included in Draft EIR Appendix 4.7, provides guideline tables to demonstrate the typical mitigation program and record keeping required for grading operations (Tables 1 and 2 and sample record-keeping chart). The record keeping is accomplished by on-site construction personnel, typically the construction superintendent.

The project applicant or its designee shall implement the following measures during construction of the proposed project:

Grading

a. Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).

b. Replace groundcover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

c. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders according to manufacturers' specifications, to exposed piles (i.e., gravel, sand, dirt) with 5 percent or greater silt content.

d. Water active sites at least twice daily.

e. Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour.

f. Monitor for particulate emissions according to district-specified procedures.

g. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114.

Paved Roads

h. Sweep paved streets at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public paved roads (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water).

i. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.

Unpaved Roads

j. Apply water three times daily, or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces.

k. Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour or less.

l. Pave construction roads that have a traffic volume of more than 50 daily trips by construction equipment, 150 total daily trips for all vehicles.

m. Pave all construction access roads at least 100 feet on to the site from the main road.

n. Pave construction roads that have a daily traffic volume of less than 50 vehicular trips.

MV 4.7-16 [Replaces Mitigation Measure SP 4.10-7] Prior to the approval of each future subdivision proposed in association with Mission Village, each of the construction emission reduction measures listed below, which are based on Tables 11-2 and 11-3 of the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, shall be implemented.

On-Road Mobile Source Construction Emissions

a. Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.

b. Provide temporary traffic controls when construction activities have the potential to disrupt traffic to maintain traffic flow (e.g., signage, flag person, detours).

c. Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours (e.g., between 7:00 PM and 6:00 AM and between 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM).

d. Develop a trip reduction plan to achieve a 1.5 average vehicle ridership ("AVR") for construction employees.

e. Implement a shuttle service to and from retail services and food establishments during lunch hours.

f. Develop a construction traffic management plan that includes the following measures to address construction traffic that has the potential to affect traffic on public streets:

- Rerouting construction traffic off congested streets;
- Consolidating truck deliveries; and
- Providing temporary dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off of the site.

g. Prohibit truck idling in excess of two minutes.

Off-Road Mobile Source Construction Emissions

h. Use pile drivers powered by an alternative to diesel fuel.

i. Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during second stage smog alerts.

j. Prevent trucks from idling longer than two minutes.

k. Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel-powered generators.

l. Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline-powered generators.

m. Use mobile equipment powered by an alternative to diesel fuel.

n. Use on-site mobile equipment powered by an alternative to gasoline.

<u>Operational Mitigation Measures</u>

(a) Point Source Operational Emissions

MV4.7-17 Any dry cleaners proposing to locate on site shall utilize the services of off-site cleaning operations at already SCAQMD-permitted locations. No on-site dry cleaning operations utilizing perchloroethylene or any other cleaning solvent containing toxic air contaminants shall be permitted within Mission Village.

(b) Mobile Source Operational Emissions

MV4.7-18 The project developer(s) shall coordinate with Santa Clarita Transit to identify appropriate bus stop/turnout locations.

MV 4.7-19 Kiosks containing transit information shall be constructed by the project applicant adjacent to selected future bus stops prior to initiation of bus service to the site.

(c) Area Source Operational Emissions

MV 4.7-20 Wood-burning fireplaces and stoves shall be prohibited in all residential units. Use of wood in fireplaces shall be prohibited through project CC&Rs.

MV 4.7-21 [Replaces Mitigation Measure SP 4.10-9] Prior to the approval of each future subdivision proposed in association with Mission Village, each of the operational emission reduction measures listed below, which are based on Tables 11-6 and 11-7 of the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, shall be implemented.

On Road Mobile Source Operational Emissions

Residential Uses

a. Provide residents with information regarding the availability of existing shuttle service providers and public transit between residential and commercial core areas.

b. Construct on-site or off-site bus stops (e.g., bus turnouts, passenger benches, and shelters).

c. Construct off-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as overpasses and wider sidewalks.

d. Include retail services within or adjacent to residential subdivisions.

e. Provide residents with information regarding the availability of existing shuttle service providers and public transit between residential areas and transit centers.

f. Contribute to regional transit systems (e.g., right-of-way, capital improvements, etc.).

g. Synchronize traffic lights on streets impacted by development.

h. Construct, contribute, or dedicate land for the provision of off-site bicycle trails linking the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes.

Commercial Uses

i. Provide preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools and provide 7 foot 2 inch minimum vertical clearance in parking facilities for vanpool access.

j. Implement on-site circulation plans in parking lots to reduce vehicle queuing.

k. Improve traffic flow at drive-throughs by designing separate windows for different functions and by providing temporary parking for orders not immediately available for pickup.

l. Set up resident worker training programs to improve job/housing balance.

m. Develop a program to minimize the use of fleet vehicles during smog alerts (for business not subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202) or XII).

n. Use low-emissions fleet vehicles:

- TLEV
- ULEV
- LEV
- ZEV

o. Reduce employee parking spaces for those businesses subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202).

p. For commercial uses subject to Rule 2202, implement a lunch shuttle service from a worksite(s) to food establishments.

q. For commercial uses subject to Rule 2202, implement compressed workweek schedules where weekly work hours are compressed into fewer than five days.

- 9/80
- 4/40
- 3/36

r. Employers with 250 or more employees are to provide on-site child care and after-school facilities or contribute to off-site development within walking distance.

s. Require retail facilities or special event centers to offer travel incentives such as discounts on purchases for transit riders.

t. Employers with 250 or more employees are to provide on-site employee services such as cafeterias, banks, etc.

u. Establish a shuttle service from residential core areas to the commercial core areas.

v. Construct on-site or off-site bus stops (e.g., bus turnouts, passenger benches, and shelters).

w. Implement a pricing structure for single-occupancy employee parking and/or provide discounts to ridesharers.

x. Include residential units within a commercial project.

y. Utilize parking in excess of code requirements as on-site park-n-ride lots or contribute to construction of off-site lots.

z. Any two of the following:

- Construct off-site bicycle facility improvements, such as bicycle trails linking the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes, or on-site improvements, such as bicycle paths.
- Include bicycle parking facilities, such as bicycle lockers and racks.
- Include showers for bicycling employees' use.

aa. Any two of the following:

- Construct off-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as overpasses, wider sidewalks.
- Construct on-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as building access that is physically separated from street and parking lot traffic and walk paths.
- Include showers for pedestrian employees' use.

ab. Provide shuttles from the commercial core areas to major transit stations.

ac. Contribute to regional transit systems (e.g., right-of-way, capital improvements, etc.).

ad. Charge visitors to park at specialty commercial/entertainment developments.

ae. Synchronize traffic lights on streets impacted by development.

af. Reschedule truck deliveries and pickups to off-peak hours.

ag. Set up paid parking systems where drivers pay at walkup kiosk and exit via a stamped ticket to reduce emissions from queuing vehicles.

ah. Require on-site truck loading zones.

ai. Implement or contribute to public outreach programs.

aj. Require employers not subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202) to provide commuter information area.

Stationary Source Operational Emissions

Residential

ak. Use solar or low emission water heaters.

al. Use central water heating systems.

am. Use built-in energy-efficient appliances.

an. Provide shade trees to reduce building heating/cooling needs.

ao. Use energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners.

ap. Use double-paned windows.

aq. Use energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights.

ar. Use lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting.

as. Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and include passive solar design (e.g., daylighting).

at. Use light-colored roofing materials to reflect heat.

au. Increase walls and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements.

Commercial Uses

av. Use solar or low emission water heaters.

aw. Use central water heating systems.

ax. Provide shade trees to reduce building heating/cooling needs.

ay. Use energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners.

az. Use double-paned windows.

ba. Use energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights.

bb. Use lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting.

bc. Use light-colored roofing materials to reflect heat.

bd. Increase walls and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements.

be. Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and include passive solar design (e.g., daylighting).

2.2.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will substantially lessen the Mission Village project's air quality impacts. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in,

or incorporated into, the project which would mitigate, in part, the significant air quality impacts attributable to the project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified air quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* **Section 8.0**, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable air quality impacts of the project.

2.3 SOLID WASTE SERVICES

2.3.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The Specific Plan's Program EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant impacts relating to solid waste disposal services because an adequate supply of landfill space had not been identified and existing hazardous management facilities in the County were inadequate. Even with the application of the recommended mitigation measures, the Program EIR concluded that these impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Site preparation (vegetation removal and grading activities) and construction activities required to develop the Mission Village project would generate a total of approximately 166,869 tons of construction waste, or an average of approximately 23,838 tons of waste per year over the seven year buildout of the project. Assuming a 50 percent diversion/recycling rate, the development of the Mission Village project would result in the generation of approximately 11,919 tons of construction waste per year for seven years. Upon buildout, the Mission Village project would generate approximately 46,305 pounds of municipal solid waste per day, or approximately 8,451 tons per year, assuming no solid waste from the project is recycled (a worst-case scenario). The project would also generate household hazardous wastes, such as used batteries, paint, etc. Cumulative development within the Santa Clarita Valley would generate 395,553 tons per year of solid waste, as well as hazardous waste, assuming no recycling. The project's share of 8,451 tons per year would represent 2.1 percent of this total.

Mitigation has been identified to reduce construction and operation waste to the extent feasible. The capacity of the landfills in Los Angeles County has been assessed and is approved to provide adequate capacity to service the existing population and planned growth until year 2023. Capacity is projected to extend beyond year 2023 when combined with other events that have expanded landfill capacity within the County, such as County disposal agreements and recycling programs. Additionally, there is a potential for alternative solid waste disposal technologies to be developed and legislatively approved in the future, given the market forces that drive the solid waste industry, which could substantially reduce landfill disposal. However, because land suitable for landfill development or expansion currently is quantitatively finite and limited due to numerous environmental, regulatory, and political constraints, until other disposal alternatives adequate to serve existing and future uses for the foreseeable future are employed, the potential impacts relating to solid and hazardous waste disposal are considered significant and unavoidable.

2.3.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to avoid or mitigate all of the solid waste impacts attributable to the Mission Village project to a level below significant. However, the following feasible mitigation measures would substantially lessen the identified significant solid waste impacts as identified in the Final EIR:

2.3.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.15-1 Each future subdivision which allows construction within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall meet the requirements of all applicable solid waste diversion, storage, and disposal regulations that are in effect at the time of subdivision review. Current applicable regulations include recycling areas that are:

- compatible with nearby structures;
- secured and protected against adverse environmental conditions;
- clearly marked, and adequate in capacity, number and distribution;
- in conformance with local building code requirements for garbage collection access and clearance;
- designed, placed and maintained to protect adjacent developments and transportation corridors from adverse impacts, such as noise, odors, vectors, or glare;
- in compliance with federal, state, or local laws relating to fire, building, access, transportation, circulation, or safety; and
- convenient for persons who deposit, collect, and load the materials.

SP 4.15-2 Future multi-family, commercial, and industrial projects within the Specific Plan shall provide accessible and convenient areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials. These areas are to be clearly marked and adequate in capacity, number, and distribution to serve the development.

SP 4.15-3 The first purchaser of each residential unit within the Specific Plan shall be given educational or instructional materials which will describe what constitutes recyclable and hazardous materials, how to separate recyclable and hazardous materials, how to avoid the use of hazardous materials, and what procedures exist to collect such materials.

SP 4.15-4 The applicant of all subdivision maps which allow construction within the Specific Plan shall comply with all applicable future state and Los Angeles County regulations and procedures for the use, collection and disposal of solid and hazardous wastes.

2.3.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's solid waste impacts, the following mitigation measure is incorporated:

MV 4.10-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall prepare a Waste Management Plan pursuant to Los Angeles County Code, Title 20, Chapter 20.87, Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling. The Waste Management Plan shall include provisions for the recycling of a minimum of 50 percent of the construction and demolition debris, and the submittal of corresponding reports to the Los Angeles County Environmental Programs Division.

2.3.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will substantially lessen the Mission Village project's solid waste impacts. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which would mitigate, in part, the significant solid waste services impacts attributable to the project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified solid waste impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* **Section 8.0**, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable solid waste impacts of the project.

2.4 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

2.4.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The Specific Plan's Program EIR identified the conversion of agricultural land to urban uses as a significant unavoidable impact associated with Specific Plan build-out on a project-specific and cumulative basis. The analysis also found that future residents of the Specific Plan may be incidentally exposed to agricultural-related activities; however, mitigation measures were recommended and adopted to reduce this impact to below a level of significance.

Development of the proposed Mission Village tract map and related off-site improvements would convert 160.7 acres of Prime Farmland, 30.1 acres of Unique Farmland, 0.6 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, 2.5 acres of Farmland of Local Importance, and 875.6 acres of grazing land to non-agricultural urban land uses. The Mission Village project's irreversible loss of 160.7 acres of Prime Farmland and 30.1 acres of Unique Farmland, and 0.6 acre of Farmland of Statewide Importance is consistent with the findings of the Specific Plan Program EIR and is considered a significant impact; based on the applicable significance thresholds, the loss of grazing land is not considered a significant impact. No feasible mitigation exists to reduce the identified significant impacts resulting from the conversion of prime agricultural land to a less than significant level and, therefore, these impacts are significant and unavoidable.

With respect to forest resources, development of the proposed Mission Village tract map and related off-site improvements would not conflict with forestland or timberland zoning. In the past, the project site was zoned for agricultural uses; but, with approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan on May 27, 2003, the Mission Village project site was re-zoned as non-agriculture. Therefore, development of the project site would not require a zone change from an existing forestland/timberland zone to a non-forestland/timberland zone, and there would be no related impacts.

The Mission Village project site contains approximately 143.7 acres (approximately 7.75 percent of the approximate 1,854-acre total project site) of native trees (i.e., oak trees and cottonwood trees, which are considered Forest Land as defined by Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), of which 10.6 acres would be permanently disturbed and 28.9 acres would be temporarily disturbed. Therefore, approximately 0.57 percent (approximately 10.6 acres of native trees) of the total project site would be lost due to development of the project. However, mitigation is provided to address the loss of these forest resources such that any potentially significant impacts related to such loss would be reduced to a less than significant level. (See **Section 3.3, Biota**, below.)

2.4.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that no feasible mitigation measures exist to avoid or mitigate below a level of significance the Mission Village project's identified impacts on significant agricultural resources. However, the following feasible mitigation measure would substantially lessen the identified agricultural impacts as identified in the Final EIR:

2.4.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures SP 4.4-1 and 4.4-2 adopted in connection with the Specific Plan are not applicable to the Mission Village project.

2.4.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To reduce the Mission Village project's impacts on agricultural resources, the following mitigation measure is incorporated:

MV 4.16-1 In order to minimize the premature conversion of agricultural lands and to track that conversion, prior to issuance of the first grading permit in areas of Mission Village where agricultural soils designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, and/or farmland of statewide importance exist (Pub.Resources Code section 21060.1), Newhall Land shall prepare and submit to the County a phasing map to document the phased discontinuation of existing agricultural activities located within the Mission Village project area over the course of its development.

2.4.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will substantially lessen the Mission Village project's agricultural resources-related impacts. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have

been required in, or incorporated into, the project which would mitigate, in part, the significant agricultural resources impacts attributable to the project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified agricultural resources-related impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* **Section 8.0**, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable agricultural resources impacts of the project.

3.0 FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGATED IMPACTS

This section identifies significant adverse impacts of the Mission Village project that require findings to be made under Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091. On the basis of information in the Final EIR, the Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce the identified significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES

3.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Specific Plan's Program EIR concluded that build-out of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would result in significant geologic, soil, and geotechnical impacts, but that the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to below a level of significance. The Program EIR further determined that site-specific geologic, soil, and geotechnical analysis would be required throughout implementation of the Specific Plan.

Based on the analysis presented in the Geotechnical and Soil Resources section of the EIR, potential impacts associated with liquefaction and seismically induced settlement are considered less than significant. Due to the project's topography, low liquefaction potential, thin liquefiable layers and the use of certified compacted fill, there would be no significant impacts associated with lateral spreading or seismically induced settlement. Potential impacts resulting from the abandoned, on-site oil wells also are considered to be less than significant because of the method of abandonment, and the ability to respond to any leaks encountered during site grading. However, unless mitigated, specific project-related significant geologic, soil, and geotechnical impacts could occur in the following areas:

- Ground rupture associated with faults along the Airport Mesa and Saddle and Del Valle Fault Zones;
- Potential hazards due to the combination of dynamic compaction and differential settlement, along with differential materials response along cut/fill and bedrock/alluvium contacts;
- Fifty-two landslide areas were identified on the site. Most of the land slide areas are

concentrated on the eastern half of the project site;

- Stability of the proposed cut and fill slopes, critical natural slopes and landslide areas;
- Potential drainage and soil erosion concerns related to surface runoff from the project site during construction and operation of the Mission Village project;
- Expansive soils associated with changes from cut and fill of the project site;
- Subsidence caused by shallow spread footing for foundation support; and
- Soil corrosivity caused by the development of concrete pads on the project site.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project's geologic, soil and geotechnical impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance, and no unavoidable significant impacts would occur. In compliance with Section 111 of the Los Angeles County Building Code, and according to the project geotechnical consultant (R.T. Franklin and Associates), the site designated on the geologic/geotechnical maps is feasible for development, would be safe against hazards from landslide, settlement or slippage, and would not affect off-site property, provided the mitigation measures identified in this section are adopted and implemented during project construction.

3.1.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures.

3.1.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.1-1 The standard building setbacks from ascending and descending man-made slopes are to be followed in accordance with Section 1806.4 of the Los Angeles County Building Code, unless superseded by specific geologic and/or soils engineering evaluations. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 44)

SP 4.1-2 The existing Grading Ordinance for planting and irrigation of cut-slopes and fill slopes is to be adhered to for grading operations within the project site. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 44)

SP 4.1-3 In order to safeguard against major seismic-related structural failures, all buildings within the project boundaries are to be constructed in conformance with the Los Angeles County Uniform Building Code, as applicable.

SP 4.1-4 The location and dimensions of the exploratory trenches and borings undertaken by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. and R.T. Frankian & Associates are to be noted on all grading plans relative to future building plans, unless the trenches and/or borings are removed by future grading operations. If future foundations traverse the trenches or borings, they are to be reviewed and

approved by the project Geotechnical Engineer. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 45.)

SP 4.1-5 Not applicable.

SP 4.1-6 Should any expansive soils be encountered during grading operations, they are not to be placed nearer the finished surface than 8 feet below the bottom of the subgrade elevation. This depth is subject to revision depending upon the expansive potential measured during grading. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-7 If expansive materials are encountered at subgrade elevation in cut areas, the soils are to be removed to a depth of 8 feet below the "finished" or "subgrade" surface and the excavated area backfilled with non-expansive, properly compacted soils. This depth is subject to revision depending upon the expansive potential measured during grading. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-8 At the time of subdivision, which allows construction, areas subject to liquefaction are to be mitigated to the satisfaction of the project Geotechnical Engineer prior to site development. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-9 Subdrains are to be placed in areas of high ground water conditions or wherever extensive irrigation is planned. The systems are to be designed to the specifications of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.

SP 4.1-10 Subdrains are to be placed in the major and minor canyon fills, behind stabilization blankets, buttress fills, and retaining walls, and as required by the Geotechnical Engineer during grading operations. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-11 Canyon subdrains may be installed in "V"-ditches or in a rectangular trench excavated to expose competent material or bedrock as approved by the Geotechnical Engineer.

SP 4.1-12 The vertical spacing of subdrains behind buttress fills, stabilization blankets, etc., are to be a maximum of 15 feet. The gradient is to be at least 2 percent to the discharge end. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-13 Geological materials subject to hydroconsolidation (containing significant void space) are to be removed prior to the placement of fill. Specific recommendations relative to hydroconsolidation are to be provided by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 44)

SP 4.1-14 Proposed structures on ridgelines will have a minimum 20-foot horizontal setback from the margin of the bedrocks to prevent perched or ground water levels where relatively impermeable materials can block downward migration.

SP 4.1-15 Subsurface exploration is required to delineate the depth and lateral extent of the landslides shown on the geologic map. This work shall be undertaken at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 15) Landslides must be mitigated through stabilization, removal, and/or building setbacks as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer, and to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

SP 4.1-16 At the subdivision stage, the existence of landslides designated with "3" on Figure 4.1-2, Existing Landslide Areas (of the Newhall Ranch EIR), and within or adjacent to the development area is to be confirmed. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 15) If landslides are confirmed in these areas, they are to be mitigated through stabilization, removal, and/or building setbacks as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.

SP 4.1-17 The existence, or lack thereof, of landslides on or adjacent to the roadway alignments for the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Boulevard will be evaluated by subsurface investigations at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, p. 11) If landslides are confirmed in these areas, they are to be mitigated through stabilization, removal, and/or building setbacks as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.

SP 4.1-18 The potential hazards associated with debris flow scars and other possible surficial failures located in proximity to the roadway alignments for the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Boulevard will be evaluated at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, p. 11) These areas are to be mitigated as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.

SP 4.1-19 Remove debris from surficial failures during grading operations prior to the placement of fill. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 16).

SP 4.1-20 All soils and/or unconsolidated slopewash and landslide debris is to be removed prior to the placement of compacted fills. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 45)

SP 4.1-21 Cut-slopes, which will expose landslide material, are to undergo geologic and geotechnical evaluation at the subdivision stage to determine their stability and degree of consolidation. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 15) Several options are available to mitigate potential landslide failure in the proposed cut-slopes. Landslides may be stabilized with buttress fills or shear keys designed by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer; landslide material can be entirely removed and replaced with a stability fill; or the slope can be redesigned to avoid the landslide.

Landslides underlying cut pad or road areas may be removed or partially removed if the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer conclude that the landslide is stable and sufficiently consolidated to build on. Landslides located on ascending natural slopes above proposed graded areas will also require evaluation for stability. Unstable landslides on natural slopes above graded areas will either require stabilization, removal, or building setbacks to mitigate potential hazards.

SP 4.1-22 Not applicable.

SP 4.1-23 Prior to construction of the road embankment located within landslide Qls II, a compacted fill shear key will be constructed at the property boundary. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, p. 6)

SP 4.1-24 Landslides which will not affect the proposed grading concept are to be placed in Restricted Use Areas on the Final Maps. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 43)

SP 4.1-25 Surficial stability of cut-slopes designated with a "G" are to be fully evaluated at the subdivision stage, due to the possibility of wedge failures or surficial material in the slope. Corrective grading measures are to be presented in detail as mitigation at both the subdivision and Grading Plan stages of development. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, pp. 17, 43) *(The focused geotechnical studies prepared for the Mission Village project included the analysis of areas previously identified with a "G" in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Certified EIR. All proposed cuts were evaluated and, where necessary, focused mitigation measures were identified and included in the list of measures presented below to mitigate potential impacts).*

SP 4.1-26 Cut slopes designated as "P" are potentially unstable and are to be fully evaluated at the subdivision stage to ascertain whether they are stable as designed. Corrective grading measures are to be presented in detail as mitigation at both the subdivision and Grading Plan stages of development. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, pp. 17, 43) *(The focused geotechnical studies prepared for the Mission Village project included the analysis of areas previously identified with a "P" in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Certified EIR. All proposed cuts were evaluated and, where necessary, focused mitigation measures were identified and included in the list of measures presented below to mitigate potential impacts).*

SP 4.1-27 Cut-slopes designated with a "U" are to be further investigated at the subdivision stage to confirm underlying geologic conditions and slope stability. Corrective grading measures are to be presented in detail as mitigation at both the subdivision and Grading Plan stages of development. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, pp. 17, 43) *(The focused geotechnical studies prepared for the Mission Village project included the analysis of areas previously identified with a "U" in the Newhall Ranch Specific*

Plan Certified EIR. All proposed cuts were evaluated and, where necessary, focused mitigation measures were identified and included in the list of measures presented below to mitigate potential impacts).

SP 4.1-28 Cut-slopes associated with the construction of the proposed extensions of Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Boulevard are to be further investigated at the subdivision stage to confirm the underlying geologic conditions and slope stability. Corrective measures are to be required if it is determined that the cut-slopes will not be stable. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, pp. 11 & 12)

SP 4.1-29 Orientations of the bedrock attitudes are to be evaluated by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Engineering Geologist to identify locations of required buttress fills. Buttress fill design and recommendations, if necessary, are to be presented as mitigation during the grading plan stage. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-30 All fills, unless otherwise specifically designed, are to be compacted to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry unit weight as determined by ASTM Designation D 1557-91 Method of Soil Compaction. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-31 No fill is to be placed until the area to receive the fill has been adequately prepared and approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-32 Fill soils are to be kept free of all debris and organic material. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-33 Rocks or hard fragments larger than 8 inches are not to be placed in the fill without approval of the Geotechnical Engineer, and in a manner specified for each occurrence. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-34 Rock fragments larger than 8 inches are not to be placed within 10 feet of finished pad grade or the subgrade of roadways or within 15 feet of a slope face. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-35 Rock fragments larger than 8 inches may be placed in windrows, below the limits given above, provided the windrows are spaced at least 5 feet vertically and 15 feet horizontally. Granular soil must be flooded around windrows to fill voids between the rock fragments. The granular soil is to be wheel rolled to assure compaction. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-36 The fill material is to be placed in layers which, when compacted, is not to exceed 8 inches per layer. Each layer is to be spread evenly and is to be thoroughly mixed during the spreading to insure uniformity of material and moisture. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-37 When moisture content of the fill material is too low to obtain adequate compaction, water is to be added and thoroughly dispersed until the soil is approximately 2 percent over optimum moisture content. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-38 When the moisture content of the fill material is too high to obtain adequate compaction, the fill material is to be aerated by blading or other satisfactory methods until the soil is approximately 2 percent over optimum moisture content. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-39 Where fills toe out on a natural slope or surface, a keyway, with a minimum width of 16 feet and extending at least 3 feet into firm, natural soil, is to be cut at the toe of the fill. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-40 Where the fills toe out on a natural or cut slope and the natural or cut slope is steeper than 5 horizontal to 1 vertical, a drainage bench with a width of at least 8 feet is to be established at the toe of the fill. Fills may be placed over cut slopes if the visible contact between the fill and cut is steeper than 45 degrees. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-41 When placing fills over slopes, sidewall benching is to extend into competent material, approved by the Geotechnical Engineer, with vertical benches not less than 4 feet. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I) Competent material is defined as being free of loose soil, heavy fracturing, or compressive soils.

SP 4.1-42 When constructing fill slopes, the grading contractor is to avoid spillage of loose material down the face of the slope during the dumping and compacting operations. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-43 The outer faces of fill slopes are to be compacted by backing a sheepsfoot compactor over the top of the slope, and thoroughly covering the entire slope surface with overlapping passes of the compactor. Compaction of the slope is to be repeated after each 4 feet of fill has been placed. The required compaction must be obtained prior to placement of additional fill. As an alternate, the slope can be overbuilt and cut back to expose a compacted core. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)

SP 4.1-44 All artificial fill associated with past petroleum activities, as well as other existing artificial fill, are to be evaluated by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer at the subdivision and/or grading plan stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, 19 September 1994, Inc., p. 45) Unstable fills are to be mitigated through removal, stabilization, or other means as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.

SP 4.1-45 Surface runoff from the future graded areas is not to run over any natural, cut, or fill slopes. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20)

SP 4.1-46 Runoff from future pads and structures is to be collected and channeled to the street and/or natural drainage courses via non-erosive drainage devices. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20)

SP 4.1-47 Water is not to stand or pond anywhere on the graded pads. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20)

SP 4.1-48 Oil and water wells that might occur on site are to be abandoned in accordance with state and local regulations. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 45)

SP 4.1-49 If any leaking or undocumented oil wells are encountered during grading operations, their locations are to be surveyed and the current well conditions evaluated immediately. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 21) Measures are to be taken to document the wells, abandonment, and remediate the well sites (if necessary) in accordance with state and local regulations.

SP 4.1-50 The exact status and location of the Exxon (Newhall Land & Farming) oil well #31 will be evaluated at the subdivision stage. If necessary, the well will be abandoned in accordance with state and local regulations. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, p. 12).

SP 4.1-51 Survey control will be required to precisely locate the Salt Creek and Del Valle Faults at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 33).

SP 4.1-52 Additional subsurface trenching will be performed within the Holser Structural Zone on Newhall Ranch during the subdivision stage to evaluate its existence. Within Potrero Canyon, additional subsurface evaluation will be performed during the subdivision stage to confirm that nontectonic alluvial movement was the cause of surface ground cracking during the January 17, 1994 earthquake, and to evaluate the potential for shallow-depth faults. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. 19 September 1994, p. 42, as revised above.) *(Additional subsurface evaluations pertaining to Holzer Fault are not applicable for the Mission Village project site. This is due to the fact that the Holzer Fault is not located on the project site.*

SP 4.1-53 Precise Building Setback Zones for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site are to be defined at the subdivision stage.

SP 4.1-54 Due to the potential activity of the Salt Creek and Del Valle Faults, site development is to remain outside of Building Setback Zones around fault traces, and the possible fault zone connecting them. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 42).

SP 4.1-55 To minimize potential hazards from shattered ridge effects, structures, and storage tanks proposed on ridgelines are to have a minimum 20-foot setback from the

margins of the bedrock. Designation of specific building setbacks will require evaluation at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 40) Building Setback Zones are to be identified on all site plans and tract maps for the site.

SP 4.1-56 The potential for ground motion and ground failure associated with a seismic event in proximity to the planned roadway alignments of Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Boulevard will be evaluated at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, p. 11) Mitigation to reduce associated significant impacts will also be identified at that time.

3.1.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts that would result from project implementation, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

MV 4.1-1 Future structures shall be designed according to standards applicable to Seismic Zone 4 of the Uniform Building Code.

MV 4.1-2 Lots underlain by transitions between different material types (e.g., bedrock to fill, bedrock to alluvium, etc.) shall be over-excavated 5 feet to minimize potential adverse impacts associated with differential materials response.

MV 4.1-3 Over-excavation of clay-rich bedding planes of the Saugus Formation or Pico Formation and subsequent placement of a certified fill cap shall be conducted to mitigate potential hazards from expansive material, and to reduce potential hazards from potential secondary seismogenic movement along bedding planes.

MV 4.1-4 Due to the potential for primary ground surface rupture along the Airport Mesa and/or Saddle Faults, Fault Building Setback zones have been designated for the area within 50 feet of the map trace of the two faults.

To reduce potential public heath and safety impacts to a less than significant level, the following restrictions shall be applicable to these areas:

- No construction of habitable structures as defined in Appendix B of CDMG Special Publication 42, are allowed within the Fault Building Setback zone.
- Pipelines, including gas, water, storm drain, and sewer, shall be constructed to allow for some flexure and emergency shut off valves shall be required for gas and water lines within these zones in case of possible ground deformation during an earthquake.
- Site-specific recommendations shall be provided at the Grading Plan or Building Plan stages.

MV 4.1-5 If critical facilities or essential services buildings (e.g., hospitals, schools, fire stations, etc.) are to be developed within the area of the Airport Mesa or Saddle faults, a Building Setback of at least 50 feet from each side of the Airport Mesa or Saddle faults shall be maintained.

MV 4.1-6 The project shall be designed in accordance will all applicable building codes and standards utilizing the appropriate geotechnical parameters as presented in the "Seismicity" section of the R.T. Frankian & Associates report entitled *Response to County of Los Angeles Review Sheets and Geotechnical Plan Review, Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 6110,5* (April 29, 2010)) to reduce seismic risk to an acceptable level as defined by CGS in Chapter 2 of SP 117a (CGS, 2008).

MV 4.1-7 The mitigation for liquefaction at the site will consist of a combination of ground motion and structural to reduce the risk to an acceptable level as defined by CGS in chapter 2 of SR 117a (CGS, 2008). The ground modification will consist of the removal of some of the soil material subject to liquefaction and/or elevating the site grades.

MV 4.1-8 The recommendations identified in Table I, *Response to County of Los Angeles Review Sheets and Geotechnical Plan Review, Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105 (*April 29, 2010) prepared by R.T. Frankian & Associates, shall be incorporated into the project such that the analyzed cut-slopes, proposed grades, remedial grades and compacted fill slopes comply with Los Angeles County minimum requirements for gross stability under static and pseudostatic loading conditions and for surficial stability, as applicable.

MV 4.1-9 All landslide removal bottoms shall be observed by the project engineering geologist and surveyed by the supervising civil engineer prior to the placement of engineered fill.

MV 4.1-10 Where proposed pad grades occur near the basal Qt contact of the mesas and the basal Qt layer contains a high percentage of oversized (>8 inches) clasts, the Qt shall be removed (over-excavated) and replaced with suitable engineered fill. Stability fills are recommended for all proposed cut-slopes that expose Qt deposits in the slope face.

MV 4.1-11 All slopewash in areas of proposed development shall be completely removed prior to the placement of engineered fill.

MV 4.1-12 In proposed fill areas, all artificial fill impacting the proposed development shall be entirely removed prior to placement of compacted/certified fill material. If artificial fill is present below proposed cut grade elevations, it shall be completely removed and replaced with certified engineered fill.

MV 4.1-13 Review of the tentative tract map design, the topographic base map and field mapping of the site indicates that where potential debris flow hazard exists the following mitigation measures shall be implemented (but not limited to) to mitigate the potential for debris flow hazard at these locations:

- Remove loose surficial material;
- Construct diverter slough walls;
- Construct impact walls;
- Construct debris basins;
- Control run-off;
- Plant selective deep-rooted vegetation; and
- Construct stability fills.

MV 4.1-14 As part of the project site grading, 48 of the landslides will be completely removed as part of the site grading. Of the remaining four landslides (Qls-XXXV, Qls-XXXVII, Qls-XLIII, and Qls-XLIV), three of the landslides (Qls-XXXV, Qls-XLIII, and Qls-XLIV) shall be partially removed until a stable configuration is achieved. The southern portion of the fourth landslide (Qls-XXXVII) shall be completely removed below the proposed building pad, and the northern portion (within the spineflower preserve) shall remain in place and be stabilized by a shear key and buttress fill slope. The remaining portion of this landslide will be placed within a Restricted Use Area.

MV 4.1-15 All cut slopes shall be graded in accordance with the recommendations of the Project Geotechnical Consultant, as described in the Vesting Tentative Tract Map plan review reports.

MV 4.1-16 The proposed fill slopes shall be graded in accordance with the recommendations of Project Geotechnical Consultant as described in the Vesting Tentative Tract Map plan review reports.

MV 4.1-17 The grading adjacent to natural slopes shall be performed in accordance with the recommendations of the Project Geotechnical Consultant, as described in the Vesting Tentative Tract Map plan review reports. Where warranted for gross stability, Building Setbacks recommended in the plan review reports that exceed the setback standards set forth in the Los Angeles County/California Building Code shall be adhered to. The standard setbacks from grossly stable ascending and descending natural slopes provided in the Los Angeles County/California Building Code shall also be followed, where not superseded by the recommended Building Setbacks.

MV 4.1-18 The debris flow hazard shall be further evaluated once a 40-scale rough grading plan has been developed for the project site. Appropriate mitigation measures, such as avoidance, debris basins, impact walls, etc., shall be provided for any additional debris flow areas identified on the rough grading plan.

MV 4.1-19 Prior to placing compacted fill, the ground surface shall be prepared by removing non-compacted artificial fill (af), disturbed compacted fill soils (caf), loose alluvium, and other unsuitable materials. Areas that are to receive compacted fill shall be inspected by the project geologist/geotechnical engineer prior to the placement of fill.

MV 4.1-20 All drainage devices shall be properly installed and inspected by the project geologist/geotechnical engineer and/or owner's representative(s) prior to placement of backfill.

MV 4.1-21 Fill soils shall consist of imported soils or on-site soils free of organics, cobbles, and deleterious material provided each material is approved by the project geologist/geotechnical engineer. The project geologist/geotechnical engineer shall evaluate and/or test the import material for its conformance with the report recommendations prior to its delivery to the site. The contractor shall notify the project geologist/geotechnical engineer prior to importing material to the site.

MV 4.1-22 Fill shall be placed in controlled layers (lifts), the thickness of which is compatible with the type of compaction equipment used. The fill materials shall be brought to optimum moisture content or above, thoroughly mixed during spreading to obtain a near uniform moisture condition and uniform blend of materials, and then placed in layers with a thickness (loose) not exceeding 8 inches. Each layer shall be compacted to a minimum compaction of 90 percent relative to the maximum dry density determined per the latest ASTM D1557 test. Density testing shall be performed by the project geologist/geotechnical engineer to verify relative compaction. The contractor shall provide proper access and level areas for testing.

MV 4.1-23 Rocks or rock fragments less than 8 inches in the largest dimension may be utilized in the fill, provided they are not placed in concentrated pockets. Rocks larger than 4 inches shall not be placed within 3 feet of finish grade.

MV 4.1-24 Rocks greater than 8 inches in largest dimension shall be taken off site, or placed in accordance with the recommendation of the Soils Engineer in areas designated as suitable for rock disposal.

MV 4.1-25 Where space limitations do not allow for conventional fill compaction operations, special backfill materials and procedures may be required. Pea gravel or other select fill can be used in areas of limited space. A sand and Portland cement slurry (2 sacks per cubic-yard mix) shall be used in limited space areas for shallow backfill near final pad grade, and pea gravel shall be placed in deeper backfill near drainage systems.

MV 4.1-26 The project geologist/geotechnical engineer shall observe the placement of fill and conduct in-place field density tests on the compacted fill to check for adequate moisture content and the required relative compaction. Where less than specified relative compaction is indicated, additional compacting effort shall be applied and the soil moisture conditioned as necessary until adequate relative compaction is attained.

MV 4.1-27 The contractor shall comply with the minimum relative compaction out to the finish slope face of fill slopes, buttresses, and stabilization fills as set forth in the specifications for compacted fill. This may be achieved by either overbuilding the

slope and cutting back as necessary, or by direct compaction of the slope face with suitable equipment, or by any other procedure that produces the required result.

MV 4.1-28 Any abandoned underground structures such as cesspools, cisterns, mining shafts, tunnels, septic tanks, wells, pipelines or others not discovered prior to grading are to be removed or treated to the satisfaction of the Soils Engineer and/or the controlling agency for the project.

MV 4.1-29 The contractor shall have suitable and sufficient equipment during a particular operation to handle the volume of fill being placed. When necessary, fill placement equipment shall be shut down temporarily in order to permit proper compaction of fills, correction of deficient areas, or to facilitate required field-testing.

MV 4.1-30 The contractor shall be responsible for the satisfactory completion of all earthwork in accordance with the project plans and specifications.

MV 4.1-31 Final reports shall be submitted after completion of earthwork and after the Soils Engineer and Engineering Geologist have finished their observations of the work. No additional excavation or filling shall be performed without prior notification to the Soils Engineer and/or Engineering Geologist.

MV 4.1-32 Trench excavations to receive backfill shall be free of trash, debris or other unsatisfactory materials prior to backfill placement, and shall be inspected by the project geologist/geotechnical engineer.

MV 4.1-33 Soils obtained from the excavation may be used as backfill if they are essentially free of organics and deleterious materials, unless otherwise indicated in the applicable geotechnical report.

MV 4.1-34 Rocks generated from the trench excavation not exceeding 3 inches in largest dimension may be used as backfill material. However, such material may not be placed within 12 inches of the top of the pipeline. No more than 30 percent of the backfill volume shall contain particles larger than 1.5 inches in diameter, and rocks shall be well mixed with finer soil.

MV 4.1-35 Soils (other than aggregates) with a Sand Equivalent (SE) greater than or equal to 30, as determined by ASTM D 2419 Standard Test Method or at the discretion of the engineer or representative in the field, may be used for bedding and shading material in the pipe zone areas. These soils are considered satisfactory for compaction by jetting procedures.

MV 4.1-36 No jetting shall be permitted in utility trenches within the top 2 feet of the subgrade of concrete slabs-on-grade.

MV 4.1-37 Trench backfill other than bedding and shading shall be compacted by mechanical methods as tamping sheepsfoot, vibrating or pneumatic rollers, or other

mechanical tampers to achieve the density specified herein. The backfill materials shall be brought to optimum moisture content or above, thoroughly mixed during spreading to obtain a near uniform moisture condition and uniform blend of materials, and then placed in horizontal layers with a thickness (loose) not exceeding 8 inches. Trench backfills shall be compacted to a minimum compaction of 90 percent relative to the maximum dry density determined per the latest ASTM D1557 test.

MV 4.1-38 The contractor shall select the equipment and process to be used to achieve the specified density without damage to the pipeline, the adjacent ground, existing improvements or completed work.

MV 4.1-39 Observations and field tests shall be carried on during construction by the project geologist/geotechnical engineer to confirm that the required degree of compaction has been obtained. Where compaction is less than that specified, additional compaction effort shall be made with adjustment of the moisture content as necessary until the specified compaction is obtained. Field density tests may be omitted at the discretion of the engineer or his representative in the field.

MV 4.1-40 Whenever, in the opinion of the project geologist/geotechnical engineer or the owner's Representative(s), an unstable condition is being created, either by cutting or filling, the work shall not proceed until an investigation has been made and the excavation plan revised, if deemed necessary.

MV 4.1-41 Fill material within a trench shall not be placed, spread, or rolled during unfavorable weather conditions. When the work is interrupted by heavy rain, fill operations shall not be resumed until field tests by the project geologist/geotechnical engineer indicate the moisture content and density of the fill are as specified.

MV 4.1-42 In order to provide a uniform firm bottom prior to placing fill, all unconsolidated alluvium, slopewash, colluvial soils and severely weathered terrace deposits and bedrock shall be removed from areas to receive fill. The estimated depths of removals (excluding landslides) are 5 to 22 feet, as shown on the Geologic Remediation Maps (Plates G7 to G11) contained in *Geologic and Geotechnical Report, Vesting Tentative Tract Map 61105* (July 22, 2004), as revised by Plates ES8-ES13 contained in the *Geologic and Geotechnical Report, Review of Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map* (December 22, 2004), prepared by Seward, which is included in EIR **Appendix 4.1**. The exact depth and extent of necessary removals will be determined in the field during the grading operations when observations and more location-specific evaluations can be performed. Removal depths for these areas are based on subsurface investigations, laboratory testing, proposed fill, depth use intended and analyses (including liquefaction and cyclic settlement analyses) as well as the geotechnical engineer's geologic and geotechnical judgment.

MV 4.1-43 All existing uncertified fill (i.e., artificial fill) is considered unsuitable for support of proposed engineered fills and/or structures and must be removed and replaced with compacted fill. It is estimated that a maximum thickness of approximately 25 feet of artificial fill currently exists in the vicinity of proposed Lots 782 and 783 on the project site.

MV 4.1-44 To protect against potential landslide activity, colluvium/slopewash present within the canyon swales and on drainage sideslopes shall be removed to depths ranging from 10 to 60 feet**.** Removals at the locations of exploratory trenches shall be extended to the bottom of the trench backfill if the adjacent removal depths are shallower than the trench.

MV 4.1-45 In areas to receive compacted fill where the surface gradient is steeper than 5:1, the soil mantle, colluvium and unsuitable material shall be removed and such areas benched horizontally into competent material in conjunction with fill placement.

MV 4.1-46 After the ground surface to receive fill has been exposed, it shall be ripped to a minimum depth of 6 inches, brought to optimum moisture content or above and thoroughly mixed to obtain a near uniform moisture condition and uniform blend of materials, and then compacted to the required relative compaction per the latest ASTM D 1557 laboratory maximum density.

MV 4.1-47 Ground water is not expected to impede the grading operations over the project site. Where recommended removals encounter groundwater, water levels will need to be controlled by providing an adequate excavation bottom slope and sumps for pumping water out as the excavation proceeds, or groundwater may be lowered by installing shallow dewatering well points prior to grading. Partial removals of soils above the water table and soil improvement below the water table (e.g., shallow compaction grouting) may be another option. Dewatering may be needed depending on the season when the removals are performed.

MV 4.1-48 A minimum 5- to 8-foot-thick over-excavation shall be performed on all cut lots, and transitional lots (transitions between bedrock, fill, terrace deposits and alluvium) and a minimum 3-foot-thick over-excavation on streets. This over-excavation will provide a uniform base for structural support of buildings and traffic loads. If on a cut/fill transition lot the maximum depth of fill exceeds 15 feet, then the thickness of the fill cap shall be one-third of the deepest fill thickness below any proposed structure. If excavation of the native soils (i.e., bedrock) exposes high expansive materials, then the lot over-excavation shall be deepened to 8 feet. Cut and transition lots located in areas of steeply dipping bedrock will need to be over-excavated to a depth of 8 feet. If these lots are underlain by weak sheared bedding planes or shears they may require a deeper over excavation and need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis during the grading operations. Lots potentially affected by the requirements have been identified in the Geologic Remediation Maps (Plates G7 to G11) included in the *Geologic and Geotechnical Report, Vesting Tentative Tract Map 61105* (July 22,

2004), as revised by Plates ES8-ES13 contained in the *Geologic and Geotechnical Report, Review of Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map* (December 22, 2004), prepared by Seward, which is included in EIR Appendix 4.1.

MV 4.1-49 All fill material shall be placed in uniform lifts not exceeding 8 inches in its loose state and compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction as determined based on the latest ASTM Test Designation D-1557.

MV 4.1-50 For fills deeper than 40 feet, the portion of fill below 40 feet depth shall be compacted to a minimum of 93 percent relative compaction. To ensure compliance with this requirement, these areas shall be delineated at the Grading Plan stage.

MV 4.1-51 Fill slope inclination shall not be steeper than 2:1. The fill material within approximately one equipment width (typically 15 feet) of the slope face shall be constructed with cohesive material obtained from on-site soils. The finished fill-slope face shall be constructed by over-building the slope and cutting back to the compacted fill material. Stability Fills are recommended where cut-slope faces will expose fill-over bedrock, alluvium-over-bedrock, or Quaternary Terrace Deposits over bedrock conditions. These fills shall be constructed with a keyway at the toe of the fill slope with a minimum equipment width but not less than 15 feet, and a minimum depth of 3 feet into the firm undisturbed earth. Following completion of the keyway excavations, the project engineering geologist shall observe and approve the keyway bottom prior to backfilling with Certified Engineered Fill.

MV 4.1-52 Where fill slopes are constructed above natural ground with a gradient of 5:1 or steeper, all topsoil, colluvium, and unsuitable material shall be removed and a keyway shall be constructed at the toe of the fill slope with a minimum width of 15 feet, and a minimum depth of 3 feet into firm undisturbed earth. Following completion of the keyway excavations, the project Engineering Geologist/Geotechnical Engineer or his representative shall observe and approve the keyway bottom prior to backfilling with compacted fill.

MV 4.1-53 Where fill slopes toe out on relatively level natural ground, the removals shall be performed to a minimum 1:1 projection from the toe of slope to the recommended removal depth. Where sliver fill-slopes are proposed, it is recommended that the slope be constructed with a minimum 15-foot-width Stability Fill throughout, which is keyed in at the toe of slope.

MV 4.1-54 Excavations deeper than 3 feet shall conform to safety requirements for excavations as set forth in the State Construction Safety Orders enforced by the State Division of Industrial Safety, CAL OSHA. Temporary excavations 12 feet or lower shall be no steeper than 1:1. For excavations to 20 feet in height, the bottom 3.5 feet may be vertical and the upper portion shall be no steeper than 1.5:1. Excavations not complying with these requirements shall be shored.

MV 4.1-55 Excavation walls in sands and dry soils shall be kept moist, but not saturated at all times.

MV 4.1-56 The bases of excavations or trenches shall be firm and unyielding prior to foundations or utility construction. On-site materials other than topsoil or soils with roots or deleterious materials may be used for backfilling excavations. Densification (compaction) by jetting may be used for on-site clean sands or imported equivalent of coarser sand provided they have a Sand Equivalent greater than or equal to 30 as determined by ASTM D2419 test method.

MV 4.1-57 Parameters for design of cantilever and braced shoring shall be provided at the grading plan stage.

MV 4.1-58 If any leaking or undocumented oil wells are encountered during grading operations, their locations shall be surveyed and the current well conditions evaluated immediately. If potentially hazardous materials relating to operation of the oil wells are encountered during future grading operations, they shall be assessed and mitigated to the satisfaction of DOGGR before grading is permitted to continue.

MV 4.1-59 To maintain appropriate long-term drainage and erosion control, the following points shall be adhered to in slope protection, landscaping, irrigation and modifications to slopes, pads and structures:

- All interceptor ditches, drainage terraces, down-drains, and any other drainage devices shall be maintained and kept clear of debris. A qualified Engineer shall review any proposed additions or revisions to these systems, to evaluate their impact on slope erosion.
- Retaining walls shall have adequate freeboard to provide a catchment area for minor slope erosion. Periodic inspection, and if necessary, cleanout of deposited soil and debris shall be performed, particularly during and after periods of rainfall.
- Slope surficial soils may be subject to water-induced mass erosion. Therefore, a suitable proportion of slope planting shall have root systems, which will develop well below 3 feet. Intervening areas can then be planted with lightweight surface plants with shallower root systems. All plants shall be lightweight and require low moisture. Any loose slough generated during the process of planting shall be properly removed from the slope face(s).
- Construction delays, climate/weather conditions, and plant growth rates may be such that additional short-term erosion control measures may be needed; examples would be matting, netting, plastic sheets, deep (5 feet) staking, etc.

MV 4.1-60 All possible precautions shall be taken to maintain moderate and uniform soil moisture. Slope irrigation systems shall be properly operated and maintained and system controls shall be placed under strict control.

MV 4.1-61 Surface drainage control design shall include provisions for positive surface gradients to ensure that surface runoff is not permitted to pond, particularly above slopes or adjacent to building foundations or slabs. Surface runoff shall be directed away from slopes and foundations and collected in lined ditches or drainage swales, via non-erodible drainage devices, which shall discharge to paved roadways, or existing watercourses. If these facilities discharge onto natural ground, means shall be provided for control erosion and to create sheet flow.

MV 4.1-62 Site grading shall be observed, particularly after heavy, prolonged rainfall, to identify erosion areas at an early stage. Maintenance work shall be done as soon as practical to repair these areas and prevent their enlargement.

MV 4.1-63 Fill slopes, Buttress Fill and Stability Fills, as applicable, shall be provided with subsurface drainage as necessary for stability. Subdrains along the bottom of canyon fills shall be constructed.

MV 4.1-64 Water should not be allowed to pond on future graded areas, or allowed to flow uncontrolled over natural or graded slopes. Surface drainage should be directed to terrace drains or debris basins. Debris material generated from erosion should be contained within site boundaries. All slope terrace drains should be kept clear of all debris to limit impounding or surface water. Graded slopes should be seeded with a deep-rooting, drought-resistant vegetation to minimize erosion.

MV 4.1-65 All final grades shall be sloped away from the building foundations to allow rapid removal of surface water runoff. No ponding of water shall be allowed adjacent to the foundations. Plants and other landscaped vegetation requiring excessive watering shall be avoided adjacent to the building foundations. If such landscaping is installed, an effective water-tight barrier shall be provided to prevent water from affecting the building foundations.

MV 4.1-66 Additional testing for expansive soils shall be performed at the grading plan stage and during finish grading so that appropriate foundation design recommendations for expansive soils, if applicable, can be made.

MV 4.1-67 Pending additional testing, either Type I or II cement shall be used in concrete placed in contact with the ground. Mitigating recommendations against soil corrosivity shall be revised/expanded based on additional confirmatory tests that shall be performed at the Grading Plan stage. Final recommendations for concrete will be in accordance with the latest UBC requirements, and a corrosion specialist shall provide mitigating recommendations for potential corrosion of metals in contact with on-site soils.

3.1.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the potentially significant geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091,

subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid all potentially significant geologic, soils, and geotechnical impacts impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.2 HYDROLOGY

3.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Specific Plan's Program EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would not increase site discharge during a capital storm, not result in upstream or downstream flooding, and not subject any on-site or off-site improvements to flood hazards. Therefore, the development proposed in the Specific Plan was found to result in less than significant on-site and off-site flooding impacts.

Site clearing and grading operations within the Mission Village project site would have the potential to discharge sediment downstream during storm events. Temporary erosion control measures in disturbed areas of the project site during the construction phase are recommended to reduce this potential impact to less than significant levels.

As to operational impacts, with implementation of the Specific Plan mitigation measures requiring the incorporation of certain project design features and additional mitigation specific to Mission Village, development of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts on drainage patterns because development would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns, significantly modify a drainage channel, nor change the rate of flow, currents, or the course and direction of surface waters such that they would cause substantial erosion or siltation, or cause on-site or off-site flooding or mudflow. Once developed, the Mission Village project would reduce post-development storm water flows during a 50-year capital storm event, as compared to existing conditions. Specifically, the amount of discharge from the project site (including the tributary watershed in which the project site lies) would decrease from 5,682 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 4,862 cfs. This 14 percent reduction in rainfall runoff would be due to the reduction in erosive areas on the project site that contribute sediment and debris to the runoff. Mitigation requires that the proposed storm drainage improvements meet the flood control requirements of the Flood Control and Watershed Management Divisions of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, thereby reducing flood impacts to less than significant levels. Additionally, the proposed bank stabilization and bridge abutments within the river would not impede or redirect flood flows within the river and, therefore, would not cause a significant impact relative to flooding.

None of the improvements proposed on the site would be subject to flood hazard: future inhabitable structures on the site would be a minimum of 1 foot above the 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed project would also not result in risk of loss, injury, or death due to flooding, mudflow, tsunami, or seiche.

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("LACDPW") would reduce storm-related flooding, erosion, and sedimentation impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, no significant unavoidable impacts are anticipated.

3.2.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant hydrology-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.2.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.2-1 All on- and off-site flood control improvements necessary to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are to be constructed to the satisfaction of the LACDPW, Flood Control Division.

SP 4.2-2 All necessary permits or letters of exemption from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for Specific Plan-related development are to be obtained prior to construction of drainage improvements. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.6, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-10 (restoration) and 4.6-11 through 4.6-16 (enhancement) (of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR).

SP 4.2-3 All necessary streambed agreement(s) are to be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game wherever grading activities alter the flow of streams under CDFG jurisdiction. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.6, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-10 (restoration) and 4.6-11 through 4.6-16 (enhancement) (of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR).

SP 4.2-4 Conditional Letters of Map Revision (CLOMR) relative to adjustments to the 100-year FIA floodplain are to be obtained by the applicant before the proposed drainage facilities are constructed. (*The project has complied with this requirement. See EIR Appendix 4.2)*

SP 4.2-5 Prior to the approval and recordation of each subdivision map, a Hydrology Plan, Drainage Plan, and Grading Plan (including an Erosion Control Plan if required) for each subdivision must be prepared by the applicant of the subdivision map to ensure that no significant erosion, sedimentation, or flooding impacts would occur during or after site development. These plans shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the LACDPW.

SP 4.2-6 Install permanent erosion control measures, such as desilting and debris basins, drainage swales, slope drains, storm drain inlet/outlet protection, and sediment traps in order to prevent sediment and debris from the upper reaches of the drainage areas which occur on the Newhall Ranch site from entering storm drainage improvements. These erosion control measures shall be installed to the satisfaction of the LACDPW.

SP 4.2-7 The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall satisfy all applicable requirements of the NPDES Program in effect in Los Angeles County to the satisfaction of the LACDPW. These requirements currently include preparation of an Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (USWMP) containing design features and Best Management Practices (BMPs) appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. In addition, the requirements currently include preparation of a Storm Water Management Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. The LACDPW shall monitor compliance with those NPDES requirements.

3.2.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's hydrology impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

MV 4.2-1 The on-site storm drains (pipes and reinforced concrete boxes) and open channels shall be designed and constructed to meet the storm flows, as required by the LACDPW.

MV 4.2-2 Debris basins shall be constructed pursuant to LACDPW requirements to intercept storm flows from undeveloped areas before they discharge into the developed portions of the Mission Village tract map site.

MV 4.2-3 Energy dissipaters consisting of either riprap or larger standard impact type energy dissipaters shall be installed along the Santa Clara River as required by LACDPW at outlet locations to reduce velocities of runoff into the channel to prevent erosion.

MV 4.2-4 The project is required to comply with the RWQCB Municipal Permit (General MS4 Permit) Order No. 01-182, NPDES No. CAS004001 (amended September 14, 2006), and with the state's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit, California State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 99-08-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) No. CAS000002, reissued on August 19, 1999, as amended and further modified by Resolution No. 2001-046 on April 26, 2001.

MV 4.2-5 During all construction phases, temporary erosion control shall be implemented to retain soil and sediment on the tract map site as follows:

- Re-vegetate exposed areas as quickly as possible;
- Minimize disturbed areas;
- Divert runoff from downstream drainages with earth dikes, temporary drains, slope drains, etc.;
- Reduce velocity through outlet protection, check dams, and slope roughening/terracing;

- Implement dust control measures, such as sand fences, watering, etc.;
- Stabilize all disturbed areas with blankets, reinforced channel liners, soil cement, fiber matrices, geotextiles, and/or other erosion resistant soil coverings or treatments;
- Stabilize construction entrances/exits with aggregate underdrains with filter cloth or other comparable method;
- Place sediment control BMPs at appropriate locations along the site perimeter and at all operational internal inlets to the storm drain system at all times during the rainy season (sediment control BMPs may include filtration devices and barriers, such as fiber rolls, silt fence, straw bale barriers, and gravel inlet filters, and/or with settling devices, such as sediment traps or basins; and/or
- Eliminate or reduce, to the extent feasible, non-storm water discharges (e.g., pipe flushing, fire hydrant flushing, over-watering during dust control, vehicle and equipment wash down, etc.) from the construction site through the use of appropriate sediment control BMPs.

MV 4.2-6 All necessary permits, agreements, and/or letters of exemption from the USACE and/or CDFG for project-related development within their respective jurisdictions must be obtained prior to issuance of grading permits.

MV 4.2-7 By October 1st of each year, a separate erosion control plan for construction activities shall be submitted to the local municipality describing the erosion control measures that will be implemented during the rainy season (October 1 through April 15).

MV 4.2-8 A final developed condition hydrology analysis (LACDPW Drainage Concept Report [DCR] and Final Design Report [FDR]) shall be prepared in conjunction with final project design when precise engineering occurs. This final analysis shall confirm that the final project design is consistent with this analysis. This final developed condition hydrology analysis shall confirm that the sizing and design of the water quality and hydrologic control BMPs control hydromodification impacts in accordance with the Newhall Ranch Sub-Regional Stormwater Mitigation Plan. All elements of the storm drain system shall conform to the policies and standards of the LACDPW, Flood Control Division, as applicable.

MV 4.2-9 Ultimate project hydrology and debris production calculations shall be prepared by a project engineer to verify the requirements for debris basins and/or desilting inlets.

MV 4.2-10 To reduce debris being discharged from the site, debris basins shall be designed and constructed pursuant to LACDPW Flood Control requirements to intercept flows from undeveloped areas entering into the developed portions of the site.

3.2.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the potentially significant hydrology-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.3 BIOTA

3.3.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Program EIR for the Specific Plan identified significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources, as portions of the contemplated development would occur in sensitive upland and riparian habitats and displace native species. While mitigation was recommended and adopted by the County, all impacts were not reduced to a level below significant.

Specific to Mission Village, the entire project site occupies 1,854.5 acres, including the 1,261.8-acre Mission Village tract map site and an additional 592.8 acres of off-site land primarily within the boundaries of the approved Specific Plan. The project site includes 277.9 acres of riparian vegetation, including 111.8 acres of riparian woodland (southern willow scrub, shrub tamarisk, and southern cottonwood-willow riparian) and 166.1 acres of other riparian vegetation communities. The project site also includes 1,576.8 acres of upland vegetation communities and land covers, of which 1,430.4 acres occur outside the 100-year floodplain of the Santa Clara River. The project site includes 1.5 miles of the Santa Clara River mainstem; this represents 1.7 percent of the overall Santa Clara River mainstem (86 miles). The total Mission Village project area, inclusive of infrastructure improvements, includes approximately 5 miles of the Santa Clara River mainstem (6 percent of overall). The Mission Village project, including the necessary off-site project components, would result in the permanent conversion of, or temporary disturbance to, 1,493.1 acres of the following vegetation types:

- 413.4 acres of California sagebrush scrub
- 16.1 acres of California sagebrush scrub–Artemisia
- 12.9 acres of California sagebrush scrub–black sage
- 83.2 acres of California sagebrush scrub–California buckwheat.
- 13.9 acres of California sagebrush scrub–undifferentiated chaparral
- 127.0 acres of California sagebrush scrub–purple sage
- 0.1 acre of disturbed California sagebrush scrub
- 394.3 acres of disturbed lands

- 219.9 acres of land currently used for agricultural purposes
- 8.0 acres of developed land
- 19.7 acres of river wash.
- 28.8 acres of southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest
- 66.1 acres of California annual grassland
- 34.3 acres of undifferentiated chaparral
- 7.8 acres of coast live oak woodland
- 22.3 acres of big sagebrush scrub
- 0.7 acre of southern willow scrub
- 6.9 acres of arrow weed scrub
- 5.6 acres of Mexican elderberry scrub
- 2.6 acres chamise chaparral
- 1.8 acres of chamise–hoaryleaf ceanothus chaparral
- 1.9 acres of valley oak/grass
- 1.6 acres of herbaceous wetlands
- 1.8 acres of mulefat scrub
- 1.1 acre of disturbed mulefat scrub
- 0.6 acre of eriodictyon scrub
- 0.1 acre of giant reed grassland
- 0.5 acre of alluvial scrub

Development of the proposed project would preclude landscape level or regional wildlife movement between the Santa Clara River and undeveloped lands to the south. Dead-End Canyon, Middle Canyon, and Magic Mountain Canyon would be developed and eliminated as potential wildlife movement corridors. Lion Canyon and portions of Exxon Canyon would not be developed, but would become dead-ends and preclude movement between large habitat areas. However, although the Mission Village portion of the Specific Plan area would be developed and affect local wildlife movement, regional habitat connectivity would be maintained. The conceptual regional open space plan developed by Penrod et al. provides for landscape-scale

habitat connectivity between the Santa Susana Mountains to the south, and the Los Padres National Forest to the north encompasses the High Country SMA/SEA 20 and the Salt Creek area and the Santa Clara River west of Mission Village. The High Country SMA/SEA 20 and Salt Creek area comprise an important part of the "least cost (best potential route) path" linkage design identified by Penrod et al. They provide a key part of the east–west linkage that crosses I-5 and connects with the Angeles National Forest in the San Gabriel Mountains to the east and with Ventura County SOAR open space to the southwest. They also provide a significant part of the north–south linkage between the Santa Susana Mountains and the "Fillmore Greenbelt" to the northwest that further links up with the Los Padres National Forest and the Angeles National Forest to the north.

In approving the Specific Plan and Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5), the Board of Supervisors found that the Specific Plan contained sufficient natural vegetative cover and open space to buffer critical resources in the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 from the development shown in the Specific Plan. The Board of Supervisors further found that the Specific Plan incorporated extensive buffer areas to protect critical resources within the Santa Clara River. The Specific Plan's adopted Resource Management Plan requires a minimum 100-foot-wide setback adjacent to the Santa Clara River between the river side of the top of bank stabilization and development within certain specified land use designations (including those of the Mission Village project site). This requirement may be modified if the Planning Director, in consultation with the County staff biologist, determines that a smaller buffer would adequately protect the riparian resources within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, or that a 100-foot-wide setback is infeasible for physical infrastructure planning. Again, these buffer criteria are consistent with the Buffer Study and CDFG recommendations.

Significant impacts associated with the Specific Plan would occur with respect to the loss of mulefat scrub, coast live oak woodland, coastal sage scrub, Mexican elderberry scrub, southern willow scrub, southern cottonwood willow riparian forest, great basin scrub, scalebroom scrub, valley freshwater marsh, wildlife habitat, special-status bird nests, special-status plant species, protected oaks, special-status wildlife species, and CDFG and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) jurisdictional resources. Significant indirect impacts would occur with respect to increased light and glare, increased non-native plant species, and increased human and domestic animal presence.

The direct and indirect impacts associated with development and operation of the Mission Village project are consistent with the findings of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR (March 1999)[2] and Revised Additional Analysis (May 2003).[3] Implementation of the mitigation measures required by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR and the Specific Plan Resource Management Plan ("RMP"), as well as the additional mitigation measures required by this EIR, would mitigate project-specific impacts to less-than-significant levels. Due to the incorporation of additional mitigation measures required by this EIR, those project-level significant unavoidable impacts identified in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR (i.e.,

---

[2] County of Los Angeles, *Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant* (1999).

[3] Impact Sciences, Inc., Revised Additional Analysis to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant Final Program EIR, Volume VIII (2003).

loss of sensitive animal species, coastal sage scrub, and wildlife habitat, and the increase in human and domestic animal presence) would be mitigated to less than significant.

3.3.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant biota impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.3.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.6-1 The restoration mitigation areas located within the River Corridor SMA shall be in areas that have been disturbed by previous uses or activities. Mitigation shall be conducted only on sites where soils, hydrology, and microclimate conditions are suitable for riparian habitat. First priority will be given to those restorable areas that occur adjacent to existing patches (areas) of native habitat that support sensitive species, particularly Endangered or Threatened species. The goal is to increase habitat patch size and connectivity with other existing habitat patches while restoring habitat values that will benefit sensitive species.

SP 4.6-2 A qualified biologist shall prepare or review revegetation plans. The biologist shall also monitor the restoration effort from its inception through the establishment phase.

SP 4.6-3 Revegetation Plans may be prepared as part of a California Department of Fish and Game 1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement and/or an U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit, and shall include:

- Input from both the Project proponent and resource agencies to assure that the Project objectives applicable to the River Corridor SMA and the criteria of this RMP are met.

- The identification of restoration/mitigation sites to be used. This effort shall involve an analysis of the suitability of potential sites to support the desired habitat, including a description of the existing conditions at the site(s) and such base line data information deemed necessary by the permitting agency.

SP 4.6-4 The revegetation effort shall involve an analysis of the site conditions such as soils and hydrology so that site preparation needs can be evaluated. The revegetation plan shall include the details and procedures required to prepare the restoration site for planting (i.e., grading, soil preparation, soil stockpiling, soil amendments, etc.), including the need for a supplemental irrigation system, if any.

SP 4.6-5 Restoration of riparian habitats within the River Corridor SMA shall use plant species native to the Santa Clara River. Cuttings or seeds of native plants shall be gathered within the River Corridor SMA or purchased from nurseries with local supplies to provide good genetic stock for the replacement habitats. Plant species

used in the restoration of riparian habitat shall be listed on the approved project plant palette (Specific Plan Table 2.6-1, Recommended Plant Species for Habitat Restoration in the River Corridor SMA) or as approved by the permitting state and federal agencies.

SP 4.6-6 The final revegetation plans shall include notes that outline the methods and procedures for the installation of the plant materials. Plant protection measures identified by the project biologist shall be incorporated into the planting design/layout.

SP 4.6-7 The revegetation plan shall include guidelines for the maintenance of the mitigation site during the establishment phase of the plantings. The maintenance program shall contain guidelines for the control of non-native plant species, the maintenance of the irrigation system, and the replacement of plant species.

SP 4.6-8 The revegetation plan shall provide for monitoring to evaluate the growth of the developing habitat. Specific performance goals for the restored habitat shall be defined by qualitative and quantitative characteristics of similar habitats on the river (e.g., density, cover, species composition, structural development). The monitoring effort shall include an evaluation of not only the plant material installed, but the use of the site by wildlife. The length of the monitoring period shall be determined by the permitting State and/or Federal agency.

SP 4.6-9 Monitoring reports for the mitigation site shall be reviewed by the permitting State and/or Federal agency.

SP 4.6-10 Contingency plans and appropriate remedial measures shall also be outlined in the revegetation plan.

SP 4.6-11 Habitat enhancement as referred to in this document means the rehabilitation of areas of native habitat that have been moderately disturbed by past activities (e.g., grazing, roads, oil and natural gas operations, etc.) or have been invaded by non-native plant species such as giant cane (*Arundo donax*) and tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.).

SP 4.6-12 Removal of grazing is an important means of enhancement of habitat values. Without ongoing disturbance from cattle, many riparian areas will recover naturally. Grazing except as permitted as a long-term resource management activity will be removed from the River Corridor SMA pursuant to the Long-Term Management Plan set forth in Section 4.6 of the Specific Plan EIR.

SP 4.6-13 To provide guidelines for the installation of supplemental plantings of native species within enhancement areas, a revegetation plan shall be prepared prior to implementation of mitigation (see guidelines for revegetation plans above). These supplemental plantings will be composed of plant species similar to those growing in the existing habitat patch (see Specific Plan Table 2.6-1).

SP 4.6-14 Not all enhancement areas will necessarily require supplemental plantings of native species. Some areas may support conditions conducive for rapid "natural" reestablishment of native species. The revegetation plan may incorporate means of enhancement to areas of compacted soils, poor soil fertility, trash or flood debris, and roads as a way of enhancing riparian habitat values.

SP 4.6-15 Removal of non-native species such as giant cane (*Arundo donax*), salt cedar or tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.), tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*), castor bean (*Ricans communis*), if included in a revegetation plan to mitigate impacts, shall be subject to the following standards:

- First priority shall be given to those habitat patches that support or have a high potential for supporting sensitive species, particularly Endangered or Threatened species.

- All non-native species removals shall be conducted according to a resource agency approved exotics removal program.

- Removal of non-native species in patches of native habitat shall be conducted in such a way as to minimize impacts to the existing native riparian plant species.

SP 4.6-16 Mitigation banking activities for riparian habitats will be subject to State and Federal regulations and permits. Mitigation banking for oak resources shall be conducted pursuant to the Oak Resources Replacement Program. Mitigation banking for elderberry scrub shall be subject to approval of plans by the County Forester.

SP 4.6-17 Access to the River Corridor SMA for hiking and biking shall be limited to the river trail system (including the Regional River Trail and various Local Trails) as set forth in this Specific Plan.

- The River trail system shall be designed to avoid impacts to existing native riparian habitat, especially habitat areas known to support sensitive species. Where impacts to riparian habitat are unavoidable, disturbance shall be minimized and mitigated as outlined above under Mitigation Measures SP 4.6-1 through SP 4.6-8.

- Access to the River Corridor SMA will be limited to daytime use of the designated trail system.

- Signs indicating that no pets of any kind will be allowed within the River Corridor SMA, with the exception that equestrian use is permitted on established trails, shall be posted along the River Corridor SMA.

- No hunting, fishing, or motor or off-trail bike riding shall be permitted.

- The trail system shall be designed and constructed to minimize impacts on native habitats.

SP 4.6-18 Where development lies adjacent to the boundary of the River Corridor SMA a transition area shall be designed to lessen the impact of the development on the conserved area. Transition areas may be comprised of Open Area, natural or revegetated manufactured slopes, other planted areas, bank areas, and trails. Exhibits 2.6-4, 2.6-5, and 2.6-6 indicate the relationship between the River Corridor SMA and the development (disturbed) areas of the Specific Plan. The SMAs and the Open Area as well as the undisturbed portions of the development areas are shown in green. As indicated on the exhibits, on the south side of the river the River Corridor SMA is separated from development by the river bluffs, except in one location. The Regional River Trail will serve as transition area on the north side of the river where development areas adjoin the River Corridor SMA (excluding Travel Village).

SP 4.6-19 The following are the standards for design of transition areas:

- In all locations where there is no steep grade separation between the River Corridor SMA and development, a trail shall be provided along this edge.

- Native riparian plants shall be incorporated into the landscaping of the transition areas between the River Corridor SMA and adjacent development areas where feasible for their long-term survival. Plants used in these areas shall be those listed on the approved plant palette (Specific Plan Table 2.6-2 of the Resource Management Plan [Recommended Plants for Transition Areas Adjacent to the River Corridor SMA]).

- Roads and bridges that cross the River Corridor SMA shall have adequate barriers at their perimeters to discourage access to the River Corridor SMA adjacent to the structures.

- Where bank stabilization is required to protect development areas, it shall be composed of ungrouted rock, or buried bank stabilization as described in Section 2.5.2.a, except at bridge crossings and other locations where public health and safety requirements necessitate concrete or other bank protection.

- A minimum 100-foot-wide buffer adjacent to the Santa Clara River should be required between the top river side of bank stabilization and development within the Land Use Designations Residential Low Medium, Residential Medium, Mixed-Use and Business Park unless, through Planning Director review in consultation with the staff biologist, it is determined that a lesser buffer would adequately protect the riparian resources within the River Corridor, or that a 100-foot-wide buffer is infeasible for physical infrastructure planning. The buffer area may be used for public infrastructure, such as flood control access; sewer, water,

and utility easements; abutments; trails and parks, subject to findings of consistency with the Specific Plan and applicable County policies.

SP 4.6-20 The following guidelines shall be followed during any grading activities that take place within the River Corridor SMA:

- Grading perimeters shall be clearly marked and inspected by the project biologist prior to grading occurring within or immediately adjacent to the River Corridor SMA.

- The project biologist shall work with the grading contractor to avoid inadvertent impacts to riparian resources.

SP 4.6-21 Upon final approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Special Management Area designation for the River Corridor SMA shall become effective. The permitted uses and development standards for the SMA are governed by the Development Regulations, Chapter 3 of the Specific Plan.

SP 4.6-22 Upon completion of development of all land uses, utilities, roads, flood control improvements, bridges, trails, and other improvements necessary for implementation of the Specific Plan within the River Corridor in each subdivision allowing construction within or adjacent to the River Corridor, a permanent, non-revocable *conservation and public access easement* shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.6-23, below, over the portion of the River Corridor SMA within that subdivision.

SP 4.6-23 The River Corridor SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles prior to the transfer of the River Corridor SMA ownership, or portion thereof to the management entity described in Mitigation Measure 4.6-26, below.

SP 4.6-24 The River Corridor SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* shall prohibit grazing, except as a long-term resource management activity, and agriculture within the River Corridor and shall restrict recreation use to the established trail system.

Agricultural land uses and grazing for purposes other than long-term resource management activities within the River Corridor shall be extended in the event of the filing of any legal action against Los Angeles County challenging final approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and any related project approvals or certification of the Final EIR for Newhall Ranch. Agricultural land uses and grazing for purposes other than long-term resource management activities within the River Corridor shall be extended by the time period between the filing of any such legal action and the entry of a final judgment by a court with appropriate jurisdiction, after exhausting all rights of appeal, or execution of a final settlement agreement between all parties to the legal action, whichever occurs first.

SP 4.6-25 The River Corridor SMA conservation and public access easement shall be consistent in its provisions with any other conservation easements to state or federal resource agencies which may have been granted as part of mitigation or mitigation banking activities.

SP 4.6-26 Prior to the recordation of the River Corridor SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* as specified in Mitigation Measure 4.6-23, above, the land owner shall provide a plan to the County for the permanent ownership and management of the River Corridor SMA, including any necessary financing. This plan shall include the transfer of ownership of the River Corridor SMA to the Center for Natural Lands Management, or if the Center for Natural Lands Management is declared bankrupt or dissolved, ownership will transfer or revert to a *joint powers authority* consisting of Los Angeles County (4 members), the City of Santa Clarita (2 members), and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (2 members).

SP 4.6-26a Two types of habitat restoration may occur in the High Country SMA: (1) riparian revegetation activities principally in Salt Creek Canyon; and (2) oak tree replacement in, or adjacent to, existing oak woodlands and savannahs.

- Mitigation requirements for riparian revegetation activities within the High Country SMA are the same as those for the River Corridor SMA and are set forth in Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-11 and 4.6-13 through 4.6-16, above.

- Mitigation requirements for oak tree replacement are set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.6-48, below.

SP 4.6-27 Removal of grazing from the High Country SMA except for those grazing activities associated with long-term resource management programs, is a principal means of enhancing habitat values in the creeks, brushland, and woodland areas of the SMA. The removal of grazing in the High Country SMA is discussed below under (b)4 Long Term Management. All enhancement activities for riparian habitat within the High Country SMA shall be governed by the same provisions as set forth for enhancement in the River Corridor SMA. Specific Plan Table 2.6-3 of the Resource Management Plan provides a list of appropriate plant species for use in enhancement areas in the High Country SMA.

(Specific Plan mitigation measures SP 4.6-28 through SP 4.6-33 are not applicable to the Mission Village project.)

SP 4.6-34 Grading perimeters shall be clearly marked and inspected by the project biologist prior to impacts occurring within or adjacent to the High Country SMA.

SP 4.6-35 The project biologist shall work with the grading contractor to avoid inadvertent impacts to biological resources outside of the grading area.

SP 4.6-36 Not applicable.

SP 4.6-37 The High Country SMA shall be offered for dedication in three approximately equal phases of approximately 1,400 acres each proceeding from north to south, as follows:

1. The first offer of dedication will take place with the issuance of the 2,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch;

2. The second offer of dedication will take place with the issuance of the 6,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch; and

3. The remaining offer of dedication will be completed by the 11,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch.

4. The Specific Plan applicant shall provide a quarterly report to the Departments of Public Works and Regional Planning, which indicates the number of residential building permits issued in the Specific Plan area by subdivision map number.

SP 4.6-38 Prior to dedication of the High Country SMA, a *conservation and public access easement* shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles and a conservation and management easement offered to the Center for Natural Lands Management. The High Country SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* shall be consistent in its provisions with any other *conservation easement*s to state or federal resource agencies, which may have been granted as part of mitigation or mitigation banking activities.

SP 4.6-39 The High Country SMA conservation and public access easement shall prohibit grazing within the High Country, except for those grazing activities associated with the long-term resource management programs, and shall restrict recreation to the established trail system.

SP 4.6-40 The High Country SMA conservation and public access easement shall be consistent in its provisions with any other conservation easements to state or federal resource agencies which may have been granted as part of mitigation or mitigation banking activities.

SP 4.6-41 The High Country SMA shall be offered for dedication in fee to a *joint powers authority* consisting of Los Angeles County (4 members), the City of Santa Clarita (2 members), and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (2 members). The *joint powers authority* will have overall responsibility for recreation within and conservation of the High Country.

SP 4.6-42 An appropriate type of service or assessment district shall be formed under the authority of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for the collection of up to $24 per single family detached dwelling unit per year and $15 per single family attached dwelling unit per year, excluding any units designated as Low and Very Low affordable housing units pursuant to Section 3.10, Affordable Housing Program of the Specific Plan. This revenue would be assessed to the homeowner

beginning with the occupancy of each dwelling unit and distributed to the *joint powers authority* for the purposes of recreation, maintenance, construction, conservation and related activities within the *High Country Special Management Area*.

SP 4.6-43 Suitable portions of *Open Area* may be used for mitigation of riparian, *oak resources*, or elderberry scrub. Mitigation activities within *Open Area* shall be subject to the following requirements, as applicable.

- River Corridor SMA Mitigation Requirements, including: Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-11 and 4.6-13 through 4.6-16; and
- High Country SMA Mitigation Requirements, including: Mitigation Measures 4.6-27, 4.6-29 through 4.6-42, and
- Mitigation Banking — Mitigation Measure 4.6-16.

SP 4.6-44 Drainages with flows greater than 2,000 cfs will have soft bottoms. Bank protection will be of ungrouted rock, or buried bank stabilization as described in Section 2.5.2.a, except at bridge crossings and other areas where public health and safety considerations require concrete or other stabilization.

SP 4.6-45 The precise alignments and widths of major drainages will be established through the preparation of drainage studies to be approved by the County at the time of subdivision maps which permit construction.

SP 4.6-46 While Open Area is generally intended to remain in a natural state, some grading may take place, especially for parks, major drainages, trails, and roadways. Trails are also planned to be within Open Area.

SP 4.6-47 At the time that final subdivision maps permitting construction are recorded, the *Open Area* within the map will be offered for dedication to the Center for Natural Lands Management. Community Parks within *Open Area* are intended to be public parks. Prior to the offer of dedication of *Open Area* to the Center for Natural Lands Management, all necessary *conservation and public access easements*, as well as easements for infrastructure shall be offered to the County.

SP 4.6-47a Mitigation Banking will be permitted within the River Corridor SMA, the High Country SMA, and the *Open Area land use designations*, subject to the following requirements:

- Mitigation banking activities for riparian habitats will be subject to state and federal regulations, and shall be conducted pursuant to the mitigation requirements set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 through 4.6-15 above.
- Mitigation banking for oak resources shall be conducted pursuant to 4.6-48, below.

- Mitigation banking for elderberry scrub shall be subject to approval of plans by the County Forester.

SP 4.6-48 Standards for the restoration and enhancement of oak resources within the High Country SMA and the Open Area include the following (oak resources include oak trees of the sizes regulated under the County Oak Tree Ordinance, Southern California black walnut trees, and mainland cherry trees/shrubs):

- To mitigate the impacts to oak resources that may be removed as development occurs in the Specific Plan Area, replacement trees shall be planted in conformance with the oak tree ordinance in effect at that time.

- Oak resource species obtained from the local gene pool shall be used in restoration or enhancement.

- Prior to recordation of construction-level final subdivision maps, an oak resource replacement plan shall be prepared that provides the guidelines for the oak tree planting and/or replanting. The Plan shall be reviewed by the Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning and the County Forester and shall include the following: site selection and preparation, selection of proper species including sizes and planting densities, protection from herbivores, site maintenance, performance standards, remedial actions, and a monitoring program.

- All plans and specifications shall follow County oak tree guidelines, as specified in the County Oak Tree Ordinance.

SP 4.6-49 To minimize the potential exposure of the development areas, Open Area, and the SMAs to fire hazards, the Specific Plan is subject to the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Protection District (LACFPD), which provides fire protection for the area. At the time of final subdivision maps permitting construction in development areas that are adjacent to Open Area and the High Country SMA, a wildfire fuel modification plan shall be prepared in accordance with the fuel modification ordinance standards in effect at that time and shall be submitted for approval to the County Fire Department.

SP 4.6-50 The wildfire fuel modification plan shall depict a fuel modification zone the size of which shall be consistent with the County fuel modification ordinance requirements. Within the zone, tree pruning, removal of dead plant material and weed and grass cutting shall take place as required by the fuel modification ordinance.

SP 4.6-51 In order to enhance the habitat value of plant communities that require fuel modification, fire retardant plant species containing habitat value may be planted within the fuel modification zone. Typical plant species suitable for Fuel Modification Zones are indicated in Specific Plan Table 2.6-5 of the Resource Management Plan. Fuel modification zones adjacent to SMAs and Open Areas

containing habitat of high value such as oak woodland and savannas shall utilize a more restrictive plant list, which shall be reviewed by the County Forester.

SP 4.6-52 The wildfire fuel modification plan shall include the following construction period requirements: (a) a fire watch during welding operations; (b) spark arresters on all equipment or vehicles operating in a high fire hazard area; (c) designated smoking and non-smoking areas; and (d) water availability pursuant to the County Fire Department requirements.

SP 4.6-53 If, at the time any subdivision map proposing construction is submitted, the County determines through an Initial Study, or otherwise, that there may be Rare, Threatened or Endangered, plant or animal species on the property to be subdivided, then, in addition to the prior surveys conducted on the Specific Plan site to define the presence or absence of sensitive habitat and associated species, current, updated site-specific surveys for all such animal or plant species shall be conducted in accordance with the consultation requirements set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.6-59 within those areas of the Specific Plan where such animal or plant species occur or are likely to occur.

The site-specific surveys shall include the unarmored three-spine stickleback, the arroyo toad, the Southwestern pond turtle, the California red-legged frog, the southwestern willow flycatcher, the least Bell's vireo, the San Fernando Valley spineflower and any other Rare, Sensitive, Threatened, or Endangered plant or animal species occurring, or likely to occur, on the property to be subdivided. All site-specific surveys shall be conducted during appropriate seasons by qualified botanists or qualified wildlife biologists in a manner that will locate any Rare, Sensitive, Threatened, or Endangered animal or plant species that may be present. To the extent there are applicable protocols published by either the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or the California Department of Fish and Game, all such protocols shall be followed in preparing the updated site-specific surveys.

All site-specific survey work shall be documented in a separate report containing at least the following information: (a) project description, including a detailed map of the project location and study area; (b) a description of the biological setting, including references to the nomenclature used and updated vegetation mapping; (c) detailed description of survey methodologies; (d) dates of field surveys and total person-hours spent on the field surveys; (e) results of field surveys, including detailed maps and location data; (f) an assessment of potential impacts; (g) discussion of the significance of the Rare, Threatened or Endangered animal or plant populations found in the project area, with consideration given to nearby populations and species distribution; (h) mitigation measures, including avoiding impacts altogether, minimizing or reducing impacts, rectifying or reducing impacts through habitat restoration, replacement or enhancement, or compensating for impacts by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments, consistent with CEQA (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15370); (i) references cited and persons contacted; and (j) other pertinent information, which is designed to disclose impacts and mitigate for such impacts."

SP 4.6-54 Prior to development within or disturbance to occupied unarmored threespine stickleback habitat, a formal consultation with the USFWS shall occur.

SP 4.6-55 Prior to development or disturbance within wetlands or other sensitive habitats, permits shall be obtained from pertinent federal and state agencies and the Specific Plan shall conform to the specific provisions of said permits. Performance criteria shall include that described in Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-16 and 4.6-42 through 4.6-47 for wetlands, and Mitigation Measures 4.6-27, 4.6-28, and 4.6-42 through 4.6-48 for other sensitive habitats.

SP 4.6-56 All lighting along the perimeter of natural areas shall be downcast luminaries with light patterns directed away from natural areas.

SP 4.6-57 Where bridge construction is proposed and water flow would be diverted, blocking nets and seines shall be used to control and remove fish from the area of activity. All fish captured during this operation would be stored in tubs and returned unharmed back to the river after construction activities were complete.

SP 4.6-58 To limit impacts to water quality the Specific Plan shall conform with all provisions of required NPDES permits and water quality permits that would be required by the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

SP 4.6-59 Consultation shall occur with the County of Los Angeles (County) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) at each of the following milestones:

1. Before Surveys. Prior to conducting sensitive plant or animal surveys at the Newhall Ranch subdivision map level, the applicant, or its designee, shall consult with the County and CDFG for purposes of establishing and/or confirming the appropriate survey methodology to be used.

2. After Surveys. After completion of sensitive plant or animal surveys at the subdivision map level, draft survey results shall be made available to the County and CDFG within sixty (60) calendar days after completion of the field survey work.

3. Subdivision Map Submittal. Within thirty (30) calendar days after the applicant, or its designee, submits its application to the County for processing of a subdivision map in the Mesas Village or Riverwood Village, a copy of the submittal shall be provided to CDFG. In addition, the applicant, or its designee, shall schedule a consultation meeting with the County and CDFG for purposes of obtaining comments and input on the proposed subdivision map submittal. The consultation meeting shall take place at least thirty (30) days prior to the submittal of the proposed subdivision map to the County.

4. Development/Disturbance and Further Mitigation. Prior to any development within, or disturbance to, habitat occupied by Rare, Threatened, or Endangered plant or animal species, or to any portion of

the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay, as defined below, all required permits shall be obtained from both USFWS and CDFG, as applicable. It is further anticipated that the Federal and State permits will impose conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law that are beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Final EIR (March 1999), the Newhall Ranch DAA (April 2001) and the Newhall Ranch Revised DAA (2002). It is also anticipated that conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law for project-related impacts on Endangered, Rare or Threatened species and their habitat will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns, and techniques associated with project-specific grading at the subdivision map level.

SP 4.6-60 If at the time subdivisions permitting construction are processed, the County determines through an Initial Study that there may be elderberry scrub vegetation on the property being subdivided, then a site-specific survey shall be conducted to define the presence or absence of such habitat and any necessary mitigation measures shall be determined and applied.

SP 4.6-61 Not Applicable.

SP 4.6-62 Not Applicable.

SP 4.6-63 Riparian resources that are impacted by buildout of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall be restored with similar habitat at the rate of 1 acre replaced for each acre lost.

SP 4.6-64 Not Applicable.

SP 4.6-65 In order to facilitate the conservation of the spineflower on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site, the applicant, or its designee, shall, concurrent with Specific Plan approval, agree to the identified special study areas shown below in Figure 2.6-8, Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay. The applicant, or its designee, further acknowledges that, within and around the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay (Figure 2.6-8), changes will likely occur to Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns and techniques associated with project-specific grading at the subdivision map level. The applicant, or its designee, shall design subdivision maps that are responsive to the characteristics of the spineflower and all other Endangered plant species that may be found on the Specific Plan site.

SP 4.6-66 Direct impacts to known spineflower populations within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area shall be avoided or minimized through the establishment of one or more on-site preserves that are configured to ensure the continued existence of the species in perpetuity. Preserve(s) shall be delineated in consultation with the County and CDFG, and will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan

development footprints for lands within and around the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay (Figure 2.6-8).

Delineation of the boundaries of Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) for the entire Specific Plan area shall be completed in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesas Village, or that portion of Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower population occurs.

A sufficient number of known spineflower populations shall be included within the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) in order to ensure the continued existence of the species in perpetuity. The conservation of known spineflower populations shall be established in consultation with the County and CDFG, and as consistent with standards governing issuance of an incidental take permit for spineflower pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2081, subdivision (b).

In addition to conservation of known populations, spineflower shall be introduced in appropriate habitat and soils in the Newhall Ranch preserve(s). The creation of introduced populations shall require seed collection and/or top soil at impacted spineflower locations and nursery propagation to increase seed and sowing of seed. The seed collection activities, and the maintenance of the bulk seed repository, shall be approved in advance by the County and CDFG.

Once the boundaries of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) are delineated, the project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for conducting a spineflower population census within the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) annually for 10 years. (These census surveys shall be in addition to the surveys required by Mitigation Measure 4.6-53, above.) The yearly spineflower population census documentation shall be submitted to the County and CDFG, and maintained by the project applicant, or its designee. If there are any persistent population declines documented in the annual population census reports, the project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for conducting an assessment of the ecological factor(s) that are likely responsible for the decline, and implement management activity or activities to address these factors where feasible. In no event, however, shall project-related activities jeopardize the continued existence of the Newhall Ranch spineflower populations. If a persistent population decline is documented, such as a trend in steady population decline that persists for a period of 5 consecutive years, or a substantial drop in population is detected over a 10-year period, spineflower may be introduced in consultation with CDFG in appropriate habitat and soils in the Newhall Ranch preserve(s), utilizing the bulk spineflower seed repository, together with other required management activity or activities. These activities shall be undertaken by a qualified botanist/biologist, subject to approval by the County and CDFG. The project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for the funding and implementation of the necessary management activity or activities, including monitoring, as approved by the County and CDFG.

Annual viability reports shall be submitted to the County and CDFG for 10 years following delineation of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) to ensure long-term documentation of the spineflower population status within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s). In the event annual status reports indicate the spineflower population within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) is not stable and viable 10 years following delineation of the spineflower preserve(s), the project applicant, or its designee, shall continue to submit annual status reports to the County and CDFG for a period of no less than an additional five years.

SP 4.6-67 Indirect impacts associated with the interface between the preserved spineflower populations and planned development within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall be avoided or minimized by establishing open space connections with Open Area, River Corridor, or High Country land use designations. In addition, buffers (i.e., setbacks from developed, landscaped, or other use areas) shall be established around portions of the delineated preserve(s) not connected to Open Area, the River Corridor or the High Country land use designations. The open space connections and buffer configurations shall take into account local hydrology, soils, existing and proposed adjacent land uses, the presence of non-native invasive plant species, and seed dispersal vectors.

Open space connections shall be configured such that the spineflower preserves are connected to Open Area, River Corridor, or High Country land use designations to the extent practicable. Open space connections shall be of adequate size and configuration to achieve a moderate to high likelihood of effectiveness in avoiding or minimizing indirect impacts (e.g., invasive plants, increased fire frequency, trampling, chemicals, etc.) to the spineflower preserve(s). Open space connections for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be configured in consultation with the County and CDFG. Open space connections for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be established for the entire Specific Plan area in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesa Village, or that portion of the Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs.

For preserves and/or those portions of preserves not connected to Open Area, River Corridor, or High Country land use designations, buffers shall be established at variable distances of between 80 and 200 feet from the edge of development to achieve a moderate to high likelihood of effectiveness in avoiding or minimizing indirect impacts (e.g., invasive plants, increased fire frequency, trampling, chemicals, etc.) to the spineflower preserve(s). The buffer size/configuration shall be guided by the analysis set forth in the "*Review of Potential Edge Effects on the San Fernando Valley Spineflower*," prepared by Conservation Biology Institute, January 19, 2000, and other sources of scientific information and analysis, which are available at the time the preserve(s) and buffers are established. Buffers for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be configured in consultation with the County and CDFG for the entire Specific Plan area. Buffers for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be established in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesa

Village, or that portion of the Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs.

Roadways and road rights-of-way shall not be constructed in any spineflower preserve(s) and buffer locations on Newhall Ranch unless constructing the road(s) in such location is found to be the environmentally superior alternative in subsequently required tiered EIRs in connection with the Newhall Ranch subdivision map(s) process. No other development or disturbance of native habitat shall be allowed within the spineflower preserve(s) or buffer(s).

The project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for revegetating open space connections and buffer areas of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) to mitigate temporary impacts due to grading that will occur within portions of those open space connections and buffer areas. The impacted areas shall be reseeded with a native seed mix to prevent erosion, reduce the potential for invasive non-native plants, and maintain functioning habitat areas within the buffer area. Revegetation seed mix shall be reviewed and approved by the County and CDFG.

SP 4.6-68 To protect the preserved Newhall Ranch spineflower populations, and to further reduce potential direct impacts to such populations due to unrestricted access, the project applicant, or its designee, shall erect and maintain temporary orange fencing and prohibitive signage around the Newhall Ranch preserve(s), open space connections and buffer areas, which are adjacent to areas impacted by proposed development prior to and during all phases of construction. The areas behind the temporary fencing shall not be used for the storage of any equipment, materials, construction debris, or anything associated with construction activities.

Following the final phase of construction of any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s), the project applicant, or its designee, shall install and maintain permanent fencing along the subdivision tract bordering the preserve(s). Permanent signage shall be installed on the fencing along the preservation boundary to indicate that the fenced area is a biological preserve, which contains protected species and habitat, that access is restricted, and that trespassing and fuel modification are prohibited within the area. The permanent fencing shall be designed to allow wildlife movement.

The plans and specifications for the permanent fencing and signage shall be approved by the County and CDFG prior to the final phase of construction of any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to a Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s).

SP 4.6-69 Indirect impacts resulting from changes to hydrology (i.e., increased water runoff from surrounding development) at the interface between spineflower preserve(s) and planned development within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall be avoided or mitigated to below a level of significance.

Achievement of this standard will be met through the documented demonstration by the project applicant, or its designee, that the storm drain system achieves pre-development hydrological conditions for the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s). To document such a condition, the project applicant, or its designee, shall prepare a study of the pre- and post-development hydrology, in conjunction with Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to spineflower preserve(s). The study shall be used in the design and engineering of a storm drain system that achieves pre-development hydrological conditions. The study must conclude that proposed grade changes in development areas beyond the buffers will maintain pre-development hydrology conditions within the preserve(s). The study shall be approved by the Planning Director of the County, and the resulting conditions confirmed by CDFG.

The storm drain system for Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to any spineflower preserves must be approved by the County prior to the initiation of any grading activities.

SP 4.6-70 Consistent with the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay reflected in Mitigation Measure 4.6-65, direct impacts to known Newhall Ranch spineflower populations associated with proposed road construction or modifications to existing roadways shall be further assessed for proposed road construction at the Newhall Ranch subdivision map level, in conjunction with the tiered EIR required for each subdivision map. To avoid or substantially lessen direct impacts to known spineflower populations, Specific Plan roadways shall be redesigned or realigned, to the extent practicable, to achieve the spineflower preserve and connectivity/preserve design/buffer standards set forth in Mitigation Measures 4.6-66 and 4.6-67. The project applicant, or its designee, acknowledges that that road redesign and realignment is a feasible means to avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant impacts on the now known Newhall Ranch spineflower populations. Road redesign or alignments to be considered at the subdivision map level include:

(a) Commerce Center Drive;

(b) Magic Mountain Parkway;

(c) Chiquito Canyon Road;

(d) Long Canyon Road;

(e) San Martinez Grande Road;

(f) Potrero Valley Road;

(g) Valencia Boulevard; and

(h) Any other or additional roadways that have the potential to significantly impact known Newhall Ranch spineflower populations.

Roadways and road rights-of-way shall not be constructed in any spineflower preserve(s) and buffer locations on Newhall Ranch, unless constructing the road(s) in such location is found to be the environmentally superior alternative in subsequently required tiered EIRs in connection with the Newhall Ranch subdivision map(s) process.

SP 4.6-71 Consistent with the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay reflected in Mitigation Measure 4.6-65, direct impacts to known Newhall Ranch spineflower populations shall be further assessed at the Newhall Ranch subdivision map level, in conjunction with the required tiered EIR process. To avoid or substantially lessen impacts to known spineflower populations at the subdivision map level, the project applicant, or its designee, may be required to adjust Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns and techniques associated with project-specific grading to achieve the spineflower preserve and connectivity/preserve design/buffer standards set forth in Mitigation Measures 4.6-66 and 4.6-67 for all future Newhall Ranch subdivision maps that encompass identified spineflower populations.

SP 4.6-72 A Fire Management Plan shall be developed to avoid and minimize direct and indirect impacts to the spineflower, in accordance with the adopted Newhall Ranch Resource Management Plan (RMP), to protect and manage the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) and buffers.

The Fire Management Plan shall be completed by the project applicant, or its designee, in conjunction with approval of any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to a spineflower preserve.

The final Fire Management Plan shall be approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department through the processing of subdivision maps.

Under the final Fire Management Plan, limited fuel modification activities within the spineflower preserves will be restricted to selective thinning with hand tools to allow the maximum preservation of Newhall Ranch spineflower populations. No other fuel modification or clearance activities shall be allowed in the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s). Controlled burning may be allowed in the future within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) and buffers, provided that it is based upon a burn plan approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department and CDFG. The project applicant, or its designee, shall also be responsible for annual maintenance of fuel modification zones, including, but not limited to, removal of undesirable non-native plants, revegetation with acceptable locally indigenous plants and clearing of trash and other debris in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Fire Department.

SP 4.6-73 At the subdivision map level, the project applicant, or its designee, shall design and implement project-specific design measures to minimize changes in surface water flows to the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) for all Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to the preserve(s) and buffers, and avoid and minimize

indirect impacts to the spineflower. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for each such subdivision map, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit for approval to the County plans and specifications that ensure implementation of the following design measures:

(a) During construction activities, drainage ditches, piping or other approaches will be put in place to convey excess storm water and other surface water flows away from the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) and connectivity/preserve design/buffers, identified in Mitigation Measures 4.6-66 and 4.6-67;

(b) Final grading and drainage design will be developed that does not change the current surface and subsurface hydrological conditions within the preserve(s);

(c) French drains will be installed along the edge of any roadways and fill slopes that drain toward the preserve(s);

(d) Roadways will be constructed with slopes that convey water flows within the roadway easements and away from the preserve(s);

(e) Where manufactured slopes drain toward the preserve(s), a temporary irrigation system would be installed to the satisfaction of the County in order to establish the vegetation on the slope area(s). This system shall continue only until the slope vegetation is established and self sustaining;

(f) Underground utilities will not be located within or through the preserve(s). Drainage pipes installed within the preserve(s) away from spineflower populations to convey surface or subsurface water away from the populations will be aligned to avoid the preserve(s) to the maximum extent practicable; and

(g) Fencing or other structural type barriers that will be installed to reduce intrusion of people or domestic animals into the preserve(s) shall incorporate footing designs that minimize moisture collection.

SP 4.6-74 A knowledgeable, experienced botanist/biologist, subject to approval by the County and CDFG, shall be required to monitor the grading and fence/utility installation activities that involve earth movement adjacent to the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) to avoid the incidental take through direct impacts of conserved plant species, and to avoid disturbance of the preserve(s). The biological monitor will conduct biweekly inspections of the project site during such grading activities to ensure that the mitigation measures provided in the adopted Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (Biota section) are implemented and adhered to.

Monthly monitoring reports, as needed, shall be submitted to the County verifying compliance with the mitigation measures specified in the adopted Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (Biota section).

The biological monitor will have authority to immediately stop any such grading activity that is not in compliance with the adopted Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (Biota section), and to take reasonable steps to avoid the take of, and minimize the disturbance to, spineflower populations within the preserve(s).

SP 4.6-75 The following measures shall be implemented to avoid and minimize indirect impacts to Newhall Ranch spineflower populations during all phases of project construction:

(a) Water Control. Watering of the grading areas would be controlled to prevent discharge of construction water into the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) or on ground sloping toward the preserve(s). Prior to the initiation of grading operations, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit for approval to the County an irrigation plan describing watering control procedures necessary to prevent discharge of construction water into the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) and on ground sloping toward the preserve(s).

(b) Storm Water Flow Redirection. Diversion ditches would be constructed to redirect storm water flows from graded areas away from the Newhall Ranch preserve(s). To the extent practicable, grading of areas adjacent to the preserve(s) would be limited to spring and summer months (May through September) when the probability of rainfall is lower. Prior to the initiation of grading operations, the project applicant, or its designee, would submit for approval to the County a storm water flow redirection plan that demonstrates the flow of storm water away from the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s).

(c) Treatment of Exposed Graded Slopes. Graded slope areas would be trimmed and finished as grading proceeds. Slopes would be treated with soil stabilization measures to minimize erosion. Such measures may include seeding and planting, mulching, use of geotextiles and use of stabilization mats. Prior to the initiation of grading operations, the project applicant, or its designee, would submit for approval to the County the treatments to be applied to exposed graded slopes that would ensure minimization of erosion.

SP 4.6-76 In conjunction with submission of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map in either Mesas Village or that portion of Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs, the project applicant, or its designee, shall reassess project impacts, both direct and indirect, to the spineflower populations using subdivision mapping data, baseline data from the Newhall Ranch Final EIR

and data from the updated plant surveys (see, Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.6-53).

This reassessment shall take place during preparation of the required tiered EIR for each subdivision map. If the reassessment results in the identification of new or additional impacts to Newhall Ranch spineflower populations, which were not previously known or identified, the mitigation measures set forth in this program, or a Fish and Game Code Section 2081 permit(s) issued by CDFG, shall be required, along with any additional mitigation required at that time.

SP 4.6-77 Direct and indirect impacts to the preserved Newhall Ranch spineflower populations shall require a monitoring and management plan, subject to the approval of the County. The applicant shall consult with CDFG with respect to preparation of the Newhall Ranch spineflower monitoring/management plan. This plan shall be in place when the preserve(s) and connectivity/preserve design/buffers are established (see Mitigation Measures 4.6-66 and 4.6-67). The criteria set forth below shall be included in the plan.

Monitoring. The purpose of the monitoring component of the plan is to track the viability of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) and its populations, and to ensure compliance with the adopted Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (Biota section)

The monitoring component of the plan shall investigate and monitor factors such as population size, growth or decline, general condition, new impacts, changes in associated vegetation species, pollinators, seed dispersal vectors, and seasonal responses. Necessary management measures will be identified. The report results will be sent annually to the County, along with photo documentation of the assessed site conditions.

The project applicant, or its designee, shall contract with a qualified botanist/biologist, approved by the County, with the concurrence of CDFG, to conduct quantitative monitoring over the life of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The botanist/biologist shall have a minimum of three years experience with established monitoring techniques and familiarity with Southern California flora and target taxa. Field surveys of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) will be conducted each spring. Information to be obtained will include: (a) an estimate of the numbers of spineflowers in each population within the preserve(s); (b) a map of the extent of occupied habitat at each population; (c) establishment of photo monitoring points to aid in documenting long-term trends in habitat; (d) aerial photographs of the preserved areas at five-year intervals; (e) identification of significant impacts that may have occurred or problems that need attention, including invasive plant problems, weed problems and fencing or signage repair; and (f) overall compliance with the adopted mitigation measures.

For a period of three years from Specific Plan re-approval, all areas of potential habitat on the Newhall Ranch site will be surveyed annually in the spring with the

goal of identifying previously unrecorded spineflower populations. Because population size and distribution limits are known to vary depending on rainfall, annual surveys shall be conducted for those areas proposed for development in order to establish a database appropriate for analysis at the project-specific subdivision map level (rather than waiting to survey immediately prior to proceeding with the project-specific subdivision map process). In this way, survey results gathered over time (across years of varying rainfall) will provide information on ranges in population size and occupation. New populations, if they are found, will be mapped and assessed for inclusion in the preserve program to avoid impacts to the species.

Monitoring/Reporting. An annual report will be submitted to the County and CDFG by December 31st of each year. The report will include a description of the monitoring methods, an analysis of the findings, effectiveness of the mitigation program, site photographs, and adoptive management measures, based on the findings. Any significant adverse impacts, signage, fencing or compliance problems identified during monitoring visits will be reported to the County and CDFG for corrective action by the project applicant, or its designee.

Management. Based on the outcome of ongoing monitoring and additional project-specific surveys addressing the status and habitat requirements of the spineflower, active management of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) will be required in perpetuity. Active management activities will be triggered by a downward population decline over 5 consecutive years, or a substantial drop in population over a 10-year period following County re-approval of the Specific Plan. Examples of management issues that may need to be addressed in the future include, but are not limited to, control of exotic competitive non-native plant species, herbivory predation, weed control, periodic controlled burns, or fuel modification compliance.

After any population decline documented in the annual populations census following County re-approval of the Specific Plan, the project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for conducting an assessment of the ecological factor(s) that are likely responsible for the decline, and implement management activity or activities to address these factors where feasible. If a persistent population decline is documented, such as a trend in steady population decline persistent for a period of 5 consecutive years, or a substantial drop in population detected over a 10-year period, spineflower may be introduced in appropriate habitat and soils in the Newhall Ranch preserve(s), utilizing the bulk spineflower seed repository, together with other required management activity or activities. In connection with this monitoring component, the project applicant, or its designee, shall contract with a qualified botanist/biologist, approved by the County, to complete: (a) a study of the breeding and pollination biology of the spineflower, including investigation into seed physiology to assess parameters that may be important as management tools to guarantee self-sustainability of populations, which may otherwise have limited opportunity for germination; and (b) a population genetics study to document the genetic diversity of the Newhall Ranch

spineflower population. The criteria for these studies shall be to develop data to make the Newhall Ranch spineflower management program as effective as possible. These studies shall be subject to approval by the County's biologist, with the concurrence of CDFG. These activities shall be undertaken by a qualified botanist/biologist, subject to approval by the County with the concurrence of CDFG. The project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for the funding and implementation of the necessary management activity or activities, as approved by the County and CDFG.

The length of the active management components set forth above shall be governed by attainment of successful management criteria set forth in the plan rather than by a set number of years.

SP 4.6-78 To the extent project-related direct and indirect significant impacts on spineflower cannot be avoided or substantially lessened through establishment of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s), and other avoidance, minimization, or other compensatory mitigation measures, a translocation and reintroduction program may be implemented in consultation with CDFG to further mitigate such impacts. Direct impacts (i.e., take) to occupied spineflower areas shall be fully mitigated at a 4:1 ratio. Impacts to occupied spineflower areas caused by significant indirect effects shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio.

Introduction of new spineflower areas will be achieved through a combination of direct seeding and translocation of the existing soil seed bank that would be impacted by grading. Prior to any development within, or disturbance to, spineflower populations, on-site and off-site mitigation areas shall be identified and seed and top soil shall be collected. One-third of the collected seed shall be sent to the Rancho Santa Ana Botanical Garden for storage. One third of the seed shall be sent to the USDA National Seed Storage Lab in Fort Collins, Colorado for storage. One third shall be used for direct seeding of the on-site and off-site mitigation areas.

Direct seeding. Prior to the initiation of grading, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit to the County a program for the reintroduction of spineflower on Newhall Ranch. The reintroduction program shall include, among other information: (a) location map with scale; (b) size of each introduction polygon; (c) plans and specifications for site preparation, including selective clearing of competing vegetation; (d) site characteristics; (e) protocol for seed collection and application; and (f) monitoring and reporting. The program shall be submitted to CDFG for input and coordination. The project applicant, or its designee, shall implement the reintroduction program prior to the initiation of grading. At least two candidate spineflower reintroduction areas will be created within Newhall Ranch and one candidate spineflower reintroduction area will be identified off site. Both on-site and off-site reintroduction areas will be suitable for the spineflower in both plant community and soils, and be located within the historic range of the taxon. Success criteria shall be included in the

monitoring/management plan, with criteria for the germination, growth, and production of viable seeds of individual plants for a specified period.

Although the reintroduction program is experimental at this stage, the County considers such a program to be a feasible form of mitigation at this juncture based upon available studies. Botanists/biologists familiar with the ecology and biology of the spineflower would prepare and oversee the reintroduction program.

Translocation. Prior to the initiation of grading, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit to the County a translocation program for the spineflower. Translocation would salvage the topsoil of spineflower areas to be impacted due to grading. Salvaged spineflower soil seed bank would be translocated to the candidate spineflower reintroduction areas. The translocation program shall include, among other information: (a) location map with scale; (b) size of each translocation polygon; (c) plans and specifications for site preparation, including selective clearing of competing vegetation; (d) site characteristics; (e) protocol for topsoil collection and application; and (f) monitoring and reporting. The translocation program shall be submitted to CDFG for input and coordination. Translocation shall occur within the candidate spineflower reintroduction areas on site and off site. Successful criteria for each site shall be included in the monitoring/management plan/with criteria for the germination and growth to reproduction of individual plants for the first year a specified period.

Although the translocation program is experimental at this stage, the County considers such a program to be a feasible form of mitigation at this juncture based upon available studies. Botanists/biologists familiar with the ecology and biology of the spineflower would prepare and oversee the translocation program.

SP 4.6-79 Not applicable.

SP 4.6-80 Not applicable.

3.3.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's biota impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

MV 4.3-1 Temporary impacts from construction activities in the riverbed shall be restricted to the following areas of disturbance: (1) an 85-foot-wide zone that extends into the river from the base of the riprap or gunite bank protection where it intercepts the river bottom; (2) 100 feet on either side of the outer edge of a new bridge or bridge to be modified; (3) a 60-foot-wide corridor for utility lines; (4) 20-foot-wide temporary access ramps; and (5) 60-foot roadway width temporary construction haul routes. The locations of these temporary construction sites and the routes of all access roads shall be shown on maps submitted with the sub-notification letter submitted to the Corps and CDFG for individual project approval. Any variation from these limits shall be submitted, with a justification for a variation for Corps and CDFG approval. The construction plans should indicate what type of vegetation, if any, would be temporarily disturbed or

removed and the post-construction activities to facilitate revegetation of the temporarily impacted areas. The boundaries of the construction site and any temporary access roads within the riverbed shall be marked in the field with stakes and flagging. No construction activities, vehicular access, equipment storage, stockpiling, or significant human intrusion shall occur outside the work area and access roads.

MV 4.3-2 Prior to initiating construction for the installation of bridges, storm drain outlets, utility lines, bank protection, trails, and/or other construction activities that result in any disturbance to the banks or wetted channel, aquatic habitats within construction sites and access roads, as well as all aquatic habitats within 300 feet of construction sites and access roads, shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist for the presence of the unarmored threespine stickleback, arroyo chub, and Santa Ana sucker. The Corps and CDFG shall be notified at least 14 days prior to the survey and shall have the option of attending. The biologist shall file a written report of the survey with both agencies within 14 days of the survey and no later than 10 days prior to any construction work in the riverbed. If there is evidence that fish spawn has occurred in the survey area, then surveys shall cease unless otherwise authorized by USFWS. If surveys determine that gravid fish are present, that spawning has recently occurred, or that juvenile fish are present in the proposed construction areas, all activities within aquatic habitat will be suspended. Construction within aquatic habitats shall only occur when it is determined that juvenile fish are not present within the project area.

MV 4.3-3 Conduct focused surveys for California red-legged frogs. Prior to initiating construction for the installation of bridges, storm drain outlets, utility lines, bank protection, trails, and/or other construction activities, all construction sites and access roads within the riverbed as well as all riverbed areas within 1,000 feet of construction sites and access roads shall be surveyed at the appropriate season for California red-legged frogs. The applicant shall contract with a qualified biologist to conduct focused surveys for California red-legged frogs. If detected in or adjacent to the project area, no work will be authorized within 500 feet of occupied habitat until the applicant provides concurrence from the USFWS to CDFG and Corps. If present, the applicant shall implement measures required by the USFWS Biological Opinion for California red-legged frog that either supplement or supercede these measures. If present, the applicant shall develop and implement a monitoring plan that includes the following measures in consultation with the USFWS and CDFG.

1) The applicant shall retain a qualified biologist with demonstrated expertise with California red-legged frogs to monitor all construction activities in potential red-legged frog habitat and assist the applicant in the implementation of the monitoring program. This person will be approved by the USFWS prior to the onset of ground-disturbing activities. This biologist will be referred to as the authorized biologist hereafter. The authorized biologist will be present during all activities immediately

adjacent to or within habitat that supports populations of California red-legged frogs.

2) Prior to the onset of construction activities, the applicant shall provide all personnel who will be present on work areas within or adjacent to the project area the following information:

   a. A detailed description of the California red-legged frogs, including color photographs;

   b. The protection the California red-legged frog receives under the Endangered Species Act and possible legal action that may be incurred for violation of the Act;

   c. The protective measures being implemented to conserve the California red-legged frogs and other species during construction activities associated with the proposed project; and

   d. A point of contact if California red-legged frogs are observed.

3) All trash that may attract predators of the California red-legged frogs will be removed from work sites or completely secured at the end of each work day.

4) Prior to the onset of any construction activities, the applicant shall meet on site with staff from the USFWS and the authorized biologist. The applicant shall provide information on the general location of construction activities within habitat of the California red-legged frogs and the actions taken to reduce impacts to this species. Because California red-legged frogs may occur in various locations during different seasons of the year, the applicant, USFWS, and authorized biologist will, at this preliminary meeting, determine the seasons when specific construction activities would have the least adverse effect on California red-legged frogs. The goal of this effort is to reduce the level of mortality of California red-legged frogs during construction.

5) Work areas will be fenced in a manner that prevents equipment and vehicles from straying from the designated work area into adjacent habitat. The authorized biologist will assist in determining the boundaries of the area to be fenced in consultation with the USFWS/CDFG. All workers will be advised that equipment and vehicles must remain within the fenced work areas.

6) The authorized biologist will direct the installation of the fence and conduct a minimum of three nocturnal surveys to move any California red-legged frogs from within the fenced area to suitable habitat outside of the fence. If California red-legged frogs are observed on the final survey or during subsequent checks, the authorized biologist will conduct

additional nocturnal surveys if he or she determines that they are necessary in concurrence with the USFWS/CDFG.

7) Fencing to exclude California red-legged frogs will be at least 24 inches in height.

8) The type of fencing must be approved by the authorized biologist and the USFWS/CDFG.

9) Construction activities that may occur immediately adjacent to breeding pools or other areas where large numbers of California red-legged frogs may congregate will be conducted during times of the year (fall/winter) when individuals have dispersed from these areas. The authorized biologist will assist the applicant in scheduling its work activities accordingly.

10) If California red-legged frogs are found within an area that has been fenced to exclude California red-legged frogs, activities will cease until the authorized biologist moves the California red-legged frog(s).

11) If California red-legged frogs are found in a construction area where fencing was deemed unnecessary, work will cease until the authorized biologist moves the California red-legged frogs. The authorized biologist in consultation with USFWS/CDFG will then determine whether additional surveys or fencing are needed. Work may resume while this determination is being made, if deemed appropriate by the authorized biologist and USFWS.

12) Any California red-legged frogs found during clearance surveys or otherwise removed from work areas will be placed in nearby suitable, undisturbed habitat. The authorized biologist will determine the best location for their release, based on the condition of the vegetation, access to deep perennial pools, soil, and other habitat features and the proximity to human activities. Clearance surveys shall occur on a daily basis in the work area.

13) The authorized biologist will have the authority to stop all activities until appropriate corrective measures have been completed.

14) Staging areas for all construction activities will be located on previously disturbed upland areas, if possible, designated for this purpose. All staging areas will be fenced.

15) To ensure that diseases are not conveyed between work sites by the authorized biologist or his or her assistants, the fieldwork code of practice developed by the Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force (DAPTF 2009) will be followed at all times.

MV 4.3-4 Focused surveys for arroyo toad shall be conducted. Prior to initiating construction for the installation of bridges, storm drain outlets, utility lines, bank protection, trails, and/or other construction activities, all construction sites and access roads within the riverbed as well as all riverbed areas within 1,000 feet of construction sites and access roads shall be surveyed at the appropriate season for arroyo toad. The applicant shall contract with a qualified biologist to conduct focused surveys for arroyo toad. If detected in or adjacent to the project area, no work will be authorized within 500 feet of occupied habitat until the applicant provides concurrence from the USFWS to CDFG and the Corps. The applicant shall implement measures required by the USFWS Biological Opinion that either supplement or supercede these measures. If arroyo toads are determined to be present, the applicant shall develop and implement a monitoring plan that includes the following measures in consultation with the USFWS and CDFG:

1) The applicant shall retain a qualified biologist with demonstrated expertise with arroyo toads to monitor all construction activities in potential arroyo toad habitat and assist the applicant in the implementation of the monitoring program. This person will be approved by the USFWS prior to the onset of ground-disturbing activities. This biologist will be referred to as the authorized biologist hereafter. The authorized biologist will be present during all activities immediately adjacent to or within habitat that supports populations of arroyo toad.

2) Prior to the onset of construction activities, the applicant shall provide all personnel who will be present on work areas within or adjacent to the project area the following information:

   a. A detailed description of the arroyo toad, including color photographs;

   b. The protection the arroyo toad receives under the Endangered Species Act and possible legal action that may be incurred for violation of the Act;

   c. The protective measures being implemented to conserve the arroyo toad and other species during construction activities associated with the proposed project; and

   d. A point of contact if arroyo toads are observed.

3) All trash that may attract predators of the arroyo toad will be removed from work sites or completely secured at the end of each work day.

4) Prior to the onset of any construction activities, the applicant shall meet on site with staff from the USFWS and the authorized biologist. The applicant shall provide information on the general location of construction activities within habitat of the arroyo toad and the actions taken to reduce impacts to this species. Because arroyo toads may occur in various locations during different seasons of the year, the applicant, USFWS, and

authorized biologists will, at this preliminary meeting, determine the seasons when specific construction activities would have the least adverse effect on arroyo toads. The goal of this effort is to reduce the level of mortality of arroyo toads during construction. The parties realize that, if arroyo toads are present, complete prevention of all mortality is likely not possible because some arroyo toads may occur anywhere within suitable habitat during any given season; the detection of every individual over large areas is impossible because of the small size, fossorial habits, and cryptic coloration of the arroyo toad.

5) Where construction can occur in habitat where arroyo toads are widely distributed, work areas will be fenced in a manner that prevents equipment and vehicles from straying from the designated work area into adjacent habitat. The authorized biologist will assist in determining the boundaries of the area to be fenced in consultation with the USFWS/CDFG. All workers will be advised that equipment and vehicles must remain within the fenced work areas.

6) The authorized biologist will direct the installation of the fence and conduct a minimum of three nocturnal surveys to move any arroyo toads from within the fenced area to suitable habitat outside of the fence. If arroyo toads are observed on the final survey or during subsequent checks, the authorized biologist will conduct additional nocturnal surveys if he or she determines that they are necessary in concurrence with the USFWS/CDFG.

7) Fencing to exclude arroyo toads will be at least 24 inches in height.

8) The type of fencing must be approved by the authorized biologist and the USFWS/CDFG.

9) Construction activities that may occur immediately adjacent to breeding pools or other areas where large numbers of arroyo toads may congregate will be conducted during times of the year (fall/winter) when individuals have dispersed from these areas. The authorized biologist will assist the applicant in scheduling its work activities accordingly.

10) If arroyo toads are found within an area that has been fenced to exclude arroyo toads, activities will cease until the authorized biologist moves the arroyo toads.

11) If arroyo toads are found in a construction area where fencing was deemed unnecessary, work will cease until the authorized biologist moves the arroyo toads. The authorized biologist in consultation with USFWS/CDFG will then determine whether additional surveys or fencing are needed. Work may resume while this determination is being made, if deemed appropriate by the authorized biologist and USFWS.

12) Any arroyo toads found during clearance surveys or otherwise removed from work areas will be placed in nearby suitable, undisturbed habitat. The authorized biologist will determine the best location for their release, based on the condition of the vegetation, soil, and other habitat features and the proximity to human activities. Clearance surveys shall occur on a daily basis in the work area.

13) The authorized biologist will have the authority to stop all activities until appropriate corrective measures have been completed.

14) Staging areas for all construction activities will be located on previously disturbed upland areas designated for this purpose. All staging areas will be fenced within potential toad habitat.

15) To ensure that diseases are not conveyed between work sites by the authorized biologist or his or her assistants, the fieldwork code of practice developed by the Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force (DAPTF 2009) will be followed at all times.

16) Drift fence/pitfall trap surveys will be implemented in toad sensitive areas prior to construction in an effort to reduce potential mortality to this species. Prior to any construction activities in the project area, silt fence shall be installed completely around the proposed work area and a qualified biologist should conduct a preconstruction/clearance survey of the work area for arroyo toads. Any toads found in the work area should be relocated to suitable habitat. The silt fence shall be maintained for the duration of the work activity.

17) The applicant shall restrict work to daylight hours, except during an emergency, in order to avoid nighttime activities when arroyo toads may be present on the access road. Traffic speed should be maintained at 15 mph or less in the work area.

MV 4.3-5 Prior to initiating construction for the installation of bridges, storm drain outlets, utility lines, bank protection, trails, and/or other construction activities, all construction sites and access roads within the riverbed as well as all riverbed areas within 500 feet of construction sites and access roads shall be surveyed at the appropriate season for southwestern pond turtle. Focused surveys shall consist of a minimum of four daytime surveys, to be completed between April 1 and June 1. The survey schedule may be adjusted in consultation with CDFG to reflect the existing weather or stream conditions. The applicant shall develop a Plan to address the relocation of southwestern pond turtle. The Plan shall include but not be limited to the timing and location of the surveys that would be conducted for this species; identify the locations where more intensive efforts should be conducted; identify the habitat and conditions in the proposed relocation site(s); the methods that would be utilized for trapping and relocating individuals; and provide for the documentation/recordation of the numbers of animals relocated.

The Plan shall be submitted to CDFG for approval 60 days prior to any ground-disturbing activities within potentially occupied habitat.

If southwestern pond turtles are detected in or adjacent to the project, nesting surveys shall be conducted.

Focused surveys for evidence of southwestern pond turtle nesting shall be conducted in, or adjacent to, the project when suitable nesting habitat exists within 1,300 feet of occupied habitat in an area where project-related ground disturbance will occur (*e.g.*, development, ground disturbance). If both of those conditions are met, a qualified biologist shall conduct focused, systematic surveys for southwestern pond turtle nesting sites. The survey area shall include all suitable nesting habitat within 1,300 feet of occupied habitat in which project-related ground disturbance will occur. This area may be adjusted based on the existing topographical features on a case-by-case basis with the approval of CDFG. Surveys will entail searching for evidence of pond turtle nesting, including remnant eggshell fragments, which may be found on the ground following nest depredation.

If a southwestern pond turtle nesting area would be adversely impacted by construction activities, the applicant shall avoid the nesting area. If avoidance of the nesting area is determined to be infeasible, the authorized biologist shall coordinate with CDFG to identify if it is possible to relocate the pond turtles. Eggs or hatchlings shall not be moved without written authorization from CDFG.

The qualified biologist shall be present during all activities immediately adjacent to or within habitat that supports populations of southwestern pond turtle. Clearance surveys for pond turtles shall be conducted within 500 feet of potential habitat by the authorized biologist prior to the initiation of construction each day. The resume of the proposed biologist will be provided to CDFG for approval prior to conducting the surveys.

MV 4.3-6 Prior to initiating construction for the installation of bridges, storm drain outlets, utility lines, bank protection, trails, and/or other construction activities, all construction sites and access roads within the riverbed as well as all riverbed areas within 300 feet of construction sites and access roads shall be surveyed at the appropriate season for two-striped garter snake and south coast garter snake. Focused surveys shall consist of a minimum of four daytime surveys, to be completed between April 1 and September 1. The survey schedule may be adjusted in consultation with CDFG to reflect the existing weather or stream conditions. If located, the species will be relocated to suitable pre-approved locations identified in the two-striped garter snake and/or south coast garter snake Relocation Plan.

The applicant shall develop a Plan to address the relocation of two-striped garter snake and south coast garter snake. The Plan shall include but not be limited to the timing and location of the surveys that would be conducted for each species,

identify the locations where more intensive efforts should be conducted, identify the habitat and conditions in the proposed relocation site(s), identify the methods that would be utilized for trapping and relocating the individual species, and provide for the documentation/recordation of the species and number of animals relocated. The Plan shall be submitted to CDFG for approval 60 days prior to any ground-disturbing activities, within potentially occupied habitat.

The qualified biologist shall be present during all activities immediately adjacent to or within habitat that supports populations of two-striped garter snake and/or south coast garter snake. Clearance surveys for garter snakes shall be conducted within 200 feet of potential habitat by the authorized biologist prior to the initiation of construction each day. The resume of the proposed biologists will be provided to CDFG for approval prior to conducting the surveys.

MV 4.3-7 Prior to construction the applicant shall develop a relocation plan for coast horned lizard, silvery legless lizard, coastal western whiptail, rosy boa, San Bernardino ringneck snake, and coast patch-nosed snake. The Plan shall include but not be limited to the timing and location of the surveys that would be conducted for each species; identify the locations where more intensive efforts should be conducted; identify the habitat and conditions in the proposed relocation site(s); the methods that would be utilized for trapping and relocating the individual species; and provide for the documentation/recordation of the species and number of the animals relocated. The Plan shall be submitted to CDFG for approval 60 days prior to any ground disturbing activities within potentially occupied habitat.

The Plan shall include the specific survey and relocation efforts that would occur for construction activities that occur both during the activity period of the special status species (generally March to November) and for periods when the species may be present in the work area but difficult to detect due to weather conditions (generally December through February). Thirty days prior to construction activities in coastal scrub, chaparral, oak woodland, riparian habitats, or other areas supporting these species qualified biologists shall conduct surveys to capture and relocate individual coast horned lizard, silvery legless lizard, coastal western whiptail, rosy boa, San Bernardino ringneck snake, and coast patch-nosed snake in order to avoid or minimize take of these special-status species. The plan shall require a minimum of three (3) surveys conducted during the time of year/day when each species is most likely to be observed. Individuals shall be relocated to nearby undisturbed areas with suitable habitat. If construction is scheduled to occur during the low activity period (generally December through February) the surveys shall be conducted prior to this period if possible and exclusion fencing shall be placed to limit the potential for re-colonization of the site prior to construction. The qualified biologist will be present during ground-disturbing activities immediately adjacent to or within habitat that supports populations of these species. Clearance surveys for special-status reptiles shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to the initiation of construction each day.

Results of the surveys and relocation efforts shall be provided to CDFG in the annual mitigation status report. Collection and relocation of animals shall only occur with the proper scientific collection and handling permits.

MV 4.3-8 During any stream diversion or culvert installation activity, a qualified biologist(s) shall be present and shall patrol the areas within, upstream, and downstream of the work area. The biologists shall inspect the diversion and inspect for stranded fish or other aquatic organisms. Under no circumstances shall the unarmored threespine stickleback be collected or relocated, unless USFWS personnel or their agents implement this measure. Any event involving stranded fish shall be recorded and reported to CDFG and USFWS within 24 hours.

MV 4.3-9 Temporary bridges, culvert crossings, or other feasible methods of providing access across the river shall be constructed outside of the winter season and not during periods when spawning is occurring. Prior to the construction of any temporary or permanent crossing of the Santa Clara River, the applicant shall develop a Stream Crossing and Diversion Plan. The plan shall include the following elements: the timing and methods for pre-construction aquatic species surveys; a detailed description of the diversion methods (e.g., berms shall be constructed of on-site alluvium materials of low silt content, inflatable dams, sand bags, or other approved materials); special-status species relocation; fish exclusion techniques, including the use of block netting and fish relocation; methods to maintain fish passage during construction; channel habitat enhancement, including the placement of vegetation, rocks, and boulders to produce riffle habitat; fish stranding surveys; and the techniques for the removal of crossings prior to winter storm flows. The Plan shall be submitted to the USFWS and CDFG for approval at least 30 days prior to implementation.

If adult special-status fishes are present and spawning has not occurred, they shall be relocated prior to the diversion or crossing. Block nets of 0.125-inch woven mesh will be set upstream and downstream. On days with possible high temperature or low humidity (temperatures in excess of 80° F), work will be done in the early morning hours, as soon as sufficient light is available, to avoid exposing fishes to high temperatures and/or low humidity. If high temperatures are present, the fishes will be herded to downstream areas past the block net. Once the fishes have been excluded by herding, a USFWS staff member or his or her agents shall inspect the site for remaining or stranded fish. A USFWS staff member or his or her agents shall relocate the fish to suitable habitat outside the project area (including those areas potentially subject to high turbidity). During the diversion/relocation of fishes, the USFWS or his or her agents shall be present at all times.

MV 4.3-10 Installation of bridges, culverts, or other structures shall not impair the movement of fish and aquatic life. Bottoms of temporary culverts shall be placed at or below channel grade. Bottoms of permanent culverts shall be placed below channel grade. Culvert crossings shall include provisions for a low flow channel where velocities are less than 2 feet per second to allow fish passage.

MV 4.3-11 **a. Stream diversion bypass channels:**

Stream diversion bypass channels will be constructed when the active wetted channel is within the work zone. Diversion bypass channels will be built in accordance with MV 4.3-9 and in consultation with CDFG/USFWS. Equipment shall not be operated in areas of ponded or flowing water unless authorized by CDFG/USFWS.

The diversion channel shall be of a width and depth comparable to the natural river channel. In all cases where flowing water is diverted from a segment of the stream channel, the bypass channel will be constructed prior to the diversion of the active stream. The bypass channel will be constructed prior to diverting the stream, beginning in the downstream area and continuing in an upstream direction. Where feasible and in consultation with CDFG/USFWS, the configuration of the diversion channel will be curved (sinuous) with multiple sets of obstructions (*i.e.*, boulders, large logs, or other CDFG/USFWS-approved materials) placed in the channel at the point of each curve (*i.e.*, on alternating sides of the channel). If emergent aquatic vegetation is present in the original channel, the applicant will transplant suitable vegetation into the diversion channel and on the banks prior to or at the time of the water diversion. A qualified restoration ecologist will supervise the construction of the diversion channels on site. The integrity of the channel and diversion shall be maintained throughout the intended diversion period. Channel bank or barrier construction shall be adequate to prevent seepage into or from the work area.

Construction of diversion channels shall not occur if surveys determine that gravid fish are present, spawning has recently occurred, or juvenile fish are present in the proposed construction areas.

At the conclusion of the diversion, either at the commencement of the winter season, or the completion of construction, the applicant will coordinate with CDFG/USFWS to determine if the diversion should be left in place or the stream returned to the original channel. If CDFG/USFWS determine the stream should be diverted to the original channel, the original channel will be modified prior to re-diversion (*i.e.*, while dry) to construct curves (sinuosity) into that channel, including the placement of obstructions (*i.e.*, boulders, large logs, or other CDFG/USFWS-approved materials). The original channel will be replanted with emergent vegetation as the diversion channel was planted. If the diversion channel is abandoned, the boulders will remain in place.

b. Dewatering:

Construction dewatering in close proximity to stream flow shall implement the following:

Assess local stream and groundwater conditions, including flow depths, groundwater elevations, and anticipated dewatering cone of influence (radius of draw down).

Assess surface water elevations upstream, adjacent to, and downstream of the extraction points, to assess any critical flow regimes susceptible to excessive draw down and therefore fish stranding issues.

Assess surface water elevations downstream of the discharge locations (if discharge is proposed to the flowing stream) to assess any flow regimes and overbank areas that may be susceptible to flooding and therefore fish stranding at the cessation of discharge. Discharge locations shall also be assessed for potential channel bed erosion from dewatering discharge, and appropriate BMPs must be implemented to prevent excessive erosion or turbidity in the discharge

The information above shall be summarized and provided in a plan approved by CDFG and Corps.

Fish shall be excluded from any artificial flowing channels from dewatering discharge. Methods to ensure separation may include, but are not limited to: block netting at the confluence; creation of a physical drop greater than 4 inches at the confluence; or maintaining a velocity range unsuitable for fish passage, such as a berm at the confluence with small diameter pipes for discharge.

MV 4.3-12 Slow-moving water habitats shall be constructed upstream and downstream of any river crossing or bridge construction area to provide refuge for special-status fishes during construction. Where feasible and in consultation with CDFG and USFWS, the applicant shall enhance slow-moving water habitats for each linear foot disturbed by hand-excavating shallow side channels and placing multiple sets of obstructions (*e.g.*, boulders, large logs, or other CDFG- and USFWS-approved materials) in the channel.

MV 4.3-13 Water containing mud, silt, or other pollutants from construction activities shall not be allowed to enter a flowing stream or be placed in locations that may be subject to normal storm flows during periods when storm flows can reasonably be expected to occur.

MV 4.3-14 Thirty days prior to construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for mountain lion natal dens. The survey area shall include the construction footprint and the area within 2,000 feet of the project disturbance boundaries. Should an active natal den be located, the applicant shall cease work within 2,000 feet and inform CDFG within 24 hours. No construction activities shall occur in the 2,000-foot buffer until a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFG establishes an appropriate setback from the den that would not adversely affect the successful rearing of the cubs. No construction activities or human intrusion shall occur within the established setback until the cubs have been successfully reared or the cats have left the area.

MV 4.3-15 Within 30 days of ground-disturbing activities associated with construction or grading that would occur during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (typically March through August in the project region, or as determined by a qualified biologist), the applicant shall have weekly surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests of bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present in the disturbance zone or within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) of the disturbance zone. Pre-construction surveys shall include nighttime surveys to identify active rookery sites. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis, with the last survey being conducted no more than 7 days prior to initiation of disturbance work. If ground-disturbing activities are delayed, then additional pre-disturbance surveys shall be conducted such that no more than 7 days will have elapsed between the survey and ground-disturbing activities.

If active nests are found, clearing and construction within 300 feet of the nest (500 feet for raptors) shall be postponed or halted, at the discretion of the biologist in consultation with CDFG, until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. In the event that golden eagles establish an active nest in the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, the buffers will be established in consultation with CDFG. Potential golden eagle nesting will be reported to CDFG within 24 hours. Limits of construction to avoid an active nest shall be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or other appropriate barriers, and construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities will occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts to these nests occur. Results of the surveys shall be provided to CDFG in the annual mitigation status report.

For listed riparian songbirds (least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, yellow-billed cuckoo) USFWS protocol surveys shall be conducted. If active nests are found, clearing and construction within 300 feet of the nest shall be postponed or halted, at the discretion of the biologist in consultation with CDFG and USFWS, until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. If no active nests are observed, construction may proceed. If active nests are found, work may proceed provided that construction activity is located at least 300 feet from active nests (or as authorized through the context of the Biological Opinion and 2081b Incidental Take Permit). This buffer may be adjusted provided noise levels do not exceed 60 dB(A) hourly L_{eq} at the edge of the nest site as determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with a qualified acoustician.

If the noise meets or exceeds the 60 dB(A) L_{eq} threshold, or if the biologist determines that the construction activities are disturbing nesting activities, the biologist shall have the authority to halt the construction and shall devise methods to reduce the noise and/or disturbance in the vicinity. This may include methods such as, but not limited to, turning off vehicle engines and other equipment

whenever possible to reduce noise, installing a protective noise barrier between the nest site and the construction activities, and working in other areas until the young have fledged. If noise levels still exceed 60 dB(A) L_{eq} hourly at the edge of nesting territories and/or a no-construction buffer cannot be maintained, construction shall be deferred in that area until the nestlings have fledged. All active nests shall be monitored on a weekly basis until the nestlings fledge. The qualified biologist shall be responsible for documenting the results of the surveys and the ongoing monitoring and for reporting these results to CDFG and USFWS.

For coastal California gnatcatcher, the applicant shall conduct USFWS protocol surveys in suitable habitat within the project area and all areas within 500 feet of access or construction-related disturbance areas. Suitable habitats, according to the protocol, include "coastal sage scrub, alluvial fan, chaparral, or intermixed or adjacent areas of grassland and riparian habitats." A permitted biologist shall perform these surveys according to the USFWS' (1997a) Coastal California Gnatcatcher Presence/Absence Survey Guidelines. If a territory or nest is confirmed, the USFWS and CDFG shall be notified immediately. If present, a 500-foot disturbance-free buffer shall be established and demarcated by fencing or flagging. No project activities may occur in these areas unless otherwise authorized by USFWS and CDFG. Construction activities in suitable gnatcatcher habitat will be monitored by a full-time qualified biologist. The monitoring shall be of a sufficient intensity to ensure that the biologist could detect the presence of a bird in the construction area.

MV 4.3-16 Thirty days prior to construction activities in grassland, scrub, chaparral, oak woodland, riverbank, and agriculture habitats, or other suitable habitat a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey within the proposed construction disturbance zone and within 200 feet of the disturbance zone for San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit and San Diego desert woodrat.

If San Diego black-tailed jackrabbits are present, non-breeding rabbits shall be flushed from areas to be disturbed. Dens, depressions, nests, or burrows occupied by pups shall be flagged and ground-disturbing activities avoided within a minimum of 200 feet during the pup-rearing season (February 15 through July 1). This buffer may be reduced based on the location of the den upon consultation with CDFG. Occupied maternity dens, depressions, nests, or burrows shall be flagged for avoidance, and a biological monitor shall be present during construction. If unattended young are discovered, they shall be relocated to suitable habitat by a qualified biologist. The applicant shall document all San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit identified, avoided, or moved and provide a written report to CDFG within 72 hours. Collection and relocation of animals shall only occur with the proper scientific collection and handling permits.

If active San Diego desert woodrat nests (stick houses) are identified within the disturbance zone or within 100 feet of the disturbance zone, a fence shall be erected around the nest site adequate to provide the woodrat sufficient foraging habitat at the discretion of the qualified biologist in consultation with CDFG.

Clearing and construction within the fenced area will be postponed or halted until young have left the nest. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when disturbance activities will occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts to these nests will occur. If avoidance is not possible, the applicant will take the following sequential steps: (1) all understory vegetation will be cleared in the area immediately surrounding active nests followed by a period of one night without further disturbance to allow woodrats to vacate the nest, (2) each occupied nest will then be disturbed by a qualified wildlife biologist until all woodrats leave the nest and seek refuge off site, and (3) the nest sticks shall be removed from the project site and piled at the base of a nearby hardwood tree (preferably a coast live oak or California walnut). Relocated nests shall not be spaced closer than 100 feet apart, unless a qualified wildlife biologist has determined that a specific habitat can support a higher density of nests. The applicant shall document all woodrat nests moved and provide a written report to CDFG.

All woodrat relocation shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in possession of a scientific collecting permit.

MV 4.3-17 Thirty days prior to construction activities in grassland, scrub, chaparral, oak woodland, riverbank, and agriculture habitats, or other suitable habitat a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey within the proposed construction disturbance zone and within 200 feet of the disturbance zone for American badger.

If American badgers are present, occupied habitat shall be flagged and ground-disturbing activities avoided within 50 feet of the occupied den. Maternity dens shall be avoided during the pup-rearing season (February 15 through July 1) and a minimum 200 foot buffer established. This buffer may be reduced based on the location of the den upon consultation with CDFG. Maternity dens shall be flagged for avoidance, identified on construction maps, and a qualified biologist shall be present during construction. If avoidance of a non-maternity den is not feasible, badgers shall be relocated either by trapping or by slowly excavating the burrow (either by hand or mechanized equipment under the direct supervision of the biologist, removing no more that 4 inches at a time) before or after the rearing season (February 15 through July 1). Any relocation of badgers shall occur only after consultation with CDFG. A written report documenting the badger removal shall be provided to CDFG within 30 days of relocation.

Collection and relocation of animals shall only occur with the proper scientific collection and handling permits.

MV 4.3-18 No earlier than 30 days prior to the commencement of construction activities, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active roosts of special-status bats are present on or within 300 feet of the project disturbance boundaries. Should an active maternity roost be identified (in California, the breeding season of native bat species is generally from April 1 through August 31), the roost shall not be disturbed and construction within 300

feet shall be postponed or halted, until the roost is vacated and juveniles have fledged. Surveys shall include rocky outcrops, caves, structures, and large trees (particularly trees 12 inches in diameter or greater at 4.5 feet above grade with loose bark or other cavities). Trees and rocky outcrops shall be surveyed by a qualified bat biologist (i.e., a biologist holding a CDFG collection permit and a Memorandum of Understanding with CDFG allowing the biologist to handle bats). If active maternity roosts or hibernacula are found, the rock outcrop or tree occupied by the roost shall be avoided (i.e., not removed) by the project. If avoidance of the maternity roost must occur, the bat biologist shall survey (through the use of radio telemetry or other CDFG approved methods) for nearby alternative maternity colony sites. If the bat biologist determines in consultation with and with the approval of CDFG that there are alternative roost sites used by the maternity colony and young are not present then no further action is required.

If a maternity roost will be impacted by the project, and no alternative maternity roosts are in use near the site, substitute roosting habitat for the maternity colony shall be provided on, or in close proximity to, the project site no less than three months prior to the eviction of the colony. Large concrete walls (e.g., on bridges) on south or southwestern slopes that are retrofitted with slots and cavities are an example of structures that may provide alternative potential roosting habitat appropriate for maternity colonies. Alternative roost sites must be of comparable size and proximal in location to the impacted colony. CDFG shall also be notified of any hibernacula or active nurseries within the construction zone.

If non-breeding bat hibernacula are found in trees scheduled to be removed or in crevices in rock outcrops within the grading footprint, the individuals shall be safely evicted, under the direction of a qualified bat biologist, by opening the roosting area to allow airflow through the cavity or other means determined appropriate by the bat biologist (e.g., installation of one-way doors). In situations requiring one-way doors, a minimum of one week shall pass after doors are installed and temperatures should be sufficiently warm for bats to exit the roost because bats do not typically leave their roost daily during winter months in southern coastal California. This action should allow all bats to leave during the course of one week. Roosts that need to be removed in situations where the use of one-way doors is not necessary in the judgment of the qualified bat biologist in consultation with CDFG shall first be disturbed by various means at the direction of the bat biologist at dusk to allow bats to escape during the darker hours, and the roost tree shall be removed or the grading shall occur the next day (*i.e.,* there shall be no less or more than one night between initial disturbance and the grading or tree removal). These actions should allow bats to leave during nighttime hours, thus increasing their chance of finding new roosts with a minimum of potential predation during daylight.

If an active maternity roost is located on the project site, and alternative roosting habitat is available, the demolition of the roost site must commence before maternity colonies form (*i.e.*, prior to March 1) or after young are flying (i.e., after July 31) using the exclusion techniques described above.

MV 4.3-19 Any common or special-status species bat day roost sites found by a qualified biologist during pre-construction surveys conducted per MV 4.3-18, to be directly (within project disturbance footprint) or indirectly (within 300 feet of project disturbance footprint) impacted are to be mitigated with creation of artificial roost sites. The project applicant shall establish (an) alternative roost site(s) within suitable preserved open space located at an adequate distance from sources of human disturbance.

MV 4.3-20 Thirty days prior to construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct CDFG protocol surveys to determine whether the burrowing owl is present at the site. The surveys shall consist of three site visits and shall be conducted in areas dominated by field crops, disturbed habitat, grasslands, and along levee locations, or if such habitats occur within 500 feet of a construction zone. If located, occupied burrows shall not be disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless a qualified biologist approved by CDFG verifies through non-invasive methods that either the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation or that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. If the burrowing owl is detected but nesting is not occurring, construction work can proceed after any owls have been evacuated from the site using CDFG-approved burrow closure procedures and after alternative nest sites have been provided in accordance with the CDFG Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (10-17-95).

Unless otherwise authorized by CDFG, a 500-foot buffer, within which no activity will be permissible, will be maintained between project activities and nesting burrowing owls during the nesting season. This protected area will remain in effect until August 31 or at CDFG's discretion and based upon monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently.

Results of the surveys and relocation efforts shall be provided to CDFG in the annual mitigation status report.

MV 4.3-21 Waste and recycling receptacles that discourage foraging by wildlife species adapted to urban environments shall be installed in common areas and parks throughout the Mission Village site.

MV 4.3-22 All oaks that will not be removed that are regulated under [County of Los Angeles Oak Tree Ordinance] CLAOTO with driplines within 50 feet of land clearing (including brush clearing) or areas to be graded shall be enclosed in a temporary fenced zone for the duration of the clearing or grading activities. Fencing shall extend to the root protection zone (i.e., the area at least 15 feet from the trunk or 5 feet beyond the drip line, whichever distance is greater). No parking or storage of equipment, solvents, or chemicals that could adversely affect the trees shall be allowed within 25 feet of the trunk at any time. Removal of the fence shall occur only after the project arborist or qualified biologist confirms the health of preserved trees.

MV 4.3-23 Mitigation Measures SP 4.6-1 through SP 4.6-16 specify requirements for riparian mitigation conducted in the High Country SMA/SEA 20, Salt Creek area, and Open Area. The applicant will prepare and implement a plan for mitigation of both riparian and upland habitats (such as riparian adjacent big sagebrush scrub), and incorporates these Mitigation Measures (SP 4.6-1 through SP 4.6-16). A Comprehensive Mitigation Implementation Plan (CMIP) has been developed by Applicant that provides an outline of mitigation to offset impacts. The CMIP demonstrates the feasibility of creating the required mitigation acreage to offset project impacts (see MV 4.3-31). However, the CMIP does not identify mitigation actions specifically for impacts to waters of the United States. But since these waters are a subset of CDFG jurisdiction, the applicable Corps mitigation requirements would be met or exceeded.[4]

Detailed riparian/wetland mitigation plans, in accordance with the CMIP, shall be submitted to, and are subject to the approval of, the Corps and CDFG as part of the sub-notification letters for individual projects. Individual project submittals shall include applicable CMIP elements, complying with the requirements outlined below. The detailed wetlands mitigation plan shall specify, at a minimum, the following: (1) the location of mitigation sites; (2) site preparation, including grading, soils preparation, irrigation installation, (2a) the quantity (seed or nursery stock) and species of plants to be planted (all species to be native to region); (3) detailed procedures for creating additional vegetation communities; (4) methods for the removal of non-native plants; (5) a schedule and action plan to maintain and monitor the enhancement/restoration area; (6) a list of criteria by which to measure success of the mitigation sites (*e.g.*, percent cover and richness of native species, percent survivorship, establishment of self-sustaining native plantings, maximum allowable percent of non-native species); (7) measures to exclude unauthorized entry into the creation/enhancement areas; and (8) contingency measures in the event that mitigation efforts are not successful. The detailed wetlands mitigation plans shall also classify the biological value (as "high," "moderate," or "low") of the vegetation communities to be disturbed as defined in these conditions, or may be based on an agency-approved method (e.g., Hybrid Assessment of Riparian Communities [HARC]). The biological value shall be used to determine mitigation replacement ratios required under MV 4.3-31 and MV 4.3-39.

The detailed wetlands mitigation plans shall provide for the 3:1 replacement of any Southern California black walnut to be removed from the riparian corridor for individual projects. The plan shall be subject to the approval of the CDFG and the Corps and approved prior to the impact to riparian resources. MV 4.3-33 describes that the functions and values will be assessed for the riparian areas that will be removed, and MV 4.3-31 and MV 4.3-39 describe the replacement ratios for the habitats that will be impacted.

[4] For detailed information concerning the Corps compensatory mitigation program for impacts to waters of the United States, please refer to Appendix 11.0 of the Section 404(b)1 Alternatives Analysis, included in Appendix F1.0 of the Final RMDP/SCP Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report ("EIS/EIR").

MV 4.3-24 Approximately 616.3 acres of coastal scrub shall be preserved on site within Open Area and/or off site within the High Country SMA/SEA 20, the Salt Creek area, or the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 within the Specific Plan area to offset impacts associated with Mission Village. This measure ensures that preserved areas will be part of a greater managed preserved system of numerous natural vegetation communities meant to support both common and special-status widllife species. These areas support the same types of habitat that would be lost through construction and would be further enhanced through management and monitoring activities.

MV 4.3-25 Prior to ground disturbance, construction, or site preparation activities, the applicant shall retain the services of a qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys for western spadefoot toad within all portions of the project site containing suitable breeding habitat. Surveys shall be conducted during a time of year when the species could be detected (e.g., the presence of rain pools). If western spadefoot toad is identified on the project site, the following measures will be implemented:

(1) Under the direct supervision of the qualified biologist, western spadefoot toad habitat shall be created within suitable natural sites on the Specific Plan site outside of the proposed development envelope. The amount of occupied breeding habitat to be impacted by the project shall be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. The actual relocation site design and location shall be approved by CDFG. The location shall be in a suitable habitat as far away as feasible from any of the homes and roads to be built. The relocation ponds shall be designed such that they only support standing water for several weeks following seasonal rains in order that aquatic predators (e.g., fish, bullfrogs, and crayfish) cannot become established.

Terrestrial habitat surrounding the proposed relocation site shall be as similar in type, aspect, and density to the location of the existing ponds as feasible. No site preparation or construction activities shall be permitted in the vicinity of the currently occupied ponds until the design and construction of the pool habitat in preserved areas of the site has been completed and all western spadefoot toad adult, tadpoles, and egg masses detected are moved to the created pool habitat.

(2) Based on appropriate rainfall and temperatures, generally between the months of February and April, the biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys in all appropriate vegetation communities within the development envelope. Surveys will include evaluation of all previously documented occupied areas and a reconnaissance-level survey of the remaining natural areas of the site. All western spadefoot adults, tadpoles, and egg masses encountered shall be collected and released in identified/created relocation ponds described above.

(3) The qualified biologist shall monitor the relocation site for five years, involving annual monitoring during and immediately following peak breeding season such that surveys can be conducted for adults as well as for egg masses and larval and post-larval toads. Further, survey data will be provided to CDFG by the monitoring biologist following each monitoring period and a written report summarizing the monitoring results will be provided to CDFG at the end of the monitoring effort. Success criteria for the monitoring program shall include verifiable evidence of toad reproduction at the relocation site.

MV 4.3-26 Prior to ground disturbance, vegetation clearing, construction, or site preparation activities, a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) for all construction/contractor personnel. A list of construction personnel who have completed training prior to the start of construction shall be maintained on site and this list shall be updated as required when new personnel start work. No construction worker may work in the field for more than five days without participating in the WEAP. The qualified biologist shall provide ongoing guidance to construction personnel and contractors to ensure compliance with environmental/permit regulations and mitigation measures. The qualified biologist shall perform the following:

- Provide training materials and briefings to all personnel working on site. The material shall include but not be limited to the identification and status of plant and wildlife species, significant natural plant community habitats (e.g., riparian), fire protection measures, and review of mitigation requirements.

- A discussion of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, other state or federal permit requirements and the legal consequences of non-compliance with these acts.

- Attend the pre-construction meeting to ensure that timing/location of construction activities do not conflict with other mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for nesting birds, pre-construction surveys, or relocation efforts).

- Conduct meetings with the contractor and other key construction personnel describing the importance of restricting work to designated areas. Maps showing the location of special-status wildlife or populations of rare plants, exclusion areas, or other construction limitations (e.g., limitations on nighttime work) will be provided to the environmental monitors and construction crews prior to ground disturbance. This applies to preconstruction activities, such as site surveying and staking, natural resources surveying or reconnaissance, establishment of water quality BMPs, and geotechnical or hydrological investigations.

- Discuss procedures for minimizing harm to or harassment of wildlife encountered during construction and provide a contact person in the event of the discovery of dead or injured wildlife.

- Review/designate the construction area in the field with the contractor in accordance with the final grading plan.

- Ensure that haul roads, access roads, and on-site staging and storage areas are sited within grading areas to minimize degradation of vegetation communities adjacent to these areas (if activities outside these limits are necessary, they shall be evaluated by the biologist to ensure that no special-status species habitats will be affected).

- Conduct a field review of the staking (to be set by the surveyor) designating the limits of all construction activity.

- Flag or temporarily fence any construction activity areas immediately adjacent to riparian areas.

- Ensure and document that required pre-construction surveys and/or relocation efforts have been implemented.

- To reduce the potential for the spread of exotic invasive invertebrates (e.g., New Zealand mud snails) and weeds (including weed seeds) during project clearing and construction, all heavy equipment proposed for use on the project site shall be verified cleaned (including wheels, tracks, undercarriages, and bumpers, as applicable) before delivery to the project site. Equipment must be documented as exotic invasive invertebrate (e.g., mud snail) and weed free upon delivery to the project site initial staging area, including: (1) vegetation clearing equipment (skid steer loaders, loaders, dozers, backhoes, excavators, chippers, grinders, and any hauling equipment, such as off-road haul trucks, flat bed, or other vehicles); (2) earth-moving equipment (scrapers, dozers, excavators, loaders, motor-graders, compactors, backhoes, off-road water trucks, and off-road haul trucks); and (3) all project-associated vehicles (including personal vehicles) that, upon inspection by the monitoring biologist, are deemed to present a risk for spreading exotic invasive invertebrates (e.g., mud snails) or weeds. Equipment shall be cleaned at existing construction yards or at a wash station. The biological monitor shall document that all construction equipment (as described above) has been cleaned prior to working within the project work site. Any equipment/vehicles determined to not be free of exotic invasive invertebrates (e.g., mud snails) and weeds shall immediately be sent back to the originating construction yard for washing, or wash station where rinse water is collected and disposed of in either a sanitary sewer or other legal point of disposal. Equipment/vehicles moved from the site must be inspected, and re-washed as necessary, prior to re-engaging in construction activities in the project work area. A written

daily log shall be kept for all vehicle/equipment washing that states the date, time, location, type of equipment washed, methods used, and location of work;

- Be present during initial vegetation clearing and grading.
- Submit to the CDFG an immediate report (within 72 hours) of any conflicts or errors resulting in impacts to special-status biological resources.

MV 4.3-27 The Draft RMDP Slender Mariposa Lily Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (Dudek 2007) shall be revised and submitted to CDFG for review and approval prior to ground disturbance to occupied habitat. Upon approval, the plan will be implemented by the applicant or its designee. The revised plan will demonstrate the feasibility of enhancing or restoring slender mariposa lily habitat in selected areas to be managed as natural open space (i.e., the Salt Creek area or High Country SMA/SEA 20, spineflower preserves, or River Corridor SMA/SEA 23) without conflicting with other resource management objectives. Habitat replacement/enhancement will be at a 1:1 ratio (acres restored/enhanced to acres impacted).

The revised plan will describe habitat improvement/ restoration measures to be completed prior to introducing slender mariposa lily. Habitat improvement/restoration will be based on native occupied slender mariposa lily habitat. The revised plan will specify: (1) the location of mitigation sites (may be selected from among 559 acres of suitable mitigation land in the High Country SMA/SEA 20 and Salt Creek area identified in the Draft Newhall Ranch Mitigation Feasibility Study (Dudek 2007); (2) a description of "target" vegetation (native shrubland or grassland) to include estimated cover and abundance of native shrubs and grasses in occupied slender mariposa lily habitat on Newhall Ranch land (either at sites to be destroyed by construction or at sites to be preserved); (3) site preparation measures to include topsoil treatment, soil decompaction, erosion control, temporary irrigation systems, or other measures as appropriate; (4) methods for the removal of non-native plants (e.g., mowing, weeding, raking, herbicide application, or burning); (5) the source of all plant propagules (seed, potted nursery stock, *etc.*), the quantity and species of seed or potted stock of all plants to be introduced or planted into the restoration/enhancement areas; (6) a schedule and action plan to maintain and monitor the enhancement/restoration areas, to include at minimum, qualitative annual monitoring for revegetation success and site degradation due to erosion, trespass, or animal damage for a period no less than two years; (7) as needed where sites are near trails or other access points, measures such as fencing, signage, or security patrols to exclude unauthorized entry into the restoration/enhancement areas; and (8) contingency measures such as replanting, weed control, or erosion control to be implemented if habitat improvement/restoration efforts are not successful.

Habitat restoration/enhancement will be judged successful when (1) percent cover and species richness of native species reach 50 percent of their cover and species richness at undisturbed occupied slender mariposa lily habitat at reference sites; and (2) the replacement vegetation has persisted at least one summer without irrigation. At that point slender mariposa lily propagules (seed or bulbs) will be introduced onto the site.

The revised plan will specify methods to collect propagules and introduce slender mariposa lily into these mitigation sites. Introductions will use source material (seeds or bulbs) from no more than 1.0 mile distant, similar slope exposures, and no more than 500 ft. elevational difference from the mitigation site, unless otherwise approved by CDFG. Bulbs may be salvaged and transplanted from slender mariposa lily occurrences to be lost; alternately, seed may be collected from protected occurrences, following CDFG-approved seed collection guidelines (*i.e.*, MOU for rare plant seed collection). No bulbs will be translocated into areas within 300 feet of proposed or existing development. The Applicant or its designee will monitor the reintroduction sites for no fewer than five additional years to estimate slender mariposa lily survivorship (for bulbs) or seedling establishment (for seeded sites).

Annual monitoring reports will be prepared and submitted to CDFG and will be made available to the public to guide future mitigation planning for slender mariposa lily. Monitoring reports will describe all restoration/enhancement measures taken in the preceding year; describe success and completion of those efforts and other pertinent site conditions (erosion, trespass, animal damage) in qualitative terms; and describe mariposa lily survival or establishment in quantitative terms.

A minimum of 133 acres of slender mariposa lily cumulative occupied area will be conserved and managed in the RMDP and SCP project boundaries. Of these 133 acres, approximately 103 acres of slender mariposa lily cumulative occupied area will be conserved and managed in the RMDP and SCP project boundary in the High Country SMA/SEA 20 and Salt Creek area, and 2 acres occur within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 and/or proposed spineflower preserves. Additional cumulative occupied area will be conserved and managed in the San Martinez Grande Canyon area at a 1:1 ratio (acres conserved and managed to acres impacted) based on impacts to cumulative occupied area within the Entrada planning area, as a means to ensure regional biodiversity of the species. Up to an additional 28 acres of slender mariposa lily cumulative occupied area can be conserved and managed in the San Martinez Grande Canyon area for this purpose.

MV 4.3-28 The Oak Resource Replacement Plan to be prepared (as described in Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measure SP 4.6-48) shall include measures to create, enhance, and/or restore 9.7 acres of coast live oak woodland and valley/oak savannah within the High Country SMA/SEA 20. The plan shall be subject to the requirements outlined in SP 4.6-48.

The applicant shall prepare an Oak Resource Management Plan that incorporates the findings of the Draft Newhall Ranch Mitigation Feasibility Report (Dudek 2007) and areas identified (in the technical report) as being suitable for oak woodland enhancement and creation shall be used as mitigation. Other mitigation sites may be used upon approval by the County. The plan shall be reviewed by the County Forester. The plan shall include the following: (1) site selection and preparation; (2) selection of proper species, including sizes and planting densities; (3) protection from herbivores; (4) site maintenance; (5) success criteria; (6) remedial actions; and (7) a monitoring program.

MV 4.3-29 The project applicant will retain a qualified biologist to develop an Exotic Wildlife Species Control Plan and implement a control program for bullfrog, African clawed frog, and crayfish. The program will require the control of these species during construction within the River corridor and modified tributaries (bridges, diversions, bank stabilization, drop structures). The Plan shall include a description of the species targeted for eradication, the methods of harvest that will be employed, the disposal methods, and the measures that would be employed to avoid impacts to sensitive wildlife (*e.g.*, stickleback, arroyo toad, nesting birds) during removal activities (*i.e.*, timing, avoidance of specific areas). Annual monitoring shall occur for the first five years after construction of project facilities. Monitoring will be conducted within sentinel locations along the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 and where the project provides potential habitat for these species (*e.g.*, future ponds and water features). Control shall be conducted within project facilities where monitoring results indicate that exotic species have colonized an area. After the first 5 years, the NLMO or other entity will be responsible for controlling exotic aquatic species.

MV 4.3-30 In order to reduce impacts to biological resources from grading and construction activities, all related activities will be conducted to facilitate the escape of animals to natural areas. Construction and grading activities will begin in disturbed areas in order to avoid stranding animals in isolated patches of vegetation. Trenches will be covered at night or escape routes provided to prevent animals from falling into and being trapped in trenches. If escape routes are provided in lieu of covering trenches, the excavations will be inspected by a qualified biologist prior to restart of work.

MV 4.3-31 The permanent removal of existing habitats in Corps and/or CDFG jurisdictional areas in the Santa Clara River and tributaries shall be replaced by creating habitats of similar functions and values/services (see MV 4.3-33) on the project site, or as allowed under MV 4.3-39. The riparian habitat mitigation will meet CDFG mitigation requirements listed in [EIR] Table 4.3-11, consistent with success criteria for mitigation in MV 4.3-36.

Table 4.3-11
CDFG Jurisdictional Permanent Impacts Mitigation Ratios

Ratios Listed by Vegetation Types & Quality				
Vegetation Community	**Veg Code/ID**	**HIGH Reach Value*** **(Mit. Ratio)**	**MEDIUM Reach Value**** **(Mit. Ratio)**	**LOW Reach Value***** **(Mit. Ratio)**
Southern Cottonwood–Willow Riparian Forrest	SCRWF	4:1	3:1	2:1
Southern Willow Scrub	SWS	3:1	2.5:1	2:1
Oak Woodland (Coast Live, Valley)	CLOW/VOW	3:1	2.5:1	2:1
Big Sagebrush Scrub	BSS	2.5:1	2:1	1.5:1
Mexican Elderberry Scrub	MES	2.5:1	2:1	1.5:1
Cismontane Alkaline Marsh	CAM	2.5:1	2:1	1.5:1
Coastal and Valley Fresh Water Marsh	CFWM	2:1	1.5:1	1:1
Mulefat Scrub	MFS	2:1	1.5:1	1.25:1
Arrowweed Scrub	AWS	2:1	1.5:1	1:1
California Sagebrush scrub, and CSB-dominated habitats	CSB, CSB-A, -BS, -CB, -CHP, and -PS	2:1	1.5:1	1:1
Herbaceous Wetland	HW	1.5:1	1.25:1	1:1
River Wash, emergent veg.	RW	1.5:1	1.25:1	1:1
Chaparral, Chamise Chaparral	CHP, CC	1.5:1	1.25:1	1:1
Coyote Brush Scrub	CYS	1.5:1	1.25:1	1:1
Eriodictyon Scrub	EDS	1.5:1	1.25:1	1:1
California Grass Lands	CGL	1:1	1:1	1:1
Agricultural/Disturbed/Developed	AGR/DL/DEV	1:1	1:1	1:1

Notes:
** HIGH reach value indicates a portion of the Santa Clara River or main tributary that scored above 0.79 Total Score utilizing the HARC methodology described in **Section 4.2**, Geomorphology and Riparian Resources, of the Draft RMDP-SCP EIS/EIR.*
*** MEDIUM reach value indicates a portion of the Santa Clara River or main tributary that scored between 0.4 and 0.79 Total Score utilizing the HARC methodology described in **Section 4.2.***
**** LOW reach value indicates a portion of the Santa Clara River or main tributary that scored below 0.4 Total Score utilizing the HARC methodology described in **Section 4.2.***

MV 4.3-32 Creation of new vegetation communities and restoration of impacted vegetation communities shall occur at suitable sites in or adjacent to jurisdictional areas or in areas where bank stabilization would occur. Locations where the excavation of uplands for bank protection/stabilization results in creation of new, unvegetated riverbed or other disturbance shall receive the highest level of priority for vegetation community restoration. Restoration sites may also occur at locations outside the riverbed where there are appropriate hydrologic conditions to create a self-sustaining riparian vegetation community and where upland and riparian vegetation community values are absent or very low. All sites shall contain suitable hydrological conditions and surrounding land uses to ensure a self-

sustaining functioning riparian vegetation community. Candidate restoration sites shall be described in the annual mitigation status report (see MV 4.3-43). Sites will be approved when the detailed wetlands mitigation plans are submitted to the Corps and CDFG as part of the sub-notification letters submitted for individual projects. Status of the sites will be addressed through agency review of the annual mitigation status report and mitigation accounting form. Each mitigation plan will include acreages, maps, and site specific descriptions of the proposed revegetation site, including analysis of soils, hydrologic suitability, and present and future adjacent land uses.

MV 4.3-33 Replacement vegetation communities shall be designed to replace the functions and values of the vegetation communities being removed. The replacement vegetation communities shall have similar dominant trees and understory shrubs and herbs (excluding exotic species) to those of the affected vegetation communities (see [EIR] Table 4.3-12 for example of recommended plant species for the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 and tributaries). In addition, the replacement vegetation communities shall be designed to replicate the density and structure of the affected vegetation communities once the replacement vegetation communities have met the mitigation success criteria.

Table 4.3-12
Potential Plant Species for Vegetation Community Restoration in the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 and Tributaries

Trees	
red willow	*Salix laevigata*
arroyo willow	*Salix lasiolepis*
Fremont cottonwood	*Populus fremontii*
black cottonwood	*Populus balsamifera* ssp. *Trichocarpa*
western sycamore	*Platanus racemosa*
Shrubs	
Mulefat	*Baccharis salicifolia*
sandbar willow	*Salix exigua*
arrow weed	*Pluchea sericea*
Herbs	
Mugwort	*Artemisia douglasiana*
western ragweed	*Ambrosia psilostachya*
Cattail	*Typha latifolia*
Bulrush	*Scirpus americanus*
prairie bulrush	*Scirpus maritimus*

Note: This is a recommended list. Other species may be found suitable based on site conditions and state and federal permits.

MV 4.3-34 Average plant spacing shall be determined based on an analysis of vegetation communities to be replaced. The applicant shall develop plant spacing specifications for all riparian vegetation communities to be restored. Plant spacing

specifications shall be reviewed and approved by the Corps and CDFG when restoration plans are submitted to the agencies as part of the sub-notification letters submitted to the Corps and CDFG for individual projects or as part of the annual mitigation status report and mitigation accounting form.

MV 4.3-35 If at any time prior to CDFG/Corps approval of the restoration area, the site is subject to an act of God (flood, fires, or drought), the applicant shall be responsible for replanting the damaged area. The site will be subject to the same success criteria as provided for MV 4.3-36. Should a second act of God occur prior to CDFG/Corps approval of the restoration area, the applicant shall coordinate with the CDFG/Corps to develop an alternative restoration strategy(ies) to meet success requirements. This may include restoration elsewhere in the River corridor or tributaries.

MV 4.3-36 The revegetation site will be considered "complete" upon meeting all of the following success criteria. In a sub-notification letter, the applicant may request modification of success criteria on a project by project basis. Acceptance of such request will be at the discretion of CDFG and the Corps.

1. Regardless of the date of initial planting, any restoration site must have been without active manipulation by irrigation, planting, or seeding for a minimum of three years prior to Agency consideration of successful completion.
2. The percent cover and species richness of native vegetation shall be evaluated based on local reference sites established by CDFG and the Corps for the plant communities in the impacted areas.
3. Native shrubs and trees shall have at least 80 percent survivorship after two years beyond the beginning of the success evaluation start date. This may include natural recruitment.
4. Non-native species cover will be no more than 5 percent absolute cover through the term of the restoration.
5. Giant reed (*Arundo donax*), tamarisk (*Tamarix ramosissima*), perennial pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*), tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissimus*), pampas grass (*Cortaderia selloana)* and any species listed on the California State Agricultural list, or Cal-IPC list of noxious weeds will not be present on the revegetation site as of the date of completion approval.
6. Using the HARC assessment methodology, the compensatory mitigation site shall meet or exceed the baseline functional scores of the impact area in Corps' jurisdictional waters, as described in the Conceptual Mitigation Plan[5] for Waters of the United States.

MV 4.3-37 Temporary irrigation shall be installed as necessary for plant establishment. Irrigation shall continue as needed until the restoration site becomes self sustaining regarding survivorship and growth. Irrigation shall be terminated in the fall to provide the least stress to plants. Following irrigation termination, the irrigation piping will be removed where not destructive to the established plants.

5 See Footnote 4, infra.

MV 4.3-38 In areas where invasive exotic plant species control is authorized by CDFG in lieu of creating or restoring other riparian habitat mitigation (MV 4.3-31), removal areas shall be kept free of exotic plant species for 5 years after initial treatment. In areas where extensive exotic removal occurs, revegetation with native plants or natural recruitment shall be documented.

MV 4.3-39 The exotics control program may utilize methods and procedures in accordance with the provisions in the Upper Santa Clara River Watershed Arundo/Tamarisk Removal Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, dated February 2006, or the applicant may propose alternative methods and procedures for Corps and CDFG review and approval pursuant to a sub-notification letter. By example: a 10-acre site occupied by 10% exotic species will be credited for 1 acre of mitigation.

MV 4.3-40 All native riparian trees with a 3-inch diameter at breast height (dbh) or greater in temporary construction areas shall be replaced using 1- or 5-gallon container plants, containered trees, or pole cuttings in the temporary construction areas in the winter following the construction disturbance. The growth and survival of the replacement trees shall meet the performance standards specified in MV 4.3-36. In addition, the growth and survival of the planted trees shall be monitored until they meet the self-sustaining success criteria in accordance with the methods and reporting procedures specified in MV 4.3-36, MV 4.3-42, and MV 4.3-43.

MV 4.3-41 Vegetation communities temporarily impacted by the proposed project shall be revegetated as described in MV 4.3-31. Large trunks of removed trees may also remain on site to provide habitat for invertebrates, reptiles, and small mammals or may be anchored within the project site for erosion control. To facilitate restoration, mulch, or native topsoil (the top 6- to 12-inch deep layer containing organic material), may be salvaged from the work area prior to construction. Following construction, salvaged topsoil shall be returned to the work area and placed in the restoration site. Within one year, the project biologist will evaluate the progress of restoration activities in the temporary impact areas to determine if natural recruitment has been sufficient for the site to reach performance goals. In the event that native plant recruitment is determined by the project biologist to be inadequate for successful habitat establishment, the site shall be revegetated in accordance with the methods designed for permanent impacts (i.e., seeding, container plants, and/or a temporary irrigation system may be recommended). This will help ensure the success of mitigation areas. The applicant shall restore the temporary construction area per the success criteria and ratios described in MV 4.3-23, MV 4.3-31, and MV 4.3-36. Annual monitoring reports on the status of the recovery of temporarily impacted areas shall be submitted to the Corps and CDFG as part of the annual mitigation status report (MV 4.3-42 and MV 4.3-43).

MV 4.3-42 To provide an accurate and reliable accounting system for mitigation, the applicant shall file a mitigation accounting form annually with the Corps and CDFG by April 1.

MV 4.3-43 An annual mitigation status report shall be submitted to the Corps and CDFG by April 1 of each year until satisfaction of success criteria identified in MV 4.3-36. This report shall include any required plans for plant spacing, locations of candidate restoration and weed control sites or proposed "in-lieu fees," restoration methods, and vegetation community restoration performance standards. For active vegetation community creation sites, the report shall include the survival, percent cover, and height of planted species; the number by species of plants replaced; an overview of the revegetation effort and its success in meeting performance criteria; the method used to assess these parameters; and photographs. For active exotics control sites, the report shall include an assessment of weed control; a description of the relative cover of native vegetation, bare areas, and exotic vegetation; an accounting of colonization by native plants; and photographs. The report shall also include the mitigation accounting form (see MV 4.3-42), which outlines accounting information related to species planted or exotics control and mitigation credit remaining. The annual mitigation and monitoring report shall document the current functional capacity of the compensatory mitigation site using the HARC assessment methodology, as well as documenting the baseline functional scores of the impact site in jurisdictional waters of the United States.

MV 4.3-44 Require focused surveys for the spring snail (*Pyrgulopsis castaicensis* n. sp.) by a qualified biologist prior to the commencement of grading/construction activities in any drainage area supporting perennial flow. Any individuals of the *Pyrgulopsis castaicensis* n. sp. found within the Middle Canyon drainage shall be relocated to appropriate habitat within Middle Canyon Spring. If *Pyrgulopsis castaicensis* n. sp. are discovered during aquatic and semi-aquatic pre-construction surveys in any other perennial flowing water, the applicant shall consult with CDFG prior to initiating disturbance of the area. A report documenting the number of *Pyrgulopsis castaicensis* n. sp. located, the conditions of the area, and where the species has been relocated to, if applicable, shall be submitted to CDFG within 60 days following the relocation.

MV 4.3-45 An Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan that addresses the use of pesticides (including rodenticides and insecticides) on site will be prepared prior to the issuance of building permits for the initial tract map. The IPM will implement appropriate Best Management Practices to avoid and minimize adverse effects on the natural environment, including vegetation communities, special-status species, species without special status, and associated habitats, including prey and food resources (e.g., insects, small mammals, seeds). Potential management practices include cultural (e.g., planting pest-free stock plants), mechanical (e.g., weeding, trapping), and biological controls (e.g., natural predators or competitors of pest species, insect growth regulators, natural pheromones, or biopesticides), and the judicious use of chemical controls, as appropriate (e.g., targeted spraying versus broadcast applications). The IPM will establish management thresholds (i.e., not all incidences of a pest require management); prescribe monitoring to determine when management thresholds have been exceeded; and identify the most appropriate and efficient control method that avoids and minimizes risks to natural resources. Preparation of the covenants, conditions, and restrictions

(CC&Rs) for each tract map shall include language that prohibits the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in the project site.

MV 4.3-46 The Natural Lands Management Organization (NLMO) shall fund or otherwise coordinate the regular removal of trash and debris from riparian habitats on or adjacent to the project site. The removal of trash shall be conducted in a manner as to not disturb sensitive habitats.

MV 4.3-47 Each tract map Home Owners' Association shall supply educational information to future residents regarding pets, wildlife, and open space areas. The material shall discuss the presence of native animals (e.g., coyote, bobcat, mountain lion), indicate that those native animals could prey on pets, indicate that no actions shall be taken against native animals should they prey on pets allowed outdoors, and indicate that pets must be leashed while using the designated trail system and/or in any areas within or adjacent to open space. Control of stray and feral cats and dogs will be conducted in open space areas on an as-needed basis by the NLMO(s) or the Newhall Ranch *joint powers authority* (JPA) managing the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, High Country SMA/SEA 20, or Salt Creek area or by the HOAs managing the Open Areas. Feral cats and dogs may be trapped and deposited with the local Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals or the Los Angeles County Department of Animal Control.

MV 4.3-48 Upon initiation of landscaping within a development area, quarterly monitoring shall be initiated for Argentine ants along the urban–open space interface at sentinel locations where invasions could occur (e.g., where moist microhabitats that attract Argentine ants may be created). A qualified biologist shall determine the monitoring locations. Ant pitfall traps will be placed in these sentinel locations and operated on a quarterly basis to detect invasion by Aregentine ants. If Argentine ants are detected during monitoring, direct control measures will be implemented immediately to help prevent the invasion from worsening. These direct controls may include but are not limited to nest/mound insecticide treatment, or available natural control methods being developed. A general reconnaissance of the infested area would also be conducted to identify and correct the possible source of the invasion, such as uncontrolled urban runoff, leaking pipes, or collected water. Monitoring and control of Argentine ants would occur for a 5-year period. After the first 5 years, the NLMO or other entity will be responsible for controlling Argentine ants.

MV 4.3-49 Thirty days prior to construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for ringtail. The survey area shall include suitable riparian and woodland habitat (southern coast live oak riparian forest, southern cottonwood–willow riparian forest, southern willow scrub, coast live oak woodland, valley oak woodland, and mixed oak woodland) within the construction disturbance zone and a 300-foot buffer around the construction site. Should the ringtail be observed in the breeding and rearing period of February 1 through August 31, no construction-related activities shall occur within 300 feet of the occupied area for the period of February 1 through August 31 or until the

ringtail has been determined by a qualified biologist (in consultation with CDFG) to no longer occupy areas within 300 feet of the construction zone and/or that construction activities would not adversely affect the successful rearing of young. If the ringtail is observed within the construction disturbance zone or in the 300-foot buffer around the construction site in the nonbreeding/rearing period of September 1 through January 31, and avoidance is not possible, denning ringtail shall be safely evicted under the direction of a qualified biologist (as determined by a Memorandum of Understanding with CDFG). All activities that involve the ringtail shall be documented and reported to CDFG.

MV 4.3-50 Any Southern California black walnut and mainland cherry trees or shrubs outside riparian areas greater than 1 inch dbh shall be replaced in the ratio of at least 2:1. Multi-trunk trees/shrub dbh shall be calculated based on combined trunk dbh. Mitigation shall be deemed complete when each replacement tree attains at least 1 inch in diameter 1 foot above the base.

MV 4.3-51 Bridges over the Santa Clara River shall be designed to minimize impacts to natural areas and riparian resources from associated lighting and stormwater runoff. All lighting will be designed to be directed away from natural areas (pursuant to SP-4.6-56) using shielded lights, low sodium-vapor lights, bollard lights, or other available light and glare minimization methods. Bridges will be designed to minimize normal vehicular lighting from trespassing into natural areas using side walls a minimum of 24 inches high. All stormwater from the bridges will be directed to water treatment facilities for water quality treatment.

MV 4.3-52 Construction plans shall include necessary design features and construction notes to ensure protection of vegetation communities and special-status plant and aquatic wildlife species adjacent to construction. In addition to applicable erosion control plans and performance under SCAQMD Rule 403d dust control (SCAQMD 2005), the project stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) shall include the following minimum BMPs. Together, the implementation of these requirements shall ensure protection of adjacent habitats and wildlife species during construction. At a minimum, the following measures/restrictions shall be incorporated into the SWPPP, and noted on construction plans where appropriate, to avoid impacting special-status species during construction:

- Avoid planting or seeding invasive species in development areas within 200 feet of native vegetation communities.
- Provide location and details for any dust control fencing along project boundaries (MV 4.3-53).
- Vehicles shall not be driven or equipment operated in areas of ponded or flowing water, or where wetland vegetation, riparian vegetation, or aquatic organisms may be destroyed, except as otherwise provided for in the 404 Permit or 1603 Agreement.

- Silt settling basins installed during the construction process shall be located away from areas of ponded or flowing water to prevent discolored, silt-bearing water from reaching areas of ponded or flowing water during normal flow regimes.

- If a stream channel has been altered during the construction and/or maintenance operations, its low flow channel shall be returned as nearly as practical to pre-project topographic conditions without creating a possible future bank erosion problem or a flat, wide channel or sluice-like area. The gradient of the streambed shall be returned to pre-project grade, to the extent practical, unless it represents a wetland restoration area.

- Temporary structures and associated materials not designed to withstand high seasonal flows shall be removed to areas above the high water mark before such flows occur.

- Staging/storage areas for construction equipment and materials shall be located outside of the ordinary high water mark.

- Any equipment or vehicles driven and/or operated within or adjacent to the stream shall be checked and maintained daily, to prevent leaks of materials that could be deleterious to aquatic life if introduced to water.

- Stationary equipment such as motors, pumps, generators, and welders which may be located within the riverbed construction zone shall be positioned over drip pans. No fuel storage tanks shall be allowed in the riverbed.

- No debris, bark, slash sawdust, rubbish, cement or concrete or washing thereof, oil, petroleum products, or other organic material from any construction, or associated activity of whatever nature, shall be allowed to enter into, or be placed where it may be washed by rainfall or runoff into, watercourses included in the permit. When construction operations are completed, any excess materials or debris shall be removed from the work area.

- No equipment maintenance shall be done within or near any stream where petroleum products or other pollutants from the equipment may enter these areas with stream flow.

- The operator shall install and use fully covered trash receptacles to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverage containers, and other miscellaneous trash. Trash will be regularly picked up in construction areas.

- The operator shall not permit pets on or adjacent to the construction site.

- No guns or other weapons are allowed on the construction site during construction, with the exception of the security personnel and only for security functions. No hunting shall be authorized/permitted during construction.

MV 4.3-53 Development areas shall have dust control measures implemented and maintained to prevent dust from impacting vegetation communities and special-status plant and aquatic wildlife species. Dust control shall comply with SCAQMD Rule 403d (SCAQMD 2005). Where construction activities occur within 100 feet of known special-status plant species locations, chemical dust suppression shall not be utilized. Where determined necessary by a qualified biologist, a screening fence (i.e., a 6-foot-high chain link fence with green fabric up to a height of 5 feet) shall be installed to protect special-status species locations. See MV 4.3-65 for dust control requirements related to spineflower preserves.

MV 4.3-54 Permanent fencing shall be installed along all River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 trails adjacent to the Santa Clara River, or other sensitive resources, in order to minimize impacts associated with increased human presence on protected vegetation communities and special-status plant and wildlife species. The fencing will be split rail to avoid inhibiting wildlife movement. Viewing platforms will be located in land covers currently mapped as agriculture, disturbed land, or developed land.

MV 4.3-55 To protect Middle Canyon Spring and to reduce potential direct impacts to any special-status species that may be located within the spring complex due to unrestricted access, the project applicant or its designee shall avoid all construction-related activities within the Middle Canyon Spring complex and erect and maintain temporary orange fencing and prohibitive signage around the Middle Canyon Spring prior to and during all phases of construction within 200 feet of the spring and, if applicable, around the Middle Canyon drainage within 100 feet of flowing water. A qualified biologist will be present to monitor construction activities within 200 feet of the spring and, if applicable, around the Middle Canyon drainage within 100 feet of flowing water. The areas behind the temporary fencing shall not be used for the storage of any equipment, materials, construction debris, or anything associated with construction activities. Any upslope runoff from construction areas will be directed away from the Middle Canyon Spring.

Following the final phase of construction of any Newhall Ranch subdivision tract adjacent to Middle Canyon Spring, the project applicant or its designee shall install and maintain permanent fencing along the subdivision tract bordering the spring. Permanent signage shall be installed on the fencing along the spring boundary to indicate that the fenced area is a biological preserve that contains protected species and habitat. No trail shall be constructed that passes within 100 feet of the Middle Canyon Spring (see EIR Figure 4.3-B).

a. As described in MV 4.3-51, the Commerce Center Drive Bridge will be designed to minimize secondary impacts associated with lighting and water quality impacts through the installation of indirect and downcast lighting, and routing of stormwater to water quality treatment facilities.

MV 4.3-56 A Middle Canyon Spring Habitat Management Plan will be developed that details the measures to be implemented to maintain the populations of the spring snail (*Pyrgulopsis castaicensis* n. sp.) and Newhall sunflower species. The plan shall be subject to the approval of CDFG and implemented by the Applicant prior to disturbance within 100 feet of flowing water in Middle Canyon Creek and/or 200 feet of Middle Canyon Spring.

MV 4.3-57 Plant palettes proposed for use on landscaped slopes, street medians, park sites, and other public landscaped and fuel modification zone (FMZ) areas within 200 feet of native vegetation communities shall be reviewed by a qualified restoration specialist to ensure that the proposed landscape plants will not naturalize and require maintenance or cause vegetation community degradation in the open space areas (River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, High Country SMA/SEA 20, Salt Creek area, and natural portions of the Open Area). Container plants to be installed within public areas within 200 feet of the open space areas shall be inspected by a qualified restoration specialist for the presence of disease, weeds, and pests, including Argentine ants. Plants with pests, weeds, or diseases shall be rejected. In addition, landscape plants within 200 feet of native vegetation communities shall not be on the Cal-IPC California Invasive Plant Inventory (most recent version) or on the list of Invasive Ornamental Plants listed in Appendix B of the Spineflower Conservation Plan (SCP). The current Cal-IPC list can be obtained from the Cal-IPC web site (http://www.cal-ipc.org/ip/inventory/index.php). Landscape plans will include a plant palette composed of native or non-native, non-invasive species that do not require high irrigation rates. Except as required for fuel modification, irrigation of perimeter landscaping shall be limited to temporary irrigation (i.e., until plants become established).

MV 4.3-58 A final SCP shall be adopted and implemented after approval by CDFG, including the permanent dedication of preserves (see draft in Appendix 4.3). The proposed spineflower preserve areas shall be offered to CDFG as a permanent conservation easement within one year after issuance of the requested 2081 Permit to ensure long-term protection. The conservation easement shall be to CDFG and contain appropriate funding and restrictions to help ensure that the spineflower preserve lands are protected in perpetuity.

MV 4.3-59 The spineflower preserves shall be managed by Applicant and their preserve manager(s) and/or natural lands management organization(s) (NLMO). Applicant shall submit a statement of qualifications for their proposed preserve manager(s)/NLMO(s) for approval by CDFG. Applicant will fund in full all implementation of spineflower preserve management as described in the SCP and all mitigation measures listed in this document.

MV 4.3-60 Spineflower preserve temporary fencing shall be shown on construction plans and installed prior to initiating construction clearing and grubbing activities within 500 feet of spineflower preserves, including the buffers. The spineflower preserve manager or a qualified biologist shall monitor fence installation. Clearing for fence installation shall be minimized to what is necessary to install the fence and, where possible, shall leave the roots of native plants in place to allow regrowth. As necessary, native vegetation will be restored and weed management will be performed following fence installation to ensure temporarily cleared native plant areas do not become weed dominated after installation. General project clearing and grubbing within 500 feet of the fence may commence upon verification by the spineflower preserve manager or the qualified biologist that protective fencing is in place and is adequate. Appropriate BMPs shall be installed at the edge of development manufactured slopes when the spineflower preserve is within 500 feet and down-slope of proposed development.

MV 4.3-61 Construction documents shall indicate that the grading contractor is responsible for protecting spineflower preserves during construction work. The construction documents shall indicate that the contractor is responsible for informing all employees and subcontractors of the environmentally sensitive areas and the proper conduct of work when working near (e.g., within 500 feet) of these areas. The construction documents shall require a pre-construction meeting to perform an "environmental education session" with the grading contractor/contractor's employees, subcontractors, and equipment operators prior to commencing construction work within 500 feet of the spineflower preserves. The environmental education session shall be conducted by the spineflower preserve manager or a qualified biologist and focus on informing workers of the location and sensitivity of the spineflower and the requirements for protecting it. The construction documents shall indicate that the grading contractor shall be responsible for mitigating any impacts to spineflower preserves due to the negligence of the grading contractor/contractor's employees, subcontractors, or equipment operators. If accidental trespass into a spineflower preserve occurs during construction, the violation shall be documented by the preserve manager and immediately reported to CDFG. Follow-up action will be taken in accordance with the Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code, Incidental Take Permit issued by CDFG.

MV 4.3-62 Construction plans shall include necessary design features and construction notes to demonstrate consistency of development in the vicinity of spineflower preserves with the Spineflower Conservation Plan (SCP). In addition to applicable erosion control plans and performance under SCAQMD Rule 403d dust control (SCAQMD 2005), the project stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). Together, the implementation of these requirements shall ensure that spineflower preserve populations are protected during construction. At a minimum, the following measures/restrictions shall be incorporated into the SWPPP and noted on construction plans, where appropriate, to avoid impacting spineflower preserves during construction:

- Avoid planting or seeding invasive species in development areas during construction phases.

- Do not use erosion control devices that may contain weeds, such as hay bales, etc., within 200 feet of spineflower preserves, or anywhere upstream of spineflower preserves.

- Do not windrow or stockpile soil within 200 feet of spineflower preserve boundaries or anywhere upstream of spineflower preserves.

- Do not locate staging areas, maintenance, or concrete washout areas within 500 feet (unless otherwise authorized by CDFG, and no closer than 200 feet in any instance), where adjacent to or anywhere upstream of spineflower preserves.

- Do not store toxic compounds, including fuel, oil, lubricants, paints, release agents, or any other construction materials that could damage spineflower habitat if spilled near spineflower preserve areas, or anywhere upstream of spineflower preserves, or along spineflower preserve boundaries.

- Provide location and details for any fencing for temporary and permanent access control along preserve boundaries (per MV 4.3-64 for temporary fencing and MV 4.3-69 for permanent fencing).

- Provide location and details for any dust control fencing along preserve boundaries (per MV 4.3-65).

- Provide location and details for any stormwater run-on controls/BMPs coming from development area to spineflower preserve (per MV 4.3-71 and MV 4.3-72).

MV 4.3-63 The spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist shall review construction plans and specifications, SWPPP, and, where appropriate, erosion control plans and implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403d dust control measures (SCAQMD 2005) prior to construction within 500 feet of spineflower preserves for compliance with the Spineflower Conservation Plan and associated permits and project-related environmental documents. A copy of the SWPPP and associated monitoring reports will be provided to CDFG.

MV 4.3-64 Spineflower preserves shall be protected prior to clearing and during construction with temporary construction fencing as described in MV 4.3-60. Openings shall be included in the fence when located within wildlife corridors and vegetation community connectivity areas to allow for the safe passage of wildlife. The spineflower preserve manager or a qualified biologist shall indicate the location and width of each of these openings. The fencing shall be three-strand non-barbed wire fence or bright orange ultraviolet stabilized polyethylene construction

"snow" fencing, attached to metal t-posts that extend at least 4 feet above grade or equivalent. Protective fencing shall be maintained in good condition until completion of project construction. Where construction activities occur within 500 feet of a spineflower preserve, the spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist shall review fencing weekly during construction monitoring visits and note any fencing that is in need of repair. Repairs shall be completed within three working days of notification by the spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist.

MV 4.3-65 Development areas shall have dust control measures implemented and maintained to prevent dust from impacting vegetation within the spineflower preserve areas. Dust control shall be implemented during construction in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403d (SCAQMD 2005). Where construction activities occur within 100 feet of a spineflower location, chemical dust suppression shall not be utilized. Where determined necessary by the spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist, a screening fence (i.e., a 6-foot-high chain link fence with green fabric up to a height of 5 feet) shall be installed to protect spineflower locations.

MV 4.3-66 The spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist shall perform weekly construction monitoring for all construction activities within 500 feet of spineflower preserve areas. The spineflower preserve manager's or qualified biologist's construction monitoring tasks shall include reviewing and approving protective fencing, dust control measures, and erosion control devices before construction work begins; conducting a contractor education session at the preconstruction meeting; reviewing the site weekly (minimum) during construction to ensure the fencing, dust control, and BMP measures are in place and functioning correctly and that work is not directly or indirectly impacting spineflower plants; and quarterly monitoring shall be initiated for Argentine ants along the construction–open space interface at sentinel locations where invasions could occur (*e.g.*, where moist microhabitats that attract Argentine ants may be created). A qualified biologist shall determine the monitoring locations. Ant pitfall traps will be placed in these sentinel locations and operated on a quarterly basis to detect invasion by Argentine ants. If Argentine ants are detected during monitoring, direct control measures will be implemented immediately to help prevent the invasion from worsening. These direct controls may include but are not limited to nest/mound insecticide treatment, or available natural control methods being developed. A general reconnaissance of the infested area would also be conducted to identify and correct the possible source of the invasion, such as uncontrolled urban runoff, leaking pipes, or collected water. Each site visit shall be followed up with a summary monitoring report sent electronically to Applicant indicating the status of the site. Monthly monitoring reports, as needed, shall be submitted to CDFG and the County of Los Angeles). Monitoring reports shall include remedial recommendations and issue resolution discussions when necessary.

MV 4.3-67 Plant palettes proposed for use on landscaped slopes, street medians, park sites, and other public landscaped and FMZ areas within 200 feet of a spineflower preserve shall be reviewed and approved within 30 days by the spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist and CDFG to ensure that the proposed landscape plants will not naturalize and require maintenance or cause vegetation community degradation in the spineflower preserve and buffer areas. Container plants to be installed within public areas within 200 feet of the spineflower preserves shall be inspected by the spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist for the presence of disease, weeds, and pests, including Argentine ants. Plants with pests, weeds, or diseases shall be rejected. In addition, for public areas within 200 feet of spineflower preserves, landscape plants shall not be on the Cal-IPC California Invasive Plant Inventory (most recent version) or on the list of Invasive Ornamental Plants listed in Appendix B of the SCP. The current Cal IPC list can be obtained from the Cal-IPC web site (http://www.cal-ipc.org/ip/inventory/index.php).

MV 4.3-68 All portions of the spineflower preserves shall be closed, with the exception of pre-identified existing dirt roads and utility easements. The pre-identified existing dirt roads and utility easement access roads shall function as access routes for the spineflower preserve manager, spineflower preserve maintenance personnel, utility personnel, and emergency services vehicles only (e.g., police, fire, and medical). No other vehicle or foot traffic, including nature or recreational trails, will be permitted in the preserve, including the buffer. The dirt roads shall be gated and locked at the outside edges of the buffer zone. Signs discouraging unauthorized access shall be posted. The only persons or entities issued gate keys shall be the spineflower preserve managers and their employees, easement holding utility companies, emergency services, the Applicant, and CDFG.

MV 4.3-69 Fencing shall be installed along the outside edge of the spineflower preserve and buffer areas adjacent to proposed developments, parks, golf courses, or other "active land uses" to prevent unauthorized access. Specific areas that are adequately protected by steep terrain (1.5:1 or steeper) and/or dense vegetation may not require fencing but would require signage. The determination of the need for fencing in these areas shall be subject to the approval of the spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist. If monitoring determines that slope and/or vegetation is not effective at deterring unauthorized access, additional fencing may be required to be added by the spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist. Fencing is not required in areas bordered by large parcels of conserved natural open space areas or the Santa Clara River riparian corridor, as installing fencing in these areas would be unnecessary and damaging to existing vegetation and wildlife corridors.

Fencing must extend a minimum of 4 feet above grade and include wood-doweled split rail fencing, exterior grade heavy-duty vinyl three-railed fencing, three-strand non-barbed wire, or approved alternate. Fencing installed adjacent to native vegetation communities and natural open space areas will allow for the passage of animals.

MV 4.3-70 Outdoor all-weather signs measuring approximately 12 by 16 inches shall be posted on all spineflower preserve access gates and along spineflower preserve fencing at approximately 800 feet on center, except adjacent to road crossings, where signs will be posted. The placement will take topography into account, emphasizing placement on ridgelines where signs will be visible to emergency fire personnel and others. Signs shall state in English and Spanish that the area is a biological preserve that hosts a state-listed endangered and federal candidate plant species and that trespassing is prohibited (in accordance with Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measure SP 4.6-68). Signs shall indicate that fuel modification and management work is not allowed within the spineflower preserve (including buffer areas). The signage shall state that people who do not abide by these rules or who damage the protected species will be subject to prosecution, including fines and/or imprisonment. All signage shall include emergency contact information and shall be reviewed and approved by the spineflower preserve manager or qualified biologist.

MV 4.3-71 Storm drain outfalls from proposed development areas shall only be installed uphill from spineflower preserve areas where necessary to retain pre-construction hydrological conditions within the spineflower preserves, sustain existing riparian and wetland vegetation communities, and/or allow for the restoration of currently disturbed areas to native riparian/alluvial vegetation communities. When located in a spineflower preserve area, storm drains must meet the following criteria:

- Storm drains must not impact spineflower either directly or indirectly, and
- Under no circumstances shall storm drains daylight onto steeply sloped areas or other areas that would cause erosion.

MV 4.3-72 Any surface water entering a spineflower preserve area from development areas during construction is required to pass through BMP measures, which will be described in the SWPPP. Storm drain outlets must contain hydrologic controls (e.g., adequate energy dissipaters) to prevent downstream erosion and stream channel down-cutting. Additionally, storm drain outlets must be designed based on pre- and post-construction hydrological studies (in accordance with Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR Mitigation Measure SP 4.6-69). Storm drains and permanent structural BMPs shall be designed by a licensed civil engineer. Requirements of MV 4.3-62 and MV 4.3-71, where applicable, shall be incorporated into the facility design and shall be subject to approval by the spineflower manager or qualified biologist. Long-term maintenance of storm drain BMPs will be the responsibility of the designated maintenance entity.

MV 4.3-73 Disturbed portions (*i.e.*, agricultural lands, disturbed lands, and developed lands) of the spineflower preserves, including buffers, will be restored through revegetation with native plant communities. In summary, areas that have greater than 30 percent relative cover by weeds will be restored to have relative cover comparable to that of existing occupied spineflower habitat. Habitat restoration and enhancement plans (including restoration plans) for areas within the preserves

shall be prepared at the direction of the preserve manager by a qualified biologist and submitted to the County and CDFG for approval prior to implementation. In addition, Cal-IPC List A and B plants that are present within the spineflower preserve will be controlled. Restoration and enhancement efforts within the spineflower preserve areas shall be in conformance with the Spineflower Conservation Plan and will not include permanent irrigation.

MV 4.3-74 In the event that a spineflower preserve, or buffer, or a portion of a spineflower preserve, or buffer burns in a wildfire or suffers from mass movements (*e.g.*, landslides, slope sloughing, or other geologic events), the spineflower preserve manager and the Applicant shall promptly review the site and determine what action, if any, should be taken. The primary anticipated post-fire spineflower preserve management activity involves monitoring the site and controlling annual weeds that may invade burned areas following a fire event, especially when such weeds (that were not previously present or not present in similar densities) exceed the 30 percent maximum threshold (see MV 4.3-73). If fire-control lines or other forms of bulldozer damage occur in the spineflower preserves, these areas will be repaired and revegetated to pre-burn conditions or better. An emergency fire response plan will be prepared (in accordance with Mitigation Measure SP-4.6-72) prior to the establishment of the spineflower preserves and approved by CDFG and Los Angeles County Fire Department. The preserve manager will contact the Los Angeles County Fire Department at least once every 5 years to review the plan and consult with them on implementation of the plan.

The same methods will be applied to mass-movement, landslide, or slope-sloughing types of events. This measure shall be implemented in conformance with the Spineflower Conservation Plan.

MV 4.3-75 Focused surveys for the undescribed species of everlasting (a special-status plant species) shall be conducted by a qualified botanist prior to the commencement of grading/construction activities wherever suitable habitat (primarily river terraces) could be affected by direct, indirect, or secondary construction impacts. The surveys shall be conducted no more than one year prior to commencement of construction activities within suitable habitat, and the surveys shall be conducted at a time of year when the plants can be located and identified. Should the species be documented within the project boundary, avoidance measures shall be implemented to minimize impacts to individual plants wherever feasible. These measures shall include minor adjustments to the boundaries/location of haul routes and other project features. If, due to project design constraints, avoidance of all plants is not possible, then further measures, described in MV 4.3-76, shall be implemented to salvage seeds and/or transplant individual plants. All seed collection and/or transplantation methods, as well as the location of the receptor site for seeds/plants (assumed to be within preserved open space areas of Newhall Ranch along the Santa Clara River), shall be coordinated with CDFG prior to impacting known occurrences of the undescribed everlasting.

MV 4.3-76 For any individual project, or any phase of an individual project, to be located where undescribed everlasting plants may occur, the Applicant shall prepare and implement an Undescribed Everlasting Mitigation and Monitoring Plan prior to the issuance of grading permits.

The Plan shall provide for replacement of individual plants to be removed at a minimum 1:1 ratio, within suitable habitat at a site where no future construction-related disturbance will occur. The plan shall specify the following: (1) the location of the mitigation site in protected/preserved areas within the Specific Plan site; (2) methods for harvesting seeds or salvaging and transplantation of individual plants to be impacted; (3) measures for propagating plants (from seed or cuttings) or transferring living specimens from the salvage site to the introduction site; (4) site preparation procedures for the mitigation site; (5) a schedule and action plan to maintain and monitor the mitigation area; (6) the list of criteria and performance standards by which to measure the success of the mitigation site (below); (7) measures to exclude unauthorized entry into the mitigation areas; and (8) contingency measures such as erosion control, replanting, or weeding to implement in the event that mitigation efforts are not successful. The performance standards for the Undescribed Everlasting Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall be the following:

(a) Within four years after reintroducing the undescribed everlasting to the mitigation site, the extent of occupied acreage and the number of established, reproductive plants will be no smaller than at the site lost for project construction.

(b) Non-native species cover will be no more than 5 percent absolute cover through the term of the restoration.

(c) Giant reed (*Arundo donax*), tamarisk (*Tamarix ramosissima*), perennial pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*), tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissimus*), pampas grass (*Cortaderia selloana*), and any species listed on the California State Agricultural list (CDFA 2009) or Cal-IPC list of noxious weeds (Cal-IPC 2006, 2007) will not be present on the revegetation site as of the date of completion approval.

MV 4.3-77 A cowbird trapping program shall be implemented once vegetation clearing begins and maintained throughout the construction, maintenance, and monitoring period of the riparian restoration sites. A minimum of five traps shall be utilized, with at least one trap adjacent to the project site and one or two traps located at feeding areas or other CDFG-approved location. The trapping contractor may consult with CDFG to request modification of the trap location(s). CDFG must approve any relocation of the traps. Traps will be maintained beginning each year on April 1 and concluding on/or about November 1 (may conclude earlier, depending upon weather conditions and results of capture). The trapping contractor may also consult CDFG on a modified, CDFG-approved trapping schedule modification. The applicant shall follow CDFG and USFWS protocol. In

the event that trapping is terminated after the first few years, subsequent phases of the development will require initiation of trapping surveys to determine whether re-establishment of the trapping program is necessary.

MV 4.3-78 Bridge and culvert designs, where practicable, shall provide roosting habitat for bats. A qualified biologist shall work with the project engineer in identifying and incorporating structures into the design that provide suitable roosting habitat for bat species occurring in the project area. The final design of the roosting structures would be chosen in consultation with CDFG.

MV 4.3-79 To preclude the invasion of Argentine ants into the spineflower preserves and their associated buffers, controls will be implemented using an integrated pest management (IPM) approach in accordance with the approved SCP. The controls include:

(1) Providing "dry zones" between urban development and spineflower populations, where typical soil moistures are maintained at levels below about 10% soil saturation, which will deter the establishment of nesting colonies of ants; and providing dry zone buffers of sufficient width to reduce the potential for Argentine ant activity within core habitat areas;

(2) Where feasible, and/or appropriate, dry areas such as parking lots and roadways shall be built next to preserve boundaries. These will be designed to slope away from the preserve to avoid runoff entering the preserve;

(3) Pedestrian pathways placed next to preserves shall consist of decomposed granite or other gravel to minimize the holding of moisture, thereby preventing establishment of suitable habitat for Argentine ant colonies;

(4) Ensuring that landscape container plants installed within 200 feet of spineflower preserves are ant free prior to installation to reduce the chance of colonies establishing in areas close to the preserves;

(5) Maintaining natural hydrological conditions in the spineflower preserves, including the buffers, through project design features for roadways, French drains, irrigation systems, underground utilities, drainage pipes and fencing, storm drains, and any other BMP measures that apply to surface water entering the preserve areas; and

(6) Using drought-resistant plants in FMZs and minimizing irrigation to the extent feasible.

MV 4.3-80 The mitigation program shall incorporate applicable principles from the interagency Federal Guidance for the Establishment, Use, and Operation of Mitigation Banks (60 FR 58605–58614) to the extent feasible and appropriate, particularly the guidance on administration and accounting. Nothing in the section 404 or section 2081 Permit or section 1605 Agreement shall preclude the applicant from selling mitigation credits to other parties wishing to use those

permits or that agreement for a project and/or maintenance activity included in the permits/agreement.

MV 4.3-81 The 1,518-acre Salt Creek area shall be offered for phased dedication to the public pursuant to Condition 42 of the approved Specific Plan. Using a "rough step" land dedication approach, irrevocable offers of dedication will be provided to CDFG for identified impact offsets in accordance with the Comprehensive Mitigation Implementation Plan (MV 4.3-23). The Salt Creek area includes approximately 629 acres of coastal scrub communities within both Ventura and Los Angeles counties. This land dedication shall be managed in conjunction with the 4,205-acre High Country SMA (containing 1,314 acres of coastal scrub communities).

a. To facilitate wildlife movement between the north side of SR-126 and the Salt Creek area, enhancements will be made to the existing agricultural undercrossing and to the agricultural land at the base of Salt Creek as discussed in MV 4.3-84. A Wildlife Movement Enhancement Plan shall be submitted to the Corps and CDFG for approval prior to implementation. The plan shall include at the minimum the following:

i. A portion of the agricultural field on the north side of SR-126 will be dedicated to wildlife movement. Trees and/or scrubs will be planted in the agricultural field to guide wildlife into the existing undercrossing.

ii. On the south side of SR-126 two rows of trees/scrubs will be planted to guide wildlife to the Santa Clara River.

iii. A wildlife corridor will be created through the agricultural fields at the base of Salt Creek Canyon. (The second part of this mitigation measure (a.i. through a.iii.) has been identified to offset cumulative impacts to wildlife habitat, including coastal scrub. Implementation of the measure is linked directly to construction activities related to the widening of SR-126 and/or the southern portion of the Homestead Village area, but is not required for implementation with the Mission Village tract map.)

MV 4.3-82 Supplemental restoration of coastal scrub shall be conducted as an adaptive management measure pursuant to MV 4.3-24. Eight areas were identified in the Draft Newhall Ranch Mitigation Feasibility Report in the High Country SMA, Salt Creek area, and River Corridor SMA (Dudek 2007A) for coastal scrub restoration. In the event that coastal scrub restoration is required pursuant to MV 4.3-24, the applicant shall develop a Coastal Scrub Restoration Plan, subject to the approval of CDFG. The plan shall specify, at a minimum, the following: (1) the location of mitigation sites to be selected from suitable mitigation land in the High Country and Salt Creek areas identified in the Feasibility Study; (2) a description of "target" vegetation (native shrubland) to include estimated cover

and abundance of native shrubs; (3) site preparation measures to include topsoil treatment, soil decompaction, erosion control, temporary irrigation systems, or other measures as appropriate; (4) methods for the removal of non-native plants (*e.g*., mowing, weeding, raking, herbicide application, or burning); (5) the source of all plant propagules (*e.g.*, seed, potted nursery stock, *etc*. collected from within five miles of the restoration site), the quantity and species of seed or potted stock of all plants to be introduced or planted into the restoration/enhancement areas; (6) a schedule and action plan to maintain and monitor the enhancement/restoration areas, to include at minimum, qualitative annual monitoring for revegetation success and site degradation due to erosion, trespass, or animal damage for a period no less than two years; (7) as needed where sites are near trails or other access points, measures such as fencing, signage, or security patrols to exclude unauthorized entry into the restoration/enhancement areas; and (8) contingency measures such as replanting, weed control, or erosion control to be implemented if habitat improvement/restoration efforts are not successful.

Habitat restoration/enhancement will be judged successful when: (1) percent cover and species richness of native species reach 50% of cover and species richness at reference sites; and (2) the replacement vegetation has persisted at least one summer without irrigation.

MV 4.3-83 a. As a supplement to MV 4.3-1, MV 4.3-23 and MV 4.3-31 through MV 4.3-43, and MV 4.3-80, additional habitat mitigation through replacement or enhancement of nesting/foraging habitat for least Bell's vireo will be provided for certain key habitat zones at higher ratios (identified as "key population areas" in [EIR] Figure 4.5-86, Alternative 2 Impacts to Least Bell's Vireo Habitat). Southern willow scrub, southern cottonwood–willow riparian, arrow weed scrub, mulefat scrub, and Mexican elderberry scrub and woodland that provide nesting/foraging habitat for least Bell's vireo in "key population areas" shall be replaced or enhanced. All permanent loss to nesting/foraging habitat in key population areas shall be mitigated at a 5:1 ratio unless otherwise authorized by CDFG or USFWS. Temporary habitat loss of foraging/nesting habitat in key population areas shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio. The requirements for replacing habitat by either creating new habitat or removing exotic species from existing habitat shall follow the procedures outlined in MV 4.3-1, MV 4.3-23 and MV 4.3-31 through MV 4.3-43, and MV 4.3-80. To replace the lost functions of habitat located adjacent to the Santa Clara River due to noise impacts, all nesting/foraging habitat within the 60 dBA sound contour (associated with development site roadway improvements) shall be considered degraded. Nesting/foraging habitat within this area shall be mitigated at a ratio of 2:1.

b. The loss of documented occupied nesting habitat for coastal California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated. If the coastal California gnatcatcher is identified nesting on site, the applicant will acquire or preserve nesting coastal California gnatcatcher habitat at a 3:1 ratio for impacts to documented occupied habitat, or by the ratio specified in MV 4.3-31, whichever is greater. Mitigation acquisition

shall occur at an agreed-upon location as approved by the USFWS upon consultation. The applicant shall enter into a binding legal agreement regarding the preservation of occupied habitat describing the terms of the acquisition, enhancement, and management of those lands.

MV 4.3-84 Road undercrossings will be built in accordance with accepted design criteria to allow the passage of mountain lions and mule deer. The applicant shall prepare a Wildlife Movement Corridor Plan that specifically addresses wildlife movement corridors at San Martinez Grande, Chiquito Canyon, and Castaic Creek, which shall be monitored for one year prior to construction of the SR-126 widenings. The Plan shall address current movement that is occurring, the methods that will be implemented to provide for passage, including lighting, fencing, vegetation planting, the installation of bubblers to encourage wildlife usage, and the size of the passage. The applicant shall install motion cameras at these locations in consultation with CDFG and monitor these passages for a period of two years subsequent to constructing improvements. A report of the wildlife documented to utilize these crossings shall be provided to CDFG annually. In addition, the Salt Creek crossing west of the Project area will be enhanced prior to initiation of construction in Long Canyon (southern portion of the Homestead Village). This crossing will be monitored for one year at the initiation of RMDP development, for two years at the time the crossing is enhanced, and then for three years after Project build-out. Prior to the construction of adjacent developments, signs will be placed along the roads indicating potential wildlife crossings where mountain lions and mule deer are likely to cross. (This mitigation measure has been identified to offset cumulative impacts to wildlife habitat (including coastal scrub). Implementation of the measure is linked directly to construction activities related to the widening of SR-126 and/or the southern portion of the Homestead Village area, but is not required for implementation with the Mission Village tract map.)

MV 4.3-85 At least 1,900 acres of Open Area within the Specific Plan area shall be offered for dedication to an NLMO in fee and/or by conservation easement. These 1,900 acres of the Open Area will be left as natural vegetation. Dedication of open areas lands shall be reported annually to CDFG.

MV 4.3-86 Pre-construction surveys for San Emigdio blue butterfly shall occur in all areas containing host plants in sufficient density to support this species. A qualified Lepidoptera biologist shall conduct focused surveys at a time of year and during weather conditions when the detection of eggs, larvae, or adults is possible. All occupied habitat shall be mapped and the locations provided to CDFG. Should the removal of quail brush or other documented host plants from occupied San Emigdio blue butterfly habitat in Potrero Canyon or other areas be required, the plants shall be removed when eggs and larvae are not present (*i.e.*, mid-September to March). Removal of quail brush plants from the documented habitat in Potrero Canyon may only be conducted from April through early September if it is determined by a qualified biologist that eggs and/or larvae are not present on the plants to be removed.

MV 4.3-87 The removal of quail brush or other documented host plants from any occupied San Emigdio blue butterfly habitat in Potrero Canyon or other areas shall be replaced at a minimum of a 1.5:1 ratio. The replacement plants shall be planted contiguous to the existing quail brush plants associated with the San Emigdio blue butterfly habitat. The success of the replanting shall be monitored for survival and vigor consistent with survivorship requirements of Mitigation Measure MV 4.3-35 and MV 4.3-36.

MV 4.3-88 Prior to any construction activities occurring within 200 feet of any occupied San Emigdio blue butterfly habitat in Potrero Canyon or other areas, the boundaries of preserved areas of the habitat shall be clearly marked with flagging. The flagging would serve to identify the boundaries of the habitat to construction personnel and to prevent the inadvertent construction-related loss of quail brush or other host plants associated with the habitat. Construction personnel working in the area shall be informed that the removal of or damage to any flagged quail brush or other host plants located outside the disturbance footprint is prohibited.

MV 4.3-89 The Newhall Ranch JPA will have overall responsibility for recreation within and conservation of the High Country. The Newhall Ranch JPA and NLMO shall develop and implement a conservation education and citizen awareness program for the High Country SMA informing the public of the special-status resources present within the High Country SMA and providing information on common threats posed by the presence of people and pets to those resources. The NLMO shall install trailhead and trail signage indicating the High Country SMA is a biological conservation area and advising that people and their animals must stay on existing trails at all times and that violators may be cited. The NLMO shall provide quarterly maintenance patrols to remove litter and monitor trail expansion and fire hazards within the High Country SMA, funded by the JPA.

MV 4.3-90 The status of the Potrero Canyon San Emigdio blue butterfly colony shall be monitored by a qualified biologist for a period of five years after Potrero Canyon Road construction completion/operation commencement to evaluate whether the operation of the road may be contributing to a population decline in the colony. Should it be determined that a population decline is occurring, habitat creation for the San Emigdio blue butterfly shall be implemented in suitable locations contiguous to the habitat but away from the road. A habitat creation plan will be prepared that details the location and methods for creating habitat, that specifies success criteria, and that describes measures that will be implemented in the event that the habitat creation does not stabilize the San Emigdio blue butterfly population.

MV 4.3-91 The installation of new, or relocation of existing, utility poles and phone and cell towers shall be coordinated with CDFG where located in the High Country SMA and Salt Creek area. The applicant or SCE shall install utility poles, phone, and cell towers in conformance with APLIC standards for collision-reducing techniques as outlined in Suggested Practices for Avian Protection on Power Lines: The State of the Art in 2006 (APLIC 2006).

MV 4.3-92 a. All surfaces on new antennae and phone/utility towers shall be designed and operated with anti-perching devices in conformance with APLIC standards to deter California condors and other raptors from perching. During construction the area shall be kept clean of debris, such as cable, trash, and construction materials. The applicant shall collect all microtrash and litter (anything shiny, such as broken glass), vehicle fluids, and food waste from the Project area on a daily basis. Workers will be trained on the issue of microtrash: what constitutes microtrash, its potential effects on California condors, and how to avoid the deposition of microtrash.

b. The applicant shall retain a qualified biologist with knowledge of California condors to monitor construction activities within the Project area. The resumes of the proposed biologist(s) will be provided to CDFG for concurrence. This biologist(s) will be referred to as the authorized biologist hereafter. During clearing and grubbing of construction areas, the qualified biologist shall be present at all times. During mass grading, construction sites shall be monitored on a daily basis. The authorized biologist will have the authority to stop all activities until appropriate corrective measures have been completed. If condors are observed landing in the Project area, the applicant shall avoid further construction within 500 feet of the sighting until the animals have left the area, or as otherwise authorized by CDFG and USFWS. All condor sightings in the Project area will be reported to CDFG and USFWS within 24 hours of the sighting. Should condors be found roosting within 0.5 mile of the construction area, no construction activity shall occur between one hour before sunset to one hour after sunrise, or until the condors leave the area, or as otherwise directed by USFWS. Should condors be found nesting within 1.5 miles of the construction area, no construction activity will occur until further authorization occurs from CDFG and USFWS.

c. To further protect California condor potentially foraging in the Project area over the long term from negative interactions with humans and/or artificial structures, the applicant or the JPA or the NLMO shall remove dead cattle that are found or reported within 1,000 feet of a residential or commercial development boundary. Dead cattle shall be relocated to a predetermined location within the High Country SMA or Salt Creek area. The locations where carcasses shall be placed shall be a minimum of 1,000 feet from a development area boundary. Appropriate locations for transfer of carcasses include open grasslands and oak/grassland areas where condors can readily detect carcasses and easily land and take off without encountering physical obstacles such as powerlines and other utility structures. The proposed locations would be selected and approved by the CDFG and USFWS. Pursuant to this measure, a telephone number for reporting dead cattle shall be provided and actively maintained. Any cattle carcasses transferred to the relocation areas shall be reported to the USFWS Condor group.

3.3.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the identified potentially significant biota-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant water service-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.4 TRAFFIC/ACCESS

3.4.1 Potential Significant Impacts

As approved, the Specific Plan would generate 357,000 average daily trips ("ADT"). The Specific Plan's Program EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant impacts, but that the identified mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to a level below significant.

Construction Impacts

During construction of the Mission Village project, trucks to deliver construction equipment and building supplies and to haul away demolition debris potentially would disrupt traffic on local roadways resulting in a short-term impact that could adversely affect regional or local roadway operations. With implementation of traffic management controls for construction vehicles where necessary, no significant traffic impacts associated with construction of the project would occur.

Operational Impacts

At project buildout, which is anticipated in Year 2021, Mission Village would generate approximately 58,000 average daily vehicle trips. Consistent with County of Los Angeles, City of Santa Clarita, and California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") traffic impact analysis guidelines, the impacts of the proposed project relative to the capacity of the surrounding roadways were analyzed under four different scenarios: (1) existing plus ambient plus project conditions; (2) 2021 project buildout cumulative conditions; (3) long-range (2035) cumulative conditions; and (4) existing plus project conditions. Project impacts under scenarios 1 and 4 are addressed in this Section 3.4; cumulative impacts identified under scenarios 2 and 3 are addressed in Section 6.6.

Under existing plus ambient plus project conditions, the project plus ambient traffic would result in significant impacts at the intersections of The Old Road and McBean Parkway, and Commerce Center Drive and SR-126. Mitigation is provided that would reduce the identified impacts to a level below significant. Additionally, prior to recordation of the project's first tract map and at designated thresholds thereafter, the project applicant will revise the Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, which identifies the necessary improvements and the residential unit thresholds (timing requirements) based on then-current phasing assumptions.

No significant impacts would occur to Congestion Management Program ("CMP") intersections or CMP freeway segments, or to the Interstate 5 (I-5) mainline. With respect to transit, the project potentially would increase demand for transit ridership beyond the capacity of existing services, thereby resulting in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation is proposed that would reduce the identified impacts to a level below significant.

With respect to on-site roadways, the installation of traffic signals at identified intersections, and the monitoring of other identified intersections for future traffic signal installation, would ensure that on-site impacts remain below a level of significant.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project's traffic/access impacts would be mitigated to a level below significant and no unavoidable significant impacts would occur.

Under existing plus project conditions, which is a hypothetical scenario presented for information purposes that assumes immediate full project buildout and does not account for cumulative traffic growth and future roadway improvements and, therefore, potentially understates and overstates project impacts, the project would result in significant impacts at the following intersections and freeway segments:

- The Old Road & Rye Canyon Road (County) [impacts mitigated by EIR mitigation]
- McBean Parkway & Magic Mountain Parkway (City) [impacts mitigated by EIR mitigation]
- McBean Parkway & Newhall Ranch Road (City) [impacts mitigated by EIR mitigation]
- Bouquet Canyon Road & Newhall Ranch Road (City) [impacts mitigated by EIR mitigation]
- Commerce Center Drive & SR-126 (Caltrans/County) [impacts mitigated by EIR mitigation]
- Southbound I-5 between Calgrove & SR-14 (Caltrans) [impacts mitigated by I-5 Improvement Project]
- I-5 South of SR-14 between SR-14 and I-210 (Caltrans) [impacts mitigated by completion of I-5/SR-14 Direct High Occupancy Vehicle ("HOV") Connector project]

The impacts identified under this scenario would be mitigated to a level below significant with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this Section and Section 6.6, and improvements presently being constructed or programmed for construction. The I-5/SR-14 Direct HOV Connector project is approximately 60 percent complete at this time and is anticipated to be completed in Fall 2012, well in advance of Mission Village project buildout. The existing plus project analysis, however, assumes the improvement is not in place with project buildout and, therefore, under this scenario, the proposed project would result in significant impacts on I-5 south of the SR-14 interchange, south to the junction with I-210. With completion of the Direct HOV Connector project, there would be no significant impacts south of the SR-14 interchange. As to the segment of I-5 between Calgrove and SR-14, the improvement recommended to mitigate the identified impact is the addition of one truck lane in the

southbound direction. This improvement will be constructed as part of the first phase of construction of the I-5 HOV/Truck Lanes SR-14 to Parker Road Improvement Project; the Early Implementation Project, which will include construction of a truck lane in the southbound direction from Pico/Lyons to the SR-14, is scheduled to be completed in July 2013, also well in advance of project buildout. The project applicant will pay to Caltrans the Mission Village project's pro-rata share of the costs to implement the I-5 Improvement Project. (See Section 6.6.2, Mitigation Measure MV 4.5-29.)

3.4.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant traffic/access-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.4.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.8-1 The applicants for future subdivision maps which permit construction shall be responsible for funding and constructing all on-site traffic improvements except as otherwise provided below. The obligation to construct improvements shall not preclude the applicant's ability to seek local, state, or federal funding for these facilities. *(All on-site traffic improvements included as part of the Mission Village project will be funded and/or constructed by the project applicant.)*

SP 4.8-2 Prior to the approval of each subdivision map which permits construction, the applicant for that map shall prepare a transportation performance evaluation which shall indicate the specific improvements for all on-site roadways which are necessary to provide adequate roadway and intersection capacity as well as adequate right-of-way for the subdivision and other expected traffic. Transportation performance evaluations shall be approved by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works according to standards and policies in effect at that time. The transportation performance evaluation shall form the basis for specific conditions of approval for the subdivision. *(EIR Section 4.5 provides the required transportation performance evaluation and, in combination with EIR Project Description, Section 1.0, indicates the on-site roadway improvements necessary to provide adequate capacity.)*

SP 4.8-3 The applicants for future subdivisions shall provide the traffic signals at the 15 locations labeled "B" through "P" in Figure 4.8-17 [of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Final EIR] as well as any additional signals warranted by future subdivision design. Signal warrants shall be prepared as part of the transportation performance evaluations noted in Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 [of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Final EIR]**.** *[Ten (10) intersections located within the Mission Village site will be signalized intersections, including the three (3) intersections depicted as signalized by* Specific Plan *Figure 4.8-17: Commerce Center Drive and "A" Street, Commerce Center Drive and Magic Mountain Parkway, and Magic Mountain Parkway and "A" Street. EIR Section 4.5 in combination with the traffic analysis presented in EIR Appendix 4.5, provides the*

required signal warrants.]

SP 4.8-4 All development within the *Specific Plan* shall conform to the requirements of the Los Angeles County Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance

SP 4.8-5 The applicants for all future subdivision maps which permit construction shall consult with the local transit provider regarding the need for, and locations of, bus pull-ins on highways within the *Specific Plan* area. All bus pull-in locations shall be approved by the Department of Public Works, and approved bus pull-ins shall be constructed by the applicant.

SP 4.8-6 Prior to the recordation of the first subdivision map which permits construction, the applicant for that map shall prepare a transportation performance evaluation which shall determine the specific improvements needed to each off-site arterial and related costs in order to provide adequate roadway and intersection capacity for the expected Specific Plan and General Plan buildout traffic trips. The transportation performance evaluation shall be based on the Master Plan of Highways in effect at that time and shall be approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The applicant shall be required to fund its fair share of improvements to these arterials, as stated on Table 4.8-18 [of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Final EIR]. The applicants' total funding obligation shall be equitably distributed over the housing units and non-residential building square footage (i.e., Business Park, Visitor-Serving, Mixed-Use, and Commercial) in the *Specific Plan*, and shall be a fee to be paid to the County and/or the City at each building permit. For off-site areas within the County unincorporated area, the applicant may construct improvements for credit against or in lieu of paying the fee. (*This mitigation measure may or may not be applicable depending upon approval of other Newhall Ranch Specific Plan subdivisions in process.)*

SP 4.8-7 Each future performance evaluation which shows that a future subdivision map will create significant impacts on SR-126 shall analyze the need for additional travel lanes on SR-126. If adequate lane capacity is not available at the time of subdivision, the applicant of the subdivision shall fund or construct the improvements necessary to serve the proposed increment of development. Construction or funding of any required facilities shall not preclude the applicant's ability to seek state, federal, or local funding for these facilities. *(The future performance evaluation presented in EIR Section 4.5 determined that the Mission Village project would cause significant impacts at the Chiquito Canyon Road/SR-126 intersection under the Stage 1 plus Related Projects scenario, and at the Commerce Center Drive/SR-126 intersection at buildout, and that the project would be responsible for its fair-share of improvements to these intersections.)*

SP 4.8-8 Project-specific environmental analysis for future subdivision maps which allow construction shall comply with the requirements of the CMP in effect at the time that subdivision map is filed. *(The future performance evaluation presented in EIR Section 4.5 complies with the requirements of the Congestion Management Program presently in effect.)*

SP 4.8-9 Prior to the recordation of the first subdivision map which permits construction, the applicant for that map shall prepare a transportation evaluation including all of the Specific Plan land uses which shall determine the specific improvements needed to the following intersections with SR-126 in the City of Fillmore and community of Piru in Ventura County: "A," "B," "C," "D," and "E" Streets, Old Telegraph, Olive, Central, Santa Clara, Mountain View, El Dorado Road, and Pole Creek (Fillmore), and Main/Torrey and Center (Piru). The related costs of those intersection improvements and the project's fair share shall be estimated based upon the expected Specific Plan traffic volumes. The transportation performance evaluation shall be based on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways in effect at that time and shall be approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The applicant's total funding obligation shall be equitably distributed over the housing units and non-residential building square footage (i.e., Business Park, Visitor Center, Mixed Use, and Commercial) in the *Specific Plan*, and shall be a fee to be paid to the City of Fillmore and the County of Ventura at each building permit. (*This mitigation measure may or may not be applicable depending upon approval other Newhall Ranch Specific Plan subdivisions in process. The referenced transportation evaluation was prepared as part of the Landmark Village EIR (SCH No. 2004021002).)*

SP 4.8-10 The Specific Plan is responsible to construct or fund its fair-share of the intersections and interchange improvements indicated on Table 4.8-18 [of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Final EIR]. Each future transportation performance evaluation required by Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 [of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Final EIR] which identifies a significant impact at these locations due to subdivision map-generated traffic shall address the need for additional capacity at each of these locations. If adequate capacity is not available at the time of subdivision map recordation, the performance evaluation shall determine the improvements necessary to carry Specific Plan generated traffic, as well as the fair share cost to construct such improvements. If the future subdivision is conditioned to construct a phase of improvements which results in an overpayment of the fair-share cost of the improvement, then an appropriate adjustment (offset) to the fees paid to Los Angeles County and/or City of Santa Clarita pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.8-6, above, shall be made. *(The transportation performance evaluation presented in EIR Section 4.5 fulfills the requirements of this* Specific Plan *mitigation measure relative to Mission Village.)*

SP-4.8-11 The applicant of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall participate in an I-5 developer fee program, if adopted by the Board of Supervisors for the Santa Clarita Valley. *(The Board of Supervisors has not adopted a developer fee program for the Santa Clarita Valley. However, the applicant and Caltrans have prepared a funding agreement under which the applicant will pay to Caltrans the project's pro-rata share of the I-5 Improvement Project. See Final EIR, Appendix F4.5.)*

SP-4.8-12 The applicant of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall participate in a transit fee program, if adopted for the entire Santa Clarita Valley by Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita. *(The applicant will be required to pay the applicable transit fees in place at the time of map recordation.)*

SP-4.8-13 Prior to the approval of each subdivision map which permits construction, the applicant for that map shall prepare a traffic analysis approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The analysis will assess project and cumulative development (including an existing plus cumulative development scenario under the County's Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines [TIA] and its Development Monitoring System [DMS]). In response to the traffic analysis, the applicant may construct off-site traffic improvements for credit against, or in lieu of paying, the mitigation fees described in Mitigation Measure 4.8-6 [of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Final EIR]. If future subdivision maps are developed in phases, a traffic study for each phase of the subdivision map may be submitted to determine the improvements needed to be constructed with that phase of development. *(The traffic analysis presented in EIR Section 4.5 fulfills the requirements of this Specific Plan mitigation measure.)*

3.4.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's traffic impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

MV 4.5-1 The Old Road & McBean Parkway - Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County Department of Public Works (DPW) approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, the project applicant shall stripe a third southbound through lane and a westbound right-turn lane at the intersection. Detailed signing and striping plans and traffic signal plans shall be submitted to the County Department of Public Works for review and approval. (*The Mission Village project's fair-share responsibility for the improvements identified in this mitigation measure is 27% in the cumulative condition. This fair-share information is provided to facilitate any future action by the Project applicant to seek participatory funding from other development unrelated to the Mission Village project. Please refer to EIR Appendix 4.5, Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. ("AFA") Traffic Impact Analysis, Appendix J, for fair-share calculations.*)

MV 4.5-2 Commerce Center Drive & SR-126 - The project applicant shall reconstruct the existing intersection as a grade-separated interchange prior to issuance of building permits for the 2,780th residential unit and 935,000 square feet of non-residential commercial uses (or an equivalent traffic-generating combination thereof), or as otherwise provided in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, whichever would require reconstruction of the intersection first. Detailed signing and striping plans and traffic signal plans shall be submitted to the County Department of Public Works for review and approval. (*The Mission Village project's fair-share responsibility for the improvements identified in this mitigation measure is 44.8% in the cumulative condition. This*

fair-share information is provided to facilitate any future action by the Project applicant to seek participatory funding from other development unrelated to the Mission Village project.)

MV 4.5-10 Applicable transit mitigation fees shall be paid by the project applicant at the time of building permit issuance, unless modified by an approved transit mitigation agreement.

MV 4.5-11 Prior to the commencement of project construction activities, the project applicant shall institute construction traffic management controls in accordance with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) traffic manual. These traffic management controls shall include measures determined on the basis of site-specific conditions including, as appropriate, the use of construction signs (e.g., "Construction Ahead") and delineators, and private driveway and cross-street closures.

MV 4.5-12 Traffic signals shall be installed at the following intersections within the project site. The design and construction of the traffic signals shall be the sole responsibility of the project. The signals shall be in place to the satisfaction of the County Department of Public Works. Detailed signing and striping plans and traffic signal plans shall be submitted to Public Works for review and approval:

- B Street at Magic Mountain Parkway;
- A Street at Magic Mountain Parkway;
- Commerce Center Drive at A Street;
- KK Drive/HH Street at Magic Mountain Parkway;
- II Drive at Magic Mountain Parkway;
- Westridge Parkway at Magic Mountain Parkway;
- Commerce Center Drive at Magic Mountain Parkway;
- Commerce Center Drive at DD Drive;
- Commerce Center Drive at GG Street; and
- Westridge Parkway at QQ Street (Fire Station Signal).

MV 4.5-13 The project applicant, or the current owner of the development, shall monitor the following intersections for the installation of traffic signals once the Mission Village elementary school is opened and every year thereafter for up to five years after the certificate of occupancy of the last residential unit of Mission Village (excluding age restricted/qualified residential units and residential units within the Saugus School District) is issued and the full planned occupancy of 900 students

for the school is reached (or fewer students if official documentation from the Newhall School District shows no increase in student enrollment for five consecutive school years):

- A Street at B Street/CC Drive;
- Q1 Street at A Street; and
- HH Street/R Street at A Street.

The referenced monitoring shall include the submittal of annual traffic signal warrant analyses to the County Department of Public Works for review and approval. At the time, if any, traffic signals are warranted, the applicant shall enter into a secured agreement/bond with Public Works to guarantee the installation of traffic signals, design the necessary striping and signal plans, and construct the signals to the satisfaction of Public Works. Any security for the traffic signal construction submitted will be returned once the construction is completed to the satisfaction of Public Works or at the expiration of the referenced monitoring program.

MV 4.5-14 The project shall install a traffic signal at the following location after detailed signing and striping plans and traffic signal plans have been reviewed and approved by the County Department of Public Works:

- Westridge Parkway at Old Rock Road.

MV 4.5-15 Prior to recordation of the first tract map in Mission Village, a revised Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis (RPA), prepared and submitted by the project applicant, shall be reviewed and approved by the County Department of Public Works (DPW). This RPA shall update the previously approved RPA and identify the necessary improvements and residential unit thresholds (timing requirements) for those improvements for Mission Village based on then-current phasing assumptions. The revised RPA shall include actual traffic counts on newly constructed roadways and/or at intersections where traffic mitigation measures have been carried out. Subsequent updates of the RPA shall be prepared based on the following development thresholds:

i) 3,176 residential units and 13.17 million square feet non-residential uses;

ii) 6,066 residential units and 14.87 million square feet non-residential uses;

iii) 14,515 residential units and 16.00 million square feet non-residential uses;

iv) 21,373 residential units and 17.65 million square feet non-residential uses;

v) 25,001 residential units and 19.78 million square feet non-residential uses; and

vi) 27,615 residential units and 22.08 million square feet non-residential uses.

In addition, the applicant shall submit to DPW for review and approval an annual report, due January 30th for the prior year, identifying the number and type of residential and commercial building permits issued for Mission Village (and any other development within the Westside Santa Clarita area). The purpose of this annual report will be to track development progress against the thresholds identified in the AFA Traffic Impact Analysis and the then-current RPA.

3.4.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the identified potentially significant direct traffic/access impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant traffic/access-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.5 NOISE

3.5.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Program EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan, on a project-specific and cumulative basis, would result in potentially significant impacts, specifically due to the exposure of on-site sensitive receptors to roadway and stationary noise levels that exceed applicable standards. However, the Program EIR further found that the identified mitigation measures would reduce said impacts to less-than-significant levels.

During approximately 96-months of construction activity, development of the Mission Village site would involve clearing and grading of approximately 28.9 million cubic yards of earthen material in a balanced cut and fill operation, and the building of the proposed improvements. These activities involve the temporary use of heavy equipment, smaller equipment, and motor vehicles, which generate both steady static and episodic noise. This noise primarily would affect the occupants of on-site uses constructed in the earlier phases of the development, as well as residents of the off-site Westridge development, resulting in potentially significant impacts that would be mitigated to a level below significant. While this construction activity noise could be audible to occupants of Travel Village Recreational Vehicle Park ("Travel Village" or "Travel Village RV Park") when construction activities would occur on the northwestern portion of the site, the increased noise levels would not exceed the applicable thresholds of significance and, therefore, would not result in significant impacts.

Daytime pile driving in the Santa Clara Riverbed, should it occur during the construction of the proposed Commerce Center Drive Bridge, would be audible to occupants of on-site uses constructed prior to the bridge, and to the occupants of Travel Village and nearby non-residential uses, including visitors and employees of Magic Mountain Theme Park. When utilizing conventional equipment, and assuming no attenuation by terrain, structures or vegetation, the potential range of significant noise impacts for noise sensitive receptors from this activity would

be approximately 4,000 feet, and would occur for a period of approximately 9–12 months during the latter phases of project construction. Noise-sensitive receptors on the site within this 4,000-foot range could include persons that would reside in apartments, condominiums, and single-family residences constructed prior to the bridge. Off-site sensitive receptors within this 4,000-foot range would include occupants of the eastern half of Travel Village. Pile driving noise impacts on future residents of Landmark Village, should Landmark Village be constructed before the Commerce Center Drive Bridge, would be less than significant.

Because pile driving could cause noise levels at nearby existing and future receptors to exceed the Noise Ordinance standards, construction noise impacts are considered significant without mitigation. These impacts were identified in the Draft EIR as significant and unavoidable due to the contingent nature of the Draft EIR mitigation (if feasible) and the limited methods available to reduce noise levels. However, at the Commission's request, the applicant conducted additional analysis and review, and has revised the EIR mitigation to eliminate the prior contingency and add additional methods alternative to conventional pile-drilling that would reduce noise levels substantially.. Accordingly, revised mitigation is included that requires the use of pile drilling techniques or hydrohammer pile driving equipment with noise reduction, or an alternative methodology (in lieu of conventional pile driving equipment) that would achieve equivalent noise level reductions. With mitigation, potential noise impacts attributable to pile-driving activities would be reduced to a level below significant.

As to the associated vibration impacts, although the piles would be driven into alluvial deposits, which tend to have a dampening effect on vibrations, vibration from the pile driving, should that method be utilized, would result in potentially significant impacts within 500 feet of the activity. These impacts were identified in the Draft EIR as significant and unavoidable due to the contingent nature (if feasibile) of the Draft EIR mitigation. However, the mitigation has been revised to eliminate the contingency and, as revised, the mitigation would reduce any potential impacts to a level below significant.

After project completion, traffic along Commerce Center Drive and Magic Mountain Parkway would cause significant noise impacts at several future on-site single-family and multi-family residences that would back onto these roadways. Lots 561, 562, 563 and 564, which are planned for single-family residences, and Lot 512, which is planned for residential/commercial, would experience significant noise impacts. There also is potential for some multi-family residences in lots designated Mixed Use Commercial (such as Lot 512), depending upon their location and orientation within each lot, to experience significant noise impacts from traffic along these roadways. Noise levels would be reduced to less than significant through the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Traffic volumes along Westridge Parkway through the project site would be less than half of those along Magic Mountain Parkway and Commerce Center Drive (individually) and, as a result, noise levels along Westridge Parkway would not result in significant noise impacts on future on-site noise-sensitive receptors along this roadway or to residential land use located to the south near the Westridge Parkway and Valencia Boulevard intersections.

Noise from the adjacent Magic Mountain Theme Park would be audible to receptors on the eastern edge of Mission Village. The theme park is operational year-round with most activity

taking place during the summer months. With a few exceptions, the park closes by 10:00 PM, but may remain open as late as 1:00 AM. Noise monitoring along the eastern edge of the Mission Village site demonstrates that noise levels from the theme park on the developed portion of the project site would be less than 60 dB(A) L_{eq} and not incompatible with the land uses proposed along the eastern portion of the site. As a result, noise impacts from activities at the theme park would be less than significant.

Periodic fireworks displays are expected to continue at the theme park. These displays occur predominantly during holidays and at Thanksgiving and Christmas. With the exception of the display on July 4th, which typically lasts 15 minutes, the displays last between 1 and 2 minutes. All displays occur before 10:00 PM. Fireworks are an impulsive noise source, which means, under Section 12.08.190 of the County's Noise Ordinance, that it is of short duration, usually less than one second and of high intensity, with an abrupt onset and rapid decay. As a result, potential noise impacts attributable to the fireworks displays are considered less than significant.

Post-project buildout mobile source noise levels at Travel Village from traffic along SR-126 would exceed 70.0 dB(A) Community Noise Equivalent Level ("CNEL") at locations where recreational vehicles are inhabited. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.9-14 from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR, the project applicant is required to construct a noise abatement barrier to reduce noise levels at Travel Village to 70 dB(A) CNEL or less.

3.5.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant noise-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.5.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.9-1 All construction activity occurring on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site shall adhere to the requirements of the "County of Los Angeles Construction Equipment Noise Standards," County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Section 12.08.440 as identified in [Specific Plan Program EIR] Table 4.9-3.

SP 4.9-2 Limit all construction activities near occupied residences to between the hours of 6:30 AM and 8:00 PM, and exclude all Sundays and legal holidays pursuant to County Department of Public Works, Construction Division standards.

SP 4.9-3 When construction operations occur adjacent to occupied residential areas, implement appropriate additional noise reduction measures that include changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, notifying adjacent residences in advance of construction work, and installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.

SP 4.9-4 Locate construction staging areas on site to maximize the distance between staging areas and occupied residential areas.

SP 4.9-5 Where new single-family residential buildings are to be constructed within an exterior noise contour of 60 dB(A) CNEL or greater, or where any multi-family buildings are to be constructed within an exterior noise contour of 65 dB(A) CNEL or greater, an acoustic analysis shall be completed prior to approval of building permits. The acoustical analysis shall show that the building is designed so that interior noise levels resulting from outside sources will be no greater than 45 dB(A) CNEL. *(The noise impacts analysis presented in EIR Section 4.6, and the information contained in EIR Appendix 4.6, provide the acoustical analysis required by this mitigation measure.)*

SP 4.9-6 For single-family residential lots located within the 60 dB(A) CNEL or greater noise contour, an acoustic analysis shall be submitted prior to tentative approval of the subdivision. The acoustic analysis shall show that exterior noise in outdoor living areas (e.g., back yards, patios, etc.) will be reduced to 60 dB(A) CNEL or less. *(The noise impacts analysis presented in EIR Section 4.6, and the information contained in EIR Appendix 4.6, provide the acoustical analysis required by this mitigation measure.)*

SP 4.9-7 For multi-family residential lots located within the 65 dB(A) CNEL or greater noise contour, an acoustic analysis shall be submitted prior to tentative approval of the subdivision. The acoustic analysis shall show that exterior noise in outdoor living areas (e.g., back yards, patios, etc.) will be reduced to 65 dB(A) CNEL or less. *(The noise impacts analysis presented in EIR Section 4.6, and the information contained in EIR Appendix 4.6, provide the acoustical analysis required by this mitigation measure.)*

SP 4.9-8 For school sites located within the 70 dB(A) CNEL or greater noise contour, an acoustic analysis shall be submitted prior to tentative approval of the subdivision. The acoustic analysis shall show that noise at exterior play areas will be reduced to 70 dB(A) CNEL or less. *(The noise impacts analysis presented in EIR Section 4.6, and the information contained in EIR Appendix 4.6, provide the acoustical analysis required by this mitigation measure.)*

SP 4.9-9 All residential air conditioning equipment installed within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site shall adhere to the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Residential Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Noise Standards, County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Section 12.08.530.

SP 4.9-10 All stationary and point sources of noise occurring on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site shall adhere to the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Section 12.08.390 as identified in [Specific Plan Program EIR] Table 4.9-2, County of Los Angeles Exterior Noise Standards for Stationary and Point Noise Sources.

SP 4.9-11 Loading, unloading, opening, closing, or other handling of boxes, crates, containers, building materials, garbage cans or similar objects between the hours of 10:00 PM and 6:00 AM in such a manner as to cause a noise disturbance is

prohibited in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Section 12.08.460.

SP 4.9-12 Loading zones and trash receptacles in commercial and Business Park areas shall be located away from adjacent residential areas, or provide attenuation so that noise levels at residential uses do not exceed the standards identified in Section 12.08.460 of the Ordinance No. 11743.

SP 4.9-13 Where residential lots are located with direct lines of sight to the Magic Mountain Theme Park, an acoustic analysis shall be submitted to show that exterior noise on the residential lots generated by activities at the park do not exceed the standards identified in Section 12.08.390 of the Ordinance No. 11743 as identified in Table 4.9-2, County of Los Angeles Exterior Noise Standards for Stationary and Point Noise Sources. *(The noise impacts analysis presented in EIR Section 4.6, and the information contained in EIR Appendix 4.6, provide the acoustical analysis required by this mitigation measure.)*

SP 4.9-14 After the time that occupancy of uses on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site occurs, AND when noise levels at Travel Village reach 70 dB(A) CNEL at locations where recreational vehicles are inhabited, the applicant shall construct a noise abatement barrier to reduce noise levels at Travel Village to 70 dB(A) CNEL or less. *(This mitigation measure may or may not be applicable to Mission Village depending upon approval of other Newhall Ranch Specific Plan subdivisions in process.)*

SP 4.9-15 Despite the absence of a significant impact, applicants for all building permits of Residential, Mixed-Use, Commercial, and Business Park land uses (Project) shall pay to the Santa Clara Elementary School District, prior to issuance of building permits, the Project's pro rata share of the cost of a sound wall to be located between SR-126 and the Little Red School House. The Project's pro rata share shall be determined by multiplying the estimated cost of the sound wall by the ratio of the project's estimated contribution of average daily trips on SR-126 (ADT) at the Little Red School House (numerator) to the total projected cumulative ADT increase at that location (denominator).[6] The total projected cumulative ADT increase shall be determined by subtracting the existing trips on SR-126[7] from the projected cumulative trips as shown in [Specific Plan Program EIR] Table 1 of Topical Response 5 – Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County after adding the total Newhall Ranch ADT traveling west of the City of Fillmore. *(The applicant will pay its pro-rata fee prior to the issuance of building permits in accordance with this mitigation measure.)*

---

[6] Cost of Sound Wall X (Project ADT on SR-126 @ LRSH*/Total Projected Cumulative ADT Increase on SR-126 @ LRSH*) * LRSH = Little Red School House.

[7] 25,165 ADT using linear extrapolation from Table 1 of Topical Response 5 – Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County.

SP 4.9-16 Despite the absence of a significant impact, the applicant for all building permits of Residential, Mixed-Use, Commercial and Business Park land uses (Project) shall participate on a fair-share basis in noise attenuation programs developed and implemented by the City of Moorpark to attenuate vehicular noise on SR-23 just north of Casey Road for the existing single-family homes which front SR-23. The mitigation criteria shall be to reduce noise levels to satisfy State noise compatibility standards. The Project's pro rata share shall be determined by multiplying the estimated cost of attenuation by the ratio of the project's estimated contribution of average daily trips on SR-23 (ADT) north of the intersection of SR-23 and Casey Road (numerator) to the total projected cumulative ADT increase at that location (denominator).[8] The total projected cumulative ADT increase shall be determined by subtracting the existing trips on SR-23 north of Casey Road[9] from the projected cumulative trips as shown in [Specific Plan Program EIR] Topical Response 5 – Traffic Impacts of the Program EIR to State and Local Roads in Ventura County after adding the total Newhall Ranch ADT traveling south of the City of Fillmore. *(The applicant will pay its pro-rata fee prior to the issuance of building permits in accordance with this mitigation measure.)*

SP 4.9-17 Prior to the approval of any subdivision map which permits construction within the Specific Plan area, the applicant for that map shall prepare an acoustical analysis assessing project and cumulative development (including an existing plus project analysis, and an existing plus cumulative development analysis including the project). The acoustical analysis shall be based upon state noise land use compatibility criteria and shall be approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services. *(The noise impacts analysis presented in EIR Section 4.6, and the information contained in EIR Appendix 4.6, provide the acoustical analysis required by this mitigation measure.)*

In order to mitigate any future impacts resulting from the project's contribution to significant cumulative noise impacts to development in existence as of the adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and caused by vehicular traffic on off-site roadways, the applicant for building permits of Residential, Mixed-Use, Commercial, Visitor Serving and Business Park land uses shall, prior to issuance of building permits, pay a fee to Los Angeles County, Ventura County, the City of Fillmore or the City of Santa Clarita. The amount of the fee shall be the project's fair-share under any jurisdiction-wide or Santa Clarita Valley-wide noise programs adopted by any of the above jurisdictions. *(The proposed Mission Village project would contribute to a significant cumulative noise impact to the Travel Village Recreational Vehicle Park; however, the project would not contribute to significant cumulative noise impacts to other development in existence as of the adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and caused by*

[8] Cost of mitigation x (Project ADT on SR-23 north of Casey Road/Total Projected cumulative ADT Increase on SR-23 north of Casey Road).

[9] ADT using linear extrapolation from Table 1 of Topical Response 5 – Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County.

vehicular traffic on off-site roadways. Mitigation Measure SP 4.9-14 requires that the Specific Plan applicant construct a noise abatement barrier at a specified time to reduce noise levels at Travel Village to 70 dB(A) CNEL or less. Because the noise abatement barrier would mitigate the identified significant impact, no further mitigation is required. In addition, the mitigation measure is not applicable because neither Los Angeles County nor the City of Santa Clarita has adopted a countywide or citywide noise program.)

3.5.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the Mission Village project's noise impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

MV 4.6-1 The project applicant, or its designee, shall not undertake construction activities that can generate noise levels in excess of the County's *Noise Ordinance* on Sundays or legal holidays.

MV 4.6-2 When construction operations occur in close proximity to on- or off-site occupied residences, and if it is determined by County staff during routine construction site inspections that the construction equipment could generate a noise level at the residences that would be in excess of the *Noise Ordinance*, the project applicant, or its designee, shall implement appropriate additional noise reduction measures. These measures shall include, among other things, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, notifying residents in advance of construction work, and installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.

MV 4.6-3 In lieu of conventional pile driving, the project developer shall utilize cast-in-drilled-hole piles, or hydrohammer pile driving equipment with noise reduction, or an alternative methodology that would achieve noise level reductions, in those circumstances in which pile-driving activities would occur within 4,000 feet of sensitive receptors.

Pile drilling is an alternate method of pile installation where a hole is drilled into the ground up to the required elevations and concrete is then cast into it. The estimated noise level of pile drilling at 50 feet is 80 to 95 dB(A) L_{eq} compared to 90 to 105 dB(A) L_{eq} of conventional pile driving.[10] Therefore, pile drilling generally produces noise levels approximately 10 to 15 decibels lower than pile driving.

Hydrohammer pile driving equipment uses an enclosed hydraulically driven hammer with noise reduction. Noise can be reduced to less than 80 dB(A) at 25 feet, 70 dB(A) at 80 feet, 65 dB(A) at 150 feet, and 60 dB(A) at 250 feet.[11]

---

[10] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances, December 1971.

[11] IHC Merwede, *IHC Hydrohammer Pile Driving Equipment*, 2011.

MV 4.6-4 If pile driving is utilized for the Commerce Center Drive Bridge construction consistent with the limitations imposed by Mitigation Measure MV 4.6-3, the project applicant shall, to the extent necessary, reduce the level of vibration impact by:

- identifying all uses in the vicinity, if any, at which the vibration perception threshold may exceed permissible County limits identified in Section 12.08.560 of the County's Noise Ordinance; and

- installing seismographs at the aforementioned sensitive locations, if any, to ensure that Section 12.08.560 of the County's *Noise Ordinance* is not exceeded, and/or that the pile driving would not cause structural damage or adversely affect vibration-sensitive equipment; and

- if the seismographs determine the permissible perception threshold is exceeded at any of the uses, adjusting vibration amplitudes of the pile driving on the conditions of the affected structures, the sensitivity of equipment, and/or human tolerance to reduce the vibration level to permissible limits.

MV 4.6-5 To mitigate the noise impacts on Lots 561, 562, 563 and 564 (Area A2) (single-family residential) that back onto Commerce Center Drive from traffic on the proposed Commerce Center Drive extension through the site, the project applicant shall, prior to occupancy, construct a 5-foot solid wall along the rear lot lines of these lots. The wall may be constructed of 3/8 or 5/8-inch Plexiglas or other material of similar acoustic performance, and shall be continuous with no breaks or gaps.

Draft EIR Mitigation Measure MV 4.6-6 applied to Lot 468, which previously was designated for apartment/condominium use. When VTTM No. 61105 was revised December 15, 2010, the spineflower preserves were expanded to include Lot 468. Therefore, as Lot 468 no longer includes sensitive receptors and would not be signficantly impacted by project noise, Mitigation Measure MV 4.6-6 is no longer necesary.

MV 4.6-7 To mitigate the noise impacts on Lot 508 (Mixed Use Commercial) from traffic on the proposed Commerce Center Drive extension through the site, the project applicant shall place planned frequent use areas for the residential component if any in the interior of the lot and separated from the roadway by structures. Alternatively, if residential uses are proposed, the project applicant shall construct a 5-foot berm/solid wall along the property line that abuts Commerce Center Drive.

MV 4.6-8 To mitigate the noise impacts on Lot 512 (Mixed Use Residential/Commercial) from traffic on the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension through the site, the project applicant shall place planned frequent use areas for the residential component in the interior of the lot and separated from the roadway by structures.

Alternatively, the project applicant shall construct a 5-foot berm/solid wall along the property line that abuts Commerce Center Drive.

MV 4.6-9 When the final plans for the Mixed-Use Residential/Commercial lots are complete showing the locations and orientations of the residences within the lots are complete, acoustic analyses shall be conducted by a qualified acoustic consultant to ensure that interior noise levels of any residences within the commercial lots can be feasibly reduced to 45 dB(A).

MV 4.6-10 All residences located within Mixed-Use Residential/Commercial areas and within 200 feet of the centerlines of Commerce Center Drive and/or Magic Mountain Parkway shall incorporate the following roadway noise-reducing measures into the exterior wall that faces onto those roadways:

(a) All windows, both fixed and operable, shall consist of either double-strength glass or double-paned glass. All windows facing sound waves generated from the mobile source noise shall be manufactured and installed to specifications that prevent any sound from window vibration caused by the noise source.

(b) Doors shall be solid core and shall be acoustically designed with gasketed stops and integral drop seals.

(c) If necessitated by the architectural design of a structure, special insulation or design features shall be installed to meet the required interior ambient noise level.

The specifications in this measure shall be refined when the final plans showing the locations and orientations of the residences within the lots along Commerce Center Drive and Magic Mountain Parkway are completed. Interior noise levels of all residences within lots designated for Mix Use shall not exceed of 45 dB(A) CNEL.

MV 4.6-11 Air conditioning units shall be installed to serve all living areas of all residences located with direct lines of sight to Commerce Center Drive and/or Magic Mountain Parkway so that windows may remain closed without compromising the comfort of the occupants.

MV 4.6-12 If residential lots abut portions of commercial lots where delivery truck/garbage truck activities would occur, a method of noise attenuation shall be specified by a qualified acoustic consultant that reduces noise to a level within normally acceptable levels identified in the applicable compatibility guidelines.

MV 4.6-13 All HVAC units within commercial lots adjacent to residential uses shall be enclosed so that noise levels from the units are no greater than 60 dB(A) at the property line when in proximity to single-family residences, and no greater than 65 dB(A) at the property line when in proximity to multi-family residences (apartments and condominiums).

MV 4.6-14 Balconies with direct lines of sight to Commerce Center Drive and/or Magic Mountain Parkway shall be discouraged from exposure to exterior noise levels greater than the 60 dB(A) CNEL standard for single-family residences or the 65 dB(A) CNEL standard for multi-family residences through architectural or site design. Alternatively, balconies shall be enclosed by solid noise barriers, such as 3/8-inch glass or 5/8-inch Plexiglas to a height specified by a qualified noise consultant that results in noise levels within normally acceptable levels identified in the applicable compatibility guidelines.

MV 4.6-15 Prior to all home sales and rentals within Mission Village, the project applicant, or its designee, shall inform prospective buyers and renters that fireworks displays periodically occur at Magic Mountain Theme Park and that instantaneous noise levels at the eastern boundary of Mission Village could exceed 90 dB(A) for the duration of the displays. The disclosure statement shall include information on the current permits to conduct fireworks displays on the theme park, including dates of the fireworks, estimated times, and durations.

3.5.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the identified potentially significant noise-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant noise-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.6 WATER SERVICE

3.6.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The analysis presented in the Specific Plan EIR forecasted that an adequate supply of water exists in the Santa Clarita Valley to meet the demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Nonetheless, the County adopted 22 water-related Specific Plan mitigation measures relative to water supply.

The proposed Mission Village project would generate a total water demand of 2,805 acre-feet per year ("afy"), which is comprised of 1,531 afy of potable water demand, and 1,274 afy of non-potable demand. Potable water demand (1,531 afy) would be met by the Valencia Water Company through the use of the project applicant's rights to 7,038 afy of groundwater from the Alluvial aquifer, which is presently used by the applicant for agricultural irrigation. Because this water is already used to support the applicant's existing agricultural uses, there would be no significant environmental effects resulting from the use of such water to meet the potable demands of the Mission Village project, which is part of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area. In addition, due to project conditions of approval, the amount of groundwater that will be used to meet the potable demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, including the Mission Village project, cannot exceed the amount of water historically and presently used by the

applicant for agricultural uses. Therefore, no net increase in groundwater use will occur with implementation of this project pursuant to the Specific Plan.

Non-potable water demand (1,274 afy) would be met through the use of recycled (reclaimed) water from the initial phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP, with buildout of the WRP occurring over time as demand for treatment increases with implementation of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Alternatively, if the Newhall Ranch WRP is not operating at the time of project occupancy, the non-potable water demand would be met through the use of recycled water from the existing Valencia WRP, located upstream of the Mission Village project site.

Accordingly, the proposed project's water demand would be met by relying on two primary sources of water supply, namely, the applicant's agricultural water supplies and recycled water supplied by the Newhall Ranch WRP or the existing Valencia WRP. Because these two independent water sources meet the water needs of the proposed project, no potable water would be needed from the existing or planned water supplies of Castaic Lake Water Agency ("CLWA"), including imported water from CLWA's State Water Project ("SWP") supplies.

Based on the information presented, an adequate supply of water is available to serve the Mission Village project, and no significant water supply or water quality impacts are expected from supplying available water to meet the demands of the Mission Village project.

3.6.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the following mitigation measures will ensure that the water service-related impacts of the project remain at less-than-significant levels:

3.6.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

Certain Specific Plan mitigation measures are not applicable to the Mission Village project, and were omitted from these findings for that reason. Those measures are SP 4.11-5, SP 4.11-11 through SP 4.11-14, SP 4.11-18, and SP 4.11-20. In addition, other Specific Plan mitigation measures already have been complied with by the project applicant via the preparation of particular environmental studies or similar documentation of water availability, and have been omitted for that reason. Those measures are SP 4.11-6 and SP 4.11-17. For additional information regarding such measures, please refer to Section 4.8, Water Service, of the Draft EIR.

SP 4.11-1 The proposed Specific Plan shall implement a water reclamation system in order to reduce the Specific Plan's demand for imported potable water. The Specific Plan shall install a distribution system to deliver non-potable reclaimed water to irrigate land uses suitable to accept reclaimed water, pursuant to Los Angeles County Department of Health Standards. (*Consistent with this measure, the Project Description section of the EIR discusses the fact that the Mission Village project will install and implement a recycled water delivery system in order to reduce the project's demand for imported potable water. As required by this measure, recycled (reclaimed) water would be used to irrigate land uses suitable*

to accept recycled water, pursuant to Los Angeles County Department of Health standards.)

SP 4.11-2 Landscape concept plans shall include a palette rich in drought-tolerant and native plants. *(Consistent with this measure, the Mission Village project's landscape plans shall include a palette rich in drought-tolerant and native plants.)*

SP 4.11-3 Major manufactured slopes shall be landscaped with materials that will eventually naturalize, requiring minimal irrigation. (*Consistent with this measure, the Mission Village project's grading/landscape plans shall include a note requiring landscaping with materials that will eventually naturalize, requiring minimal irrigation.*)

SP 4.11-4 Water conservation measures as required by the State of California shall be incorporated into all irrigation systems. (*Consistent with this measure, the Mission Village project shall incorporate into all of its irrigation systems, water conservation measures required by the State of California.*)

SP 4.11-7 Prior to commencement of use, all uses of recycled water shall be reviewed and approved by the State of California Health and Welfare Agency, Department of Health Services. (*Consistent with this measure, the Mission Village project's recycled water delivery system shall be reviewed and approved by the State of California Health and Welfare Agency, Department of Health Services.*)

SP 4.11-8 Prior to the issuance of building permits that allow construction, the applicant of the subdivision shall finance the expansion costs of water service extension to the subdivision through the payment of connection fees to the appropriate water agency(ies). (*Consistent with this measure, prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant for the Mission Village project shall pay for and construct the required water service extension to the Mission Village subdivision.*)

SP 4.11-9 Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that the Upper Santa Clara Water Committee (or Santa Clarita Valley Water Purveyors), made up of the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 36, Newhall County Water District, Santa Clarita Water Division of CLWA and the Valencia Water Company, prepare an annual water report that will discuss the status of groundwater within the Alluvial and Saugus Aquifers, and State Water Project water supplies as they relate to the Santa Clarita Valley. The report will also include an annual update of the actions taken by CLWA to enhance the quality and reliability of existing and planned water supplies for the Santa Clarita Valley. In those years when the Committee or purveyors do not prepare such a report, the applicant at its expense shall cause the preparation of such a report that is acceptable to the County to address these issues. This annual report shall be provided to Los Angeles County who will consider the report as part of its local land use decision-making process. (*As an update, a total of 10 annual water reports have been prepared and provided to the County of Los Angeles, the City of Santa Clarita and other interested persons*

and organizations from 1998 through 2008. The latest 2009 Water Report is included in EIR Appendix 4.8.)

SP 4.11-10 Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), in cooperation with other Santa Clarita Valley retail water providers, continue to update the *UWMP* for Santa Clarita Valley once every five years (on or before December 31) to ensure that the County receives up-to-date information about the existing and planned water supplies in the Santa Clarita Valley. The County will consider the information contained in the updated *UWMP* in connection with the County's future local land use decision-making process. The County will also consider the information contained in the updated *UWMP* in connection with the County's future consideration of any Newhall Ranch tentative subdivision maps allowing construction. (*CLWA and other local retail water purveyors have completed and adopted the 2005 UWMP. The County will consider the information contained in the adopted 2005 UWMP in connection with the Mission Village project.*)

SP 4.11-15 Groundwater historically and presently used for crop irrigation on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site and elsewhere in Los Angeles County shall be made available by the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, to partially meet the potable water demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The amount of groundwater pumped for this purpose shall not exceed 7,038 afy. This is the amount of groundwater pumped historically and presently by the Newhall Land and Farming Company in Los Angeles County to support its agricultural operations. Pumping this amount will not result in a net increase in groundwater use in the Santa Clarita Valley.

To monitor groundwater use, the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide the County an annual report indicating the amount of groundwater used in Los Angeles County and the specific land upon which that groundwater was historically used for irrigation. For agricultural land located off the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site in Los Angeles County, at the time agricultural groundwater is transferred from agricultural uses on that land to Specific Plan uses, The Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide a verified statement to the County's Department of Regional Planning that Alluvial aquifer water rights on that land will now be used to meet Specific Plan demand. (*Consistent with this measure, the applicant has provided the County with the annual reports, and the reports are included in EIR Appendix 4.8.*)

SP 4.11-16 The agricultural groundwater used to meet the needs of the Specific Plan shall meet the drinking water quality standards required under Title 22 prior to use. (*Consistent with this measure, the agricultural groundwater used to meet the needs of the Mission Village project shall meet the drinking water quality standards required under Title 22 prior to use.*)

SP 4.11-19 A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Water Resource Monitoring Program has been entered into between United Water Conservation District and the Upper Basin Water Purveyors, effective August 20, 2001. The MOU/Water Resource Monitoring Program, when executed, will put in place a joint water resource monitoring program that will be an effective regional water management tool for both the Upper and Lower Santa Clara River areas as further information is developed, consistent with the MOU. This monitoring program will result in a database addressing water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over various representative water cycles. The parties to the MOU intend to utilize this database to further identify surface water and groundwater impacts on the Santa Clara River Valley. The applicant, or its designee, shall cooperate in good faith with the continuing efforts to implement the MOU and Water Resource Monitoring Program.

As part of the MOU process, the United Water Conservation District and the applicant have also entered into a "Settlement and Mutual Release" agreement, which is intended to continue to develop data as part of an ongoing process for providing information about surface and groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley. In that agreement, the County and the applicant have agreed to the following:

"4.3 Los Angeles County and Newhall will each in good faith cooperate with the parties to the MOU and will assist them as requested in the development of the database calibrating water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over multi-year water cycles. Such cooperation will include, but not be limited to, providing the parties to the MOU with historical well data and other data concerning surface water and groundwater in the Santa Clara River and, in the case of Newhall, providing Valencia Water Company with access to wells for the collection of well data for the MOU.

4.4 Los Angeles County and Newhall further agree that the County of Los Angeles will be provided with, and consider, the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program in connection with, and prior to, all future Newhall Ranch subdivision approvals or any other future land use entitlements implementing the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. If the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program identifies significant impacts to surface water or groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley, Los Angeles County will identify those impacts and adopt feasible mitigation measures in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act." *(Since the MOU was signed in 2001, the United Water Conservation District and the Upper Basin Water Purveyors (CLWA, Los Angeles County Waterworks District #36, CLWA Santa Clarita Water Division, NCWD and Valencia Water Company) have worked together to accomplish the stated purpose and objectives of the MOU. The MOU has resulted in the collection and analysis of groundwater and other hydrologic data, along with construction and*

calibration of a sophisticated regional groundwater flow model for the Upper Basin. These efforts benefit the service areas of both the United Water Conservation District and the Upper Basin water purveyors.)

SP 4.11-21 The applicant, in coordination with RWQCB staff, shall select a representative location upstream and downstream of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and sample surface and groundwater quality. Sampling from these two locations would begin upon approval of the first subdivision map and be provided annually to the RWQCB and County for the purpose of monitoring water quality impacts of the Specific Plan over time. If the sampling data results in the identification of significant new or additional water quality impacts resulting from the Specific Plan, which were not previously known or identified, additional mitigation shall be required at the subdivision map level. (*This measure is not applicable until subdivision map approval for the Mission Village project.*)

SP 4.11-22 Beginning with the filing of the first subdivision map allowing construction on the Specific Plan site and with the filing of each subsequent subdivision map allowing construction, the Specific Plan applicant, or its designee, shall provide documentation to the County of Los Angeles identifying the specific portion(s) of irrigated farmland in the County of Los Angeles proposed to be retired from irrigated production to make agricultural water available to serve the subdivision. As a condition of subdivision approval, the applicant or its designee, shall provide proof to the County that the agricultural land has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the subdivision. (*Consistent with this measure, the applicant of the Mission Village project has provided the County with this documentation. As a condition of approval of the Mission Village tract map, the applicant will provide proof to the County that the agricultural land in the County proposed to be retired from irrigated production, in fact, has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the Mission Village subdivision.*)

3.6.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

In addition to the adopted Specific Plan mitigation measures, the following water-related mitigation measure is applicable to the Mission Village project:

MV 4.8-1 Upon the issuance of building permits associated with each subdivision map allowing construction within the Mission Village site, the applicant shall pay Facility Capacity Fees to the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) in accordance with CLWA policies and procedures.

3.6.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and ensure that the water service-related impacts of the Mission Village project, as identified in the Final EIR, remain at less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project,

which mitigate or avoid potentially significant water service-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.7 WASTEWATER DISPOSAL

3.7.1 Potential Significant Impacts

Construction-related wastewater disposal impacts would be less than significant, as portable, on-site sanitation facilities would be utilized during construction activities.

Once project construction is complete, the proposed Mission Village project would generate a worst-case average total of approximately 0.96 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater. Of the total project wastewater generation, approximately 0.695 mgd would be treated by the Newhall Ranch County Sanitation District ("NRSD") at the Newhall Ranch WRP once WRP construction is complete. Due to gravitational limitations, the remaining approximately 0.266 mgd would be permanently treated at the Valencia WRP, subject to conditions specified in a Joint Sewerage Services Agreement to be executed between NRSD and the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District ("SCVSD").

The treatment capacity of the Newhall Ranch WRP would be 6.8 mgd, with a maximum flow of 13.8 mgd. Until the development of the Newhall Ranch WRP is complete, there are three potential scenarios for the interim conveyance and treatment of the portion of wastewater generated by the Mission Village project that ultimately would be permanently treated at the Newhall Ranch WRP. The first scenario is to construct an initial phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP to serve the Mission Village project site, with buildout of the WRP occurring over time as demand for treatment increases. Under this scenario, the initial phase of the WRP would be designed and constructed to accommodate the project's predicted wastewater generation. The second scenario would temporarily direct all wastewater flows from the Mission Village project by pipeline across the Commerce Center Drive Bridge to the existing Valencia WRP until the first phase of the Newhall Ranch WRP is complete. The third scenario assumes that the Commerce Center Drive Bridge is not constructed until after occupancy of some of the land uses in the Mission Village project, and an interim pump station would be constructed that would direct wastewater to the existing Valencia WRP. Under both the second and third scenarios, wastewater from the Mission Village project would be pumped temporarily to the Valencia WRP; however, the developer (Newhall) would still be required to build the Newhall Ranch WRP.

Under an Interconnection Agreement with the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District ("SCVSD"), the Valencia WRP can temporarily treat wastewater for up to 6,000 Newhall Ranch dwelling units in Mission Village and Landmark Village until such time as the Newhall Ranch WRP is constructed and operational. The Interconnection Agreement was developed to establish a logical plan for the development and administration of the new NRSD and its infrastructure, and it sets conditions under which the first 6,000 homes in Newhall Ranch may temporarily discharge wastewater to the existing Valencia WRP. The conditions include payment of the standard connection fee (fair share of the cost of the existing infrastructure) and transfer of title of the 22-acre Newhall Ranch WRP site to the NRSD. Newhall Ranch residents also would pay the SCVSD an annual service charge to recover the full cost of treating their wastewater at the

Valencia WRP. As stated, temporary treatment of wastewater at the existing Valencia WRP would not eliminate the need for the developer to construct the Newhall Ranch WRP and to finance the new sewerage system within the Specific Plan area; instead, the temporary treatment of wastewater at the existing Valencia WRP is a practical engineering decision based on the need to build up an adequate, steady flow of wastewater before starting up the Newhall Ranch WRP.

Based on the SCVSD future wastewater generation estimates and the planned expansion of the Saugus and Valencia WRPs, the Valencia WRP would have sufficient capacity to temporarily accommodate the Mission Village project's total predicted wastewater generation of 0.96 mgd. Additionally, the Mission Village project is expected to produce wastewater chloride concentrations similar to those in the existing SCVSD service area; therefore, the interim discharge of wastewater from the Valencia WRP due to the Mission Village project's wastewater would not impact the SCVSD's ability to comply with the adopted chloride TMDL.

The County also rejects claims that the Interconnection Agreement was "hidden" from public review. To the contrary, the agreement was considered and approved by SCVSD's predecessor Boards (i.e., Districts 26 and 32) at their January 9, 2002 meeting, which was noticed, the subject of an agenda, and open to the public in compliance with the Brown Act. Further, the agreement was referenced in prior County staff reports supporting formation of the new NRSD (see, for example, Department of Public Works staff report to the Board of Supervisors, dated December 1, 2005, pages 3-4; and the Department's staff report to the Board, dated January 18, 2011, both of which are incorporated by reference).

Based on the above information and that provided in **Topical Response 5:Chloride** in the Mission Village Final EIR, the wastewater disposal impacts of the Mission Village project would be less than significant.

3.7.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the following mitigation measures will ensure that the wastewater disposal-related impacts of the project remain at less-than-significant levels:

3.7.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.12-1 The Specific Plan shall reserve a site of sufficient size to accommodate a water reclamation plant to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. (*This measure has been implemented by the Board of Supervisors' approval of the Newhall Ranch WRP within the boundary of the Specific Plan.*)

SP 4.12-2 A 5.8 to 6.9 mgd water reclamation plant shall be constructed on the Specific Plan site, pursuant to County, state and federal design standards, to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. (*This measure will be implemented pursuant to the project-level analysis already completed for the Newhall Ranch WRP in the certified Newhall Ranch Specific Plan EIR.*)

SP 4.12-3 The Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan shall be implemented pursuant to County, state and federal design standards. *(The proposed Mission Village sewer system*

would implement the previously adopted Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan relative to the Mission Village portion of the Specific Plan.)

SP 4.12-4 Prior to recordation of each subdivision permitting construction, the applicant of each subdivision shall obtain a letter from the new County sanitation district stating that treatment capacity will be adequate for that subdivision. *(This mitigation measure, as it applies to Mission Village, will be implemented concurrent with project development.)*

SP 4.12-5 All facilities of the sanitary sewer system will be designed and constructed for maintenance by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and/or the new County sanitation district or similar entity in accordance with their manuals, criteria, and requirements. *(This mitigation measure, as it applies to Mission Village, will be implemented concurrent with project development.)*

SP 4.12-6 Pursuant to Los Angeles County Code, Title 20, Division 2, all industrial waste pretreatment facilities shall, prior to the issuance of building permits, be reviewed by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Industrial Waste Planning and Control Section and/or the new County sanitation district, to determine if they would be subject to an Industrial Wastewater Disposal Permit. *(To the extent this mitigation measure applies to Mission Village, it will be implemented concurrent with project development.)*

SP 4.12-7 Each subdivision permitting construction shall be required to be annexed into the Los Angeles County Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District. *(This mitigation measure, as it applies to Mission Village, will be implemented concurrent with project development.)*

3.7.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures beyond those identified above are required or necessary, because the Mission Village project does not result in any significant wastewater disposal impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measures.

3.7.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and ensure the wastewater disposal-related impacts of the Mission Village project, as identified in the Final EIR, remain at less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant wastewater disposal-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.8 SHERIFF SERVICES

3.8.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Specific Plan Program EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would significantly increase the demand for sheriff (police) protection services throughout the Newhall Ranch site and the local vicinity. The Program EIR further estimated that the Specific Plan would require the services of an additional 20 sworn officers and 8.5 civilian support personnel at build-out. However, the Program EIR concluded that adoption of the recommended mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department provides the primary police protection service for the Specific Plan site, including the proposed Mission Village site, and the surrounding Santa Clarita Valley area. Additionally, the Department of the California Highway Patrol (CHP) provides traffic regulation enforcement; emergency incident management; and service and assistance on Interstate 5 (I-5), State Route 126 (SR-126), SR-14, and other major roadways in the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley area.

The Sheriff's Department current deputy-to-resident ratio without the proposed project is less than the desired level of service set by the County. With respect to the CHP, the Newhall Area CHP Station currently is able to provide adequate service to the Mission Village Project site and the Santa Clarita Valley, and the station does not anticipate any increase or a need to increase it's equipment in the future; no upgrades to the CHP station are planned.

Buildout of the Mission Village project would significantly increase the demand for police protection and traffic-related services on the project site and in the local vicinity. Based on the Sheriff Department's standard deputy-to-resident ratio, the proposed project would require the services of an additional 11 sworn officers. Payment of the applicable law enforcement facilities fees and new tax revenues generated by the project would provide the funds necessary to employ and equip the additional officers and mitigate impacts to the Sheriff's Department to a less than significant level. Additionally, although not made necessary by the project, the applicant has entered into negotiations with the Sheriff's Department for the provision of a Sheriff station site that would serve the entire Specific Plan site. Thus, by facilitating establishment of a Sheriff's station in the project vicinity, the proposed project would mitigate any cumulatively considerable impacts to sheriff services.

As to the CHP, the proposed project also would increase demands for CHP services in the project area. However, through increased revenues generated by the proposed project (via motor vehicle registration fees and drivers license fees paid by new on-site residents and businesses), the project would generate more than sufficient funding for the additional staffing and equipment that would be needed to serve the project area. This funding can and should be allocated by the state CHP to the local Santa Clarita Valley Station, consistent with present funding practices, to meet projected demands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant project impacts to CHP services, nor would the project contribute to any cumulatively considerable impacts to CHP services.

Construction activities related to the proposed project would increase the incidence of petty crimes on the site and also would increase construction traffic on SR-126 that may potentially delay emergency vehicles traveling through the area. However, by retaining the services of a private security company to patrol the project construction site, and by implementing a construction traffic control plan, any potentially significant construction-related impacts to law enforcement services would be reduced to a level below significant.

Finally, new resident and daytime populations (employees and visitors) at the project site would be subject to the same potential hazards as existing County residents. It is expected that State and County emergency evacuation plans would be implemented (and amended as necessary) to provide for the safe evacuation of all County residents and employees. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur relative to emergency evacuation in the event of a natural or man-made disaster.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project's impacts on law enforcement services would be mitigated to below a level of significance, and no unavoidable significant impacts would occur.

3.8.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant law enforcement-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.8.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.17-1 As subdivision maps are submitted to the County for approval in the future, the applicant shall incorporate County Sheriff's Department design requirements (such as those pertaining to site access, site security lighting, etc.) which will reduce demands for Sheriff's service to the subdivisions and which will help ensure adequate public safety features within the tract designs.

3.8.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's impacts on law enforcement services, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

MV 4.11-1 Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project applicant, or its designee, shall enter into an agreement with the California Highway Patrol for traffic control services during project construction. Such traffic control shall include the posting of reduced construction zone speed limit signs as necessary.

MV 4.11-2 Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project applicant, or its designee, shall retain the services of a private security company to patrol the construction site(s), as necessary, to minimize the potential for trespass, theft and other unlawful activity associated with construction-related activities.

MV 4.11-3 Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project applicant, or its designee, shall prepare an approved traffic management plan for construction activities affecting rights-of-way within the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

MV 4.11-4 Prior to the issuance of building permits or certificates of occupancy as applicable, the project applicant, or its designee, shall pay to the County the applicable law enforcement facilities fee required by Los Angeles County Code section 22.74.010, et seq., or, in the alternative, shall enter into an agreement with the County for the in lieu payment of such fees.

MV 4.11-5 Prior to the issuance of building permits or certificates of occupancy as applicable, the project applicant, or its designee, shall incorporate the following crime prevention measures into the proposed Project:

- Provide lighting in open areas and parking lots;
- Ensure the visibility of doors and windows from the street;
- Ensure that the required building address numbers are lighted and readily apparent from the street for emergency response agencies; and
- Provide knox box entry key system for law enforcement if a gated community, gated apartments or gated town homes are planned in the project boundary.

3.8.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the identified potentially significant law enforcement services-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant sheriff services-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.9 FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

3.9.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Specific Plan Program EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would significantly increase the demand for fire protection services. The Program EIR recommended and the County adopted four mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Fire protection and emergency medical response services for the Mission Village project and the surrounding area are provided by the County's Fire District. Thirteen fire stations and four fire

camps provide fire protection services for the Santa Clarita Valley area. The closest station to the project site is Fire Station 76, located at 27223 Henry Mayo Drive in Valencia. The closest available district response units would provide fire protection services. Should a significant incident occur, the entire resources of the Fire Department, not just the stations closest to the site, would serve the project. The County's Fire Department and a franchise private ambulance company also provide paramedic services to the area.

The Mission Village project site is located in an area that has been designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (formerly called Fire Zone 4) by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, which denotes the County Forester's highest fire hazard potential.

Pursuant to mitigation adopted by the County as part of its approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, and project specific mitigation proposed by the Mission Village EIR, the applicant currently is in discussions with the County's Fire District with respect to a memorandum of understanding ("MOU") relative to the construction of fire stations to serve Newhall Ranch, Entrada, and Legacy Village (the MOU "Project Area"). A fire station is to be constructed on the Mission Village site (Fire Station 177) that would ultimately provide fire protection services for the Mission Village site. Until such time as that station is completed, existing Fire Stations 76 and Fire Station 124 would be available to serve the project site.

Additionally, the proposed project would be required to meet all County codes and requirements relative to providing adequate fire protection services to the site during both the construction and operational stages of the project. As a result, the project would not diminish the staffing or the response times of existing fire stations in the Santa Clarita Valley, nor would it create a special fire protection requirement on the site that would result in a decline in existing service levels.

With implementation of each of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project's fire protection services impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance, and no unavoidable significant impacts would occur.

3.9.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant fire protection services-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.9.2.1 Newhall Ranch Mitigation Measures

SP 4.18-1 At the time of final subdivision maps permitting construction in development areas that are adjacent to Open Area and the High Country SMA, a Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan shall be prepared and submitted for approval by the County Fire Department. The Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan shall include the following construction period requirements: (a) a fire watch during welding operations; (b) spark arresters on all equipment or vehicles operating in a high fire hazard area; (c) designated smoking and non-smoking areas; and (d) water availability pursuant to County Fire Department requirements. The wildfire fuel modification plan shall depict a fuel modification zone in conformance with the Fuel Modification Ordinance in effect at the time of subdivision. Within the zone, tree

pruning, removal of dead plant material and weed and grass cutting shall take place as required by the County Forester. Fire resistant plant species containing habitat value may be planted in the fuel modification zone. *(The proposed Mission Village project provides standards that are parallel with standards as presented by the Wildfire Fuel Modification Program. Construction vehicles used during the construction of the Mission Village Project would incorporate the use of spark arrestors on all machinery to prevent fires, along with a lookout for fires during welding and activities that could produce large amounts of sparks.)*

SP 4.18-2 Each subdivision and site plan for the proposed Specific Plan shall provide sufficient capacity for fire flows of 1,250 [gallons per minute] gpm at 20 pounds [per square inch] psi residual pressure for a 2-hour duration for single-family residential units, and 5,000 gpm at 20 psi residual pressure for a 5-hour duration for multi-family residential units and commercial/retail uses, or whatever fire flow requirement is in effect at the time of subdivision and site plan approval. (*All development within the Mission Village project area will be required to comply with the fire flow standards for single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial uses, and industrial uses as provided in the Los Angeles County Municipal Code, as adopted through the 2006 California Fire Code.*)

SP 4.18-3 Each subdivision map and site plan for the proposed Specific Plan shall comply with all applicable building and fire codes and hazard reduction programs for Fire Zones 3 and 4 that are in effect at the time of subdivision map and site plan approval. (*The proposed Mission Village Project will include development standards for construction of residential and commercial uses that would provide for the reduction of fire threats.)*

SP 4.18-4 The developer will provide funding for three fire stations to the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County (the "Fire District") in lieu of developer fees. The developer will dedicate two fire station sites for the two fire stations located in Newhall Ranch. The Fire District will dedicate the site for the fire station to be located at the Del Valle Training Facility. Each fire station site will have a building pad consisting of a net buildable area of 1 acre. If the cost of constructing the three fire stations, providing and dedicating the two fire station sites, and providing three engines, one paramedic squad and 63 percent of a truck company exceeds the developer's developer fee obligation for the Newhall Ranch development as determined by the Fire District, the Fire District will fund the costs in excess of the fee obligation.

Two of the three fire stations to be funded by the developer will not exceed 6,000 square feet; the third fire station to be funded by the developer will not exceed 8,500 square feet. The Fire District will fund the cost of any space/square footage of improvement in excess of these amounts as well as the cost of the necessary fire apparatus for any such excess square footage of improvements. The cost of three fire engines, a proportionate share of a truck and one squad to be provided by the developer will be determined based upon the apparatus cost at the time the apparatus is placed in service.

The Fire District and the developer will mutually agree to the requirements of first-phase protection requirements based upon projected response/travel coverage. Such mutual agreement regarding first-phase fire protection requirements ("fire protection plan") and the criteria for timing the development of each of the three fire stations will be defined in a Memorandum of Understanding between the developer and the Fire District. Delivery of fire service for Newhall Ranch will be either from existing fire stations or one of the three fire stations to be provided by the developer pursuant to this section. Prior to the commencement of the operation of any of the three fire stations, fire service may be delivered to Newhall Ranch from existing fire stations or from temporary fire stations to be provided by the developer at mutually agreed-upon locations, to be replaced by the permanent stations which will be located within the Newhall Ranch development. The developer and the Fire District will annually review the fire protection plan to evaluate development and market conditions and modify the Memorandum of Understanding accordingly. (*The Mission Village Project Site will be required to comply with the MOU for the development of Fire Station 177 as specifically provided by Mitigation Measure MV 4.12-2.*)

3.9.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's fire protection services impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

MV 4.12-1 Prior to approval of a final subdivision map for the project, the applicant must prepare and submit for approval by the County Fire Department a preliminary fuel modification plan, a preliminary landscape plan, and a preliminary irrigation plan for the project, as required by Section 1117.2.1 of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code.

MV 4.12-2 The applicant shall construct a fire station on the Mission Village site, including all ancillary requirements for normal fire station operation such as landscaping, parking, fuel tanks, storage rooms, etc. The applicant also shall provide funding for the purchase of one Fire District standard, fully equipped fire pumper engine, and one Tiller Truck/Quint to be housed at the fire station. Upon completion of construction, the fire station, including the underlying land and equipment, shall be conveyed to the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County (Fire District) in lieu of the payment of any/all developer fees otherwise required of the project. The applicant and the Fire District shall enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) detailing the terms of the agreement as generally set forth in this mitigation measure.

The fire station will be constructed on a minimum 1.5-acre site located south of Magic Mountain Parkway at the intersection of Westridge Parkway and "QQ" Street; the location and configuration of the site shall be approved by the Fire District. The fire station shall be approximately 13,500 [gross square feet] GSF in size and include a 3,600 GSF apparatus storage building; future changes in federal, state, or local requirements may affect this minimum size. The Fire

District shall approve all plans and designs for the fire station prior to the commencement of construction.

The Fire District will evaluate with the applicant the requirements of first-phase protection based upon projected response/travel coverage with the goal of achieving 5-minute response coverage. The results of such evaluation shall include requirements for first-phase fire protection ("fire protection plan"), and the criteria for timing the development of the fire station shall be outlined in the MOU. Prior to the commencement of operation of the fire station, fire service may be delivered to Mission Village from existing fire stations or from temporary fire stations to be provided by the applicant at mutually agreed-upon locations, to be replaced by the permanent station. The use of such temporary fire stations shall be approved by the Fire District and detailed in the MOU. (*This mitigation measure implements mitigation previously adopted by the County in connection with development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and does not impose upon the applicant an obligation to fund or construct additional fire stations beyond those obligations previously imposed by the County.*)

MV 4.12-3 The proposed development shall provide multiple ingress/egress access for the circulation of traffic, and emergency response issues. Said determinations shall be approved through the tentative map approval.

MV 4.12-4 The development of this project shall comply with all applicable code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows and fire hydrants. Specifics for said requirements shall be established during the review and approval process of the tentative map.

MV 4.12-5 This property is located within the area described by the Forester and Fire Warden as a Fire Zone 4, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). All applicable fire code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire hydrants, fire flows, brush clearance and fuel modification plans, must be met.

MV 4.12-6 Specific fire and life safety requirements for the construction phase will be addressed at the building fire plan check. There may be additional fire and life safety requirements during this time.

MV 4.12-7 Every building constructed shall be accessible to Fire Department apparatus by way of access roadways, with an all-weather surface of not less than the prescribed width and indicated on the Tentative or Exhibit "A" maps. The roadway shall be extended to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls when measured by an unobstructed route around the exterior of the building.

MV 4.12-8 Access roads shall be maintained with a minimum of 10 feet of brush clearance on each side. Fire access roads shall have an unobstructed vertical clearance clear-to-sky with the exception of protected tree species. Protected tree species overhanging fire access roads shall be maintained to provide a vertical clearance

of 13 feet, 6 inches. Applicant to obtain all necessary permits prior to the commencement of trimming of any protected tree species.

MV 4.12-9 The maximum allowable grade shall not exceed 15 percent except where topography makes it impractical to keep within such grade; in such cases, an absolute maximum of 20 percent will be allowed for up to 150 feet in distance. The average maximum allowed grade, including topographical difficulties, shall be no more than 17 percent. Grade breaks shall not exceed 10 percent in 10 feet.

MV 4.12-10 Requirements for access, fire flows, and hydrants are to be addressed at the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee meeting during the subdivision tentative map stage.

MV 4.12-11 Fire sprinkler systems shall be installed in residential and commercial occupancies consistent with applicable code and ordinance requirements. For those occupancies not requiring fire sprinkler systems, it is encouraged that fire sprinkler systems be installed. This will reduce potential fire and life losses.

MV 4.12-12 Prior to construction, the following items shall be addressed:

a. Installation and inspection of the required all weather access to be provided as determined by either the tentative map review process or building penult issuance.

b. Fire hydrants shall be installed and tested prior to the clearance for the commencement of construction.

Institutional:

MV 4.12-13 The development may require fire flows up to 8,000 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for up to a 4-hour duration as outlined in the 2002 County of Los Angeles Fire Code Appendix III-AA. Final fire flows will be based on the size of buildings, their relationship to other structures, property lines, and types of construction used.

MV 4.12-14 Fire hydrant spacing shall be based on fire flow requirements as outlined in the 2002 County of Los Angeles Fire Code Appendix III-BB. Additional hydrants will be required if hydrant spacing exceeds specified distances.

MV 4.12-15 All access devices and gates shall comply with California Code of Regulations, Title 19, Article 3.05 and Article 3.16. Los Angeles County Fire Department Regulation #5.

Commercial/High-Density Residential:

MV 4.12-16 The development may require fire flows up to 5,000 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for up to a 5-hour duration. Final fire flows will be based on the size of buildings, their relationship to other structures, property lines, and types of construction used. Fire flows shall be established as

part of the tentative map review process with the submittal of architectural details to determine actual flow requirement. If adequate architectural detail is unavailable during the tentative map review process, maximum fire flows will be established with the ability of the fire flow to be changed during the actual architectural plan review by Fire Prevention Engineering for building permit issuance.

MV 4.12-17 Fire hydrant spacing shall be 300 feet and shall meet the following requirements:

a. No portion of lot frontage shall be more than 200 feet via vehicular access from a public fire hydrant.
b. No portion of a building shall exceed 400 feet via vehicular access from a properly spaced public fire hydrant.
c. Additional hydrants will be required if hydrant spacing exceeds specified distances.
d. When cul-de-sac depth exceeds 200 feet on a commercial street, hydrants shall be required at the corner and mid block.
e. A cul-de-sac shall not be more than 500 feet in length, when serving land zoned for commercial use.

MV 4.12-18 Turning radii shall not be less than 32 feet. This measurement shall be determined at the centerline of the road. A Fire Department approved turning area shall be provided for all driveways exceeding 150 feet in length and at the end of all cul-de-sacs.

MV 4.12-19 All on-site driveways/roadways shall provide a minimum unobstructed width of 28 feet, clear-to-sky. The on-site driveway is to be within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of any building. The centerline of the access driveway shall be located parallel to, and within 30 feet of an exterior wall on one side of the proposed structure.

MV 4.12-20 Driveway width for non-residential developments shall be increased when any of the following conditions will exist:

a. Provide 34 feet in width, when parallel parking is allowed on one side of the access roadway/driveway. Preference is that such parking is not adjacent to the structure.
b. Provide 36 feet in width, when parallel parking is allowed on each side of the access roadway/driveway. For buildings in excess of 35 feet, minimum paved fire access is 28 feet.
c. Any access way less than 34 feet in width shall be labeled "Fire Lane" on the final recording map, and final building plans.
d. For streets or driveways with parking restrictions: The entrance to the street/driveway and intermittent spacing distances of 150 feet shall be posted with Fire Department approved signs stating "NO PARKING –

FIRE LANE" in 3-inch-high letters. Driveway labeling is necessary to endure access for Fire Department use.

Single-Family/Two-Family Dwelling Units:

MV 4.12-21 Single-family detached homes shall require a minimum fire flow of 1,250 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for a 2-hour duration. Two-family dwelling units (duplexes) shall require a fire flow of 1,500 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for a 2-hour duration. When there are five or more condominium units are taking access on a single driveway, the minimum fire flow shall be increased to 1,500 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for a 2-hour duration.

MV 4.12-22 Fire hydrant spacing shall be 600 feet and shall meet the following requirements:

a. No portion of lot frontage shall be more than 450 feet via vehicular access from a public fire hydrant.
b. Lots of 1 acre or more shall place no portion of a structure where it exceeds 750 feet via vehicular access from a properly spaced public fire hydrant.
c. When cul-de-sac depth exceeds 450 feet on a residential street, fire hydrants shall be required at the corner and mid block.
d. Additional hydrants will be required if hydrant spacing exceeds specified distances during the tentative map review process or building permit plan check.

MV-4.12-23 Streets or driveways within the development shall be provided with the following:

a. Provide 36 feet in width on all streets where parking is allowed on both sides.
b. Provide 34 feet in width on cul-de-sacs up to 700 feet in length. This allows parking on both sides of the street.
c. Provide 36 feet in width on cul-de-sacs from 701 to 1,000 feet in length. This allows parking on both sides of the street.
d. For streets or driveways with parking restrictions: The entrance to the street/driveway and intermittent spacing distances of 150 feet shall be posted with Fire Department approved signs stating "NO PARKING – FIRE LANE" in 3-inch-high letters. Driveway labeling is necessary to ensure access for Fire Department use.
e. Turning radii shall not be less than 32 feet. This measurement shall be determined at the centerline of the road.

MV 4.12-24 A Fire Department approved turning area shall be provided for all driveways exceeding 150 feet in length and at the end of all cul-de-sacs.

Limited Access Devices (Gates, Etc.):

MV 4.12-25 All access devices and gates shall meet the following requirements:

a. Any single-gated opening used for ingress and egress shall be a minimum of 26 feet in width, clear-to-sky.

b. Any divided gate opening (when each gate is used for a single-direction of travel, i.e., ingress or egress) shall be a minimum width of 20 feet clear-to-sky.

c. Gates and/or control devices shall be positioned a minimum of 50 feet from a public right-of-way, and shall be provided with a turnaround having a minimum of 32 feet of turning radius. If an intercom system is used, the 50 feet shall be measured from the right-of-way to the intercom control device.

d. All limited access devices shall be of a type approved by the Fire Department.

e. Gate detail plans shall be submitted for review and approval to the Fire Department as part of the tentative map submittal or prior to installation. These plans shall show all locations, widths, and details of the proposed gates.

3.9.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the identified potentially significant fire protection services-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant fire protection services-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.10 EDUCATION

3.10.1 Potential Significant Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan was forecasted to significantly increase the demand for educational services within the boundary of Newhall Ranch and in the local vicinity. However, the Program EIR concluded that adoption of the recommended mitigation measures and the execution of three school facilities/funding agreements would reduce the impacts to a level below significant.

The Newhall School District (Newhall District), Saugus Union Elementary School District (Saugus District) and the William S. Hart Union High School District (Hart District) currently provide public elementary, junior high/middle school, and senior high school education in the Mission Village project area. The Newhall and Saugus Districts provide elementary school service (kindergarten and grades 1–6) to the project site. The Hart District provides junior high school (grades 7 and 8) and senior high school (grades 9–12) services to the project site. The

Mission Village project would generate an estimated 969 elementary students, 267 middle school students, and 378 senior high school students for the three districts at buildout.

The "School Facilities Funding Agreement entered into between the Newhall District and Newhall Land and Farming Company" (Newhall School Funding Agreement), effective December 1, 2009, and included in the EIR, would mitigate Mission Village impacts on education facilities in the Newhall District to a level below significant. Under the Newhall School Funding Agreement, Newhall guarantees to the Newhall District that there will be adequate school facilities available to accommodate every student within the Specific Plan.

The "School Facilities Funding Agreement Between the Saugus Union School District and Newhall Land and Farming Company" (Saugus School Funding Agreement), effective February 18, 1997, and included in the EIR, would mitigate the proposed Mission Village project's impacts on the Saugus District. Under the Saugus School Funding Agreement, the applicant and the Saugus District have agreed to a financing schedule and a financing plan, in combination with certain mitigation payments, which will provide permanent facilities, including land, buildings, furnishings and equipment to house grades K–6 students who will reside in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area. Once implemented, the Saugus School Funding Agreement would fully mitigate Mission Village's direct impacts on the Saugus School District's educational facilities.

Project impacts on the Hart District would be mitigated through the "School Facilities Funding Agreement Between the William S. Hart Union High School District and The Newhall Land and Farming Company" (Hart School Funding Agreement), effective October 1998, and included in the EIR. The Hart School Funding Agreement conditionally obligates The Newhall Land and Farming Company to provide up to three additional junior high schools and two additional senior high schools to the Hart District. Once implemented, the Hart School Funding Agreement would fully mitigate Mission Village's direct impacts on the Hart District's educational facilities.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project's education-related impacts would be mitigated to a level below significant, and no unavoidable significant impacts would occur.

3.10.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potentially significant education-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.10.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.16-1 The Specific Plan developer shall reserve five elementary schools sites, one junior high school site and one high school site, of 7 to 10, 20 to 25, and 40 to 45 acres in size, respectively, depending upon adjacency to local public parks and joint use agreements. *(The Mission Village project includes the reservation of a 9.5-acre elementary school site.)*

SP 4.16-2 The developer of future subdivisions which allow construction will comply with the terms and conditions of the School Facilities Funding Agreement between The Newhall Land and Farming Company and the Newhall School District.

SP 4.16-3 The developer of future subdivisions which allow construction will comply with the terms and conditions of the School Facilities Funding Agreement between The Newhall Land and Farming Company and the William S. Hart Union High School District.

(Specific Plan mitigation measures SP 4.16-4 and SP 4.16-5 are not applicable to Mission Village.)

3.10.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's education-related impacts, the following mitigation measure is incorporated:

MV 4.13-1 The developer of future subdivisions which allow construction will comply with the terms and conditions of the School Facilities Funding Agreement between The Newhall Land and Farming Company and the Saugus Union School District.

3.10.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the identified potentially significant education-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant education-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.11 LIBRARY SERVICES

3.11.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Program EIR for the Specific Plan identified potentially significant impacts resulting from implementation of the Specific Plan as a result of the significantly increased demands that would be placed on library facilities and library materials due to the increase in residents in the Santa Clarita area. The Program EIR recommended a mitigation program, adopted by the County, that facilitated collaboration between the project applicant and the County to ensure that adequate library services are funded and provided; and, therefore, impacts were reduced to a level below significance.

The Mission Village project site is located in the Valencia Library service area of the County of Los Angeles Public Library (County Library). In addition to the Valencia Library, the Santa Clarita Valley area is served by three other County libraries (Newhall Library, Canyon Country Jo Anne Darcy Library, and Castaic Library), and the Santa Clarita Valley Bookmobile. Existing

library facility space in the Santa Clarita Valley does not meet the County Library's service level guidelines.

As part of the County's approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the County adopted a library mitigation measure requiring that the developer dedicate up to two library sites and provide funding for the construction and development of library facilities on the Specific Plan site. Consistent with that mitigation, the proposed Mission Village project includes a 3.3-acre site for development of a public library in the Village Center area of the project. The Specific Plan mitigation measure also provides that, prior to issuance of the first residential building permit on Newhall Ranch, the County Librarian and developer must develop a mutually acceptable "Library Construction Plan." The plan must outline the library construction requirements and define elements such as location, size, funding, and timing of facilities construction. The Library Construction Plan, a completion schedule, land dedication criteria, and a funding plan must be defined and set forth in a MOU between the developer and County Librarian. With implementation of the Specific Plan mitigation, any potential impacts to library services resulting from the Mission Village project would be reduced to less than significant levels.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project's library services impacts would be mitigated to a level below significant, and no unavoidable significant impacts would occur.

3.11.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant library services-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measure:

3.11.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.19-1 The developer will provide funding for a maximum of two libraries (including the site(s), construction, furniture, fixtures, equipment, and materials) to the County Librarian. The developer will dedicate a maximum of two library sites for a maximum of two libraries located in Newhall Ranch in lieu of the land component of the County's library facilities mitigation fee, in accordance with the provisions of Section 22.72.090 of Section 2 of Ordinance No. 98-0068. The actual net buildable library site area required and provided by the developer will be determined by the actual size of the library building(s), the Specific Plan parking requirements, the County Building Code, and other applicable rules.

The total library building square footage to be funded by the developer will not exceed 0.35 net square feet per person. The developer's funding of construction of the library(s) and furnishings, fixtures, equipment and materials for the library(s) will be determined based on the cost factors in the library facilities mitigation fee in effect at the time of commencement of construction of the library(s).

Prior to County's issuance of the first residential building permit of Newhall Ranch to the developer, the County Librarian and the developer will mutually agree upon the library construction requirements (location, size, funding and time of construction) based upon the projected development schedule and the population of Newhall Ranch based on the applicable number of average persons per household included in the library facilities mitigation fee in effect at the time. Such mutual agreement regarding the library construction requirements ("Library Construction Plan") and the criteria for timing the completion of the library(s) will be defined in a MOU between the developer and the County Librarian. Such MOU shall include an agreement by the developer to dedicate sufficient land and pay the agreed amount of fees on a schedule to allow completion of the library(s) as described below. The developer's funding for library facilities shall not exceed the developer's fee obligation at the time of construction under the developer fee schedule.

If two libraries are to be constructed, the first library will be completed and operational by the time of County's issuance of the 8,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch, and the second library will be completed and operational by the time of County's issuance of the 15,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch. If the County Librarian decides that only one library will be constructed, the library will be completed and operational by the time of County's issuance of the 10,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch.

No payment of any sort with respect to library facilities will be required under Section 2.5.3.d. of the Specific Plan in order for the developer to obtain building permits for nonresidential buildings.

3.11.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures beyond that identified in the Specific Plan are required or necessary because the Mission Village project would not result in any significant library services-related impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measure.

3.11.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce the identified potentially significant library services-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant library services-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.12 UTILITIES

3.12.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Specific Plan's Program EIR identified potentially significant impacts to electricity and natural gas, as build-out under the Specific Plan would increase demand for both utility types and require the provision of new delivery infrastructure. The Program EIR concluded that implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce all utilities-related impacts to a level below significant.

The Mission Village proposed project would require energy resources and infrastructure to serve the project site. Current projections for energy supply and demand by SCE and the Southern California Gas Company ("SCGC") indicate that these utility providers would have sufficient electricity and natural gas resources to serve the project site. In addition, the proposed project would exceed the statewide energy efficiency requirements set forth in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations by 15 percent. Further, consistent with the Specific Plan EIR, providing electricity and natural gas to the Mission Village project site would not require a considerable extension of distribution infrastructure.

Importantly, several of Mission Village's design features would reduce its demand for energy resources, and further ensure that all impacts to utilities-related resources are less than significant. First, as indicated above, Mission Village's residential, commercial, and public buildings would exceed current state efficiency standards (i.e., Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations) by at least 15 percent, thereby reducing the overall demand for electricity and natural gas resources. (See EIR Section 4.23, Global Climate Change, Mitigation Measures MV 4.23-1 and 4.23-2.) In addition, the project applicant may rely on renewable energy sources to meet a portion of the project's energy demands, and is evaluating the feasibility of energy efficient municipal lighting and smart meter programs. (See EIR Section 4.23, Global Climate Change, Mitigation Measures MV 4.23-3 and 4.23-4 and discussion of potentially feasible programs regarding municipal lightings and smart meters). With implementation of the mitigation measures from the Specific Plan EIR, and implementation of the "green" project design features summarized above, the Mission Village project is anticipated to result in less than significant impacts to electricity and natural gas resources and infrastructure.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project's utilities impacts would be mitigated to a level below significant, and no unavoidable significant impacts would occur.

3.12.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant utilities-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.12.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

Electricity

SP 4.14-1 All development within the Specific Plan area shall comply with the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations*).

SP 4.14-2 Southern California Edison or other energy provider is to be notified of the nature and extent of future development on the Specific Plan site prior to recordation of all future subdivisions.

SP 4.14-3 All future tract maps are to comply with Southern California Edison or other energy provider guidelines for grading, construction, and development within SCE easements.

SP 4.14-4 Electrical infrastructure removals and relocations are to be coordinated between the Specific Plan engineer and Southern California Edison or other energy provider as each tract is designed and constructed.

SP 4.14-5 All future tract maps are to be reviewed by Los Angeles County to ensure adequate accessibility to Edison or other energy provider facilities as a condition of their approvals.

SP 4.14-6 Not applicable.

Natural Gas

SP 4.13-1 All development within the Specific Plan area shall comply with the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations*).

SP 4.13-2 A letter from the Southern California Gas Company [SCGC] or other gas provider is to be obtained prior to recordation of all future subdivisions stating that service can be provided to the subdivision under construction.

SP 4.13-3 The Specific Plan is to meet the requirements of SCGC in terms of pipeline relocation, grading in the vicinity of gas mains, and development within Southern California Gas Company easements. These requirements would be explicitly defined by SCGC at the future tentative map stage.

SP 4.13-4 All potential buyers or tenants of property in the vicinity of Southern California Gas Company transmission lines are to be made aware of the line's presence in order to assure that no permanent construction or grading occurs over and within the vicinity of the high-pressure gas mains.

Project design features incorporated as Global Climate Change mitigation measures also would reduce the Mission Village project's demand for electricity and natural gas.

3.12.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the Specific Plan's Program EIR, as set forth above, are required or necessary, because the Mission Village project would not result in any significant electricity and natural gas utilities impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measures.

3.12.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the identified potentially significant utilities-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant utilities-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.13 ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

3.13.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Specific Plan's Program EIR determined that potentially significant hazardous materials impacts would result from implementation of the Specific Plan. Specifically, on-site impacts would occur with respect to past and present oil and natural gas production operations, existing SCE electrical transmission lines, existing high-pressure natural gas lines, the future transport of hazardous waste along SR-126, and due to the proximity of Chiquita Canyon Landfill. However, the Program EIR further found that implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level below significant.

The potential environmental safety impacts relative to development of the Mission Village project site include soil contamination attributable to past and present agricultural activities, on-site petroleum (i.e., oil) drilling and pipeline activities, and the disposal of on-site hazardous materials debris. Hazardous materials generally include petroleum products (including oil and gasoline), automotive fluids (antifreeze, hydraulic fluid), paint, cleaners (dry cleaning solvents, cleaning fluids), and pesticides from agricultural uses (at higher concentrations). Byproducts generated as a result of activities using hazardous materials (such as dry cleaning solvents, oil, and gasoline) are considered hazardous waste. Contamination usually takes the form of a hazardous materials or waste spill in soil. Such contamination can penetrate soils into the groundwater table, resulting in the pollution of a local water supply. Commercial uses, particularly those using underground storage tanks ("USTs"), are most common in causing such contamination. Potential environmental safety impacts associated with the project site include observed stained soil (including possible petroleum hydrocarbon contamination) near abandoned oil wells and pipelines, aboveground storage tanks ("ASTs"), and equipment storage areas. Unless mitigated, these potentially contaminated soils could result in significant impacts, especially if construction utilizing these soils, or contamination within these soils, was permitted without proper monitoring and testing. When remediated to local, state and federal standards, including re-abandonment procedures for previously abandoned wells and pipelines, any

potentially significant impacts relative to these conditions would be reduced to a level below significant and, therefore, would not result in environmental safety hazards to Mission Village residents, employees and/or visitors or to adjacent properties.

Related to potential soil contamination, soils contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons in oil fields and near abandoned wells are capable of generating gasses containing methane, total petroleum hydrocarbons ("TPHs"), and volatile organic compounds ("VOCs") through anaerobic biodegradation, which gasses are then emitted into the air. Unremediated, contaminated soil could pose a potentially significant impact to public health and safety, due to the potential for methane, TPH or VOC gasses to accumulate under structures, otherwise known as vapor intrusion. However, mitigation would reduce potential impacts due to vapor migration to less than significant.

Potential environmental safety impacts associated with the project site also include miscellaneous debris present on the project site that could contain previously unidentified hazardous materials. Mitigation is recommended requiring that unidentified structures or materials encountered during project construction be assessed and the appropriate action taken in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. With mitigation, potential impacts relative to on-site debris would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Electrical transmission line poles and transformers on the project site may contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), which could constitute a potentially significant impact. With mitigation, impacts relative to PCBs would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The presence of pesticides in the soils from historic agricultural operations, and the continuing use of pesticides in connection with ongoing agricultural activities, constitutes a potential impact, although the impact does not rise to a significant level. Soil sampling has been conducted to determine on-site concentrations of pesticides. The results conclude no concentration of hazardous pesticides exceeding the residential or industrial use Preliminary Remediation Goals are present. Additionally, no Proposition 65 pesticides have been used on the Mission Village project site. With respect to the future use of pesticides, due to the regulation of those pesticides used by agricultural activities occurring on Newhall Ranch, including the chemical and physical properties of those pesticides used, the requirement to use the pesticides in accordance with manufacturer specifications, and the mode of application of the pesticides, it is not expected that humans would be subject to either acute overexposure or chronic exposure to any of the pesticides used. Therefore, the on-site use of pesticides would not create a potential public health hazard, and would create no significant impact to the development property or its residents.

Other potential impacts, such as those associated with the presence of on-site ponds used for the disposal of hazardous wastes and water wells, would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with mitigation.

No potentially significant impacts were identified with regard to on-site high-pressure gas lines, electrical transmission lines, transport of hazardous materials on State Route (SR)-126, the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, and the Castaic Lake Dam inundation area. Therefore, no mitigation is required or recommended for these potential environmental safety impacts.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project's environmental safety impacts would be mitigated to a level below significant, and no unavoidable significant impacts would occur.

3.13.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant environmental safety-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.13.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.5-1 All final school locations are to comply with the California State Board of Education requirement that no schools be sited within 100 feet from the edge of the right-of-way of 100-110 kV lines; 150 feet from the 220–230 kV lines; and 250 feet from the 345 kV lines. *(The school proposed as part of the Mission Village project will not be sited within an electric transmission line restricted zone.)*

SP 4.5-2 Only non-habitable structures shall be located within SCE easements. *(The Mission Village tract map does not locate any habitable structures within a Southern California Edison [SCE] easement.)*

SP 4.5-3 Prior to issuance of grading permits, all abandoned oil and natural gas-related sites must be remediated to the satisfaction of the California Department of Oil and Gas, the Los Angeles County Hazardous Materials Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles region). *(All abandoned oil and natural gas-related sites on the Mission Village project site have been abandoned and remediated, as necessary, according to California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) standards. Furthermore, pursuant to project-specific mitigation measure MV 4.19-10, all former oil wells to be disturbed or located in an area of development on the Mission Village site shall be reabandoned according to DOGGR standards prior to the issuance of grading permits.)*

SP 4.5-4 Not applicable.

SP 4.5-5 The Specific Plan is to meet the requirements of SCGC in terms of pipeline relocation, grading in the vicinity of gas mains, and development within SCGC easements. These requirements would be explicitly defined at the future tentative map stage. *(The Mission Village tentative tract map incorporates all applicable requirements of the Southern California Gas Company [SCGC] with respect to pipeline relocation, grading in the vicinity of gas mains, and development within SCGC easements.)*

SP 4.5-6 All potential buyers or tenants of property in the vicinity of SCGC transmission lines are to be made aware of the line's presence in order to assure that no

permanent construction or grading occurs over and within the vicinity of the high-pressure gas mains. *(This mitigation measure will be implemented concurrent with project development.)*

SP 4.5-7 In accordance with the provisions of the 2008 Los Angeles County Building Code (Title 26), Section 110.4 ~~308(d)~~, all buildings and enclosed structures that would be constructed within the Specific Plan located within 25 feet of oil or gas wells shall be designed according to recommendations contained in a report prepared by a licensed civil engineer and approved by the Building Official ~~provided with methane gas protection systems~~. Buildings located within 25 feet and 200 feet of oil or gas wells shall, prior to the issuance of building permits by the County of Los Angeles, be evaluated in accordance with the current rules and regulations of the State of California Division of Oil and Gas. *(This mitigation measure has been revised, as shown, to reflect subsequent changes in the Los Angeles County Building Code.)*

SP 4.5-8 Not applicable.

SP 4.5-9 In accordance with the provisions of the Los Angeles County Code, Title 11, Division 4, Underground Storage of Hazardous Materials regulations, the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works shall review, prior to the issuance of building permits by the County of Los Angeles, any plans for underground hazardous materials storage facilities (e.g., gasoline) that may be constructed or installed within the Specific Plan. *(This mitigation measure will be implemented prior to the issuance of building permits.)*

3.13.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's environmental safety impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

(1) OIL WELLS

MV 4.19-1 During grading operations, all former oil wells located on the Mission Village development property shall be reabandoned and the sites remediated, if necessary, according to the requirements of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources, if such sites are to be disturbed or are located in an area of development.

(2) ABOVE-GROUND STORAGE TANKS, AGRICULTURAL STORAGE AREAS, AND SOIL STAINING

MV 4.19-2 During grading operations, those areas of the Mission Village development property identified as formerly containing above-ground storage tanks, current agricultural storage areas and current soil staining by the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of Proposed The Mesas East, Valencia, California* (BA Environmental, February 2005), shall be investigated for the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons and hazardous materials and/or wastes, and, where

necessary, shall be remediated in conformance with applicable federal, state and local laws, to the satisfaction of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources, the Los Angeles County Hazardous Materials Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles region).

(3) PIPELINES

MV 4.19-3 During grading operations, all pipelines located on the Mission Village development property that will no longer be used to transport oil products shall be reabandoned according to the requirements of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources. The soil beneath these pipelines shall be assessed for petroleum hydrocarbons. Any identified contaminated soil shall be remediated in conformance with applicable federal, state and local laws, to the satisfaction of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources, the Los Angeles County Hazardous Materials Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles region).

(4) WATER WELLS

MV 4.19-4 During grading operations, all groundwater monitoring wells and production water wells not intended for future use shall be abandoned according to applicable federal, state and local regulations.

(5) POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS (PCBS)

MV 4.19-5 Prior to demolition or rehabilitation, all electrical poles and facilities to be demolished or rehabilitated shall be surveyed to determine if they contain PCBs. If PCBs are present, they shall be removed and disposed of by a licensed and certified PCB removal contractor, in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations.

(6) PONDS

MV 4.19-6 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, all ponds located on the project site that may have been used for the treatment or disposal of hazardous wastes shall be tested for environmental hazards and remediated, if necessary, in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations.

(7) SOIL STAINING

MV 4.19-7 Areas of visible soil staining not planned for excavation shall be assessed for environmental hazards and treated, as necessary, in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations. Areas of visible soil staining that are scheduled to be excavated shall have any visibly impacted soil disposed of in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations.

(8) PREVIOUSLY UNIDENTIFIED HAZARDS

MV 4.19-8 In the event that previously unidentified, obvious, or suspected hazardous materials, contamination, underground storage tanks, sumps, debris, asbestos, septic tanks, cesspools or other features or materials that could present a threat to human health or the environment are discovered during construction, construction activities in the vicinity of the find shall cease immediately until the project site is evaluated by a qualified professional. Work shall not resume until appropriate actions recommended by the professional have been implemented and it has been demonstrated that the identified contaminants have been remediated or removed from the project site in accordance with applicable law.

(9) WATER QUALITY CONTROL BASIN

MV 4.19-9 Soils excavated for construction of the unlined water quality control basin will not be used for construction of the basin. If discolored soil is encountered, it will be excavated and will not be used in construction of the basin.

(10) SOIL GAS REMEDIATION

MV 4.19-10 In the event that previously unidentified, obvious, or suspected hazardous materials, contamination, debris, or other features or materials that could present a threat to human health or the environment are discovered during construction, construction activities shall cease immediately until the affected area is evaluated by a qualified professional. A remediation plan shall be developed in consultation with the appropriate regulatory authorities and the remediation identified shall be completed. Work shall not resume in the affected area until appropriate actions have been implemented in accordance with the remediation plan. The remediation action plan shall include the following:

- Remediation goals and cleanup criteria that could include, but are not necessarily limited to, excavation and on-site treatment, excavation and off-site treatment, and/or removal of contaminated soil and/or groundwater;

- A detailed description of the access points and haul-out routes for remedial activities; remediation methods and procedures; mitigation of dust; minimization or avoidance of disturbance to sensitive ecosystems; and verification soil sampling and analysis.

- Included in the discussion shall be information on disposal sites, transport and disposal methods, as well as recordkeeping methods for documenting remediation, regulatory compliance, and health and safety programs for on-site workers; and

- Removal of oil development equipment and debris.

MV 4.19-11 A Soil Management Plan for the residential development envelopes and recreational construction areas shall be developed and implemented, as

appropriate. The objective of the Soil Management Plan is to provide guidance for the proper handling, on-site management, and disposal of impacted soil that may be encountered during construction activities (*i.e.*, excavation and grading). The plan shall include practices that are consistent with the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health regulations, California Code of Regulations, title 8, as well as Certified Unified Program Agency remediation standards that are protective of the planned use. Appropriately trained professionals will be on site during preparation, grading, and related earthwork activities to monitor soil conditions encountered. In order to confirm the absence or presence of hazardous substances associated with former land use, a sampling strategy shall be implemented. The sampling strategy shall include procedures regarding logging/sampling and laboratory analyses. The Soil Management Plan will outline guidelines for the following:

- Identifying impacted soil;
- Assessing impacted soil;
- Soil excavation;
- Impacted soil storage;
- Verification sampling; and
- Impacted soil characterization and disposal.

In the event that potentially contaminated soils are encountered within the footprint of construction, soils will be tested and stockpiled. The Certified Unified Program Agency will determine whether further assessment is warranted. The Certified Unified Program Agency shall determine and oversee the handling and disposal of impacted soils.

MV 4.19-12 To reduce potentially hazardous conditions and minimize the impacts from handling potentially hazardous materials, the owner shall include the following in its construction contract documents prior to the initiation of construction activities:

- The Contractor(s) shall enforce strict on-site handling rules to keep construction and maintenance materials out of receiving waters and storm drains per the County's NPDES guidelines and as outlined in the Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan; and
- The Contractor(s) shall prepare a Health and Safety Plan. The plan shall include measures to be taken in the event of an accidental spill. In addition, the Contractor(s) shall store all reserve fuel supplies only within the confines of a designated construction staging area, refuel equipment only within the

designated construction staging area, and regularly inspect all construction equipment for leaks.

MV 4.19-13 Prior to the initiation of grading activities, low level PCE impacted soil located on the Mission Village project site, as identified in Final EIR Appendix F4.19, shall be remediated pursuant to the practices set forth in the Soil Management Plan.

MV 4.19-14 Prior to the initiation of grading activities, surficial contamination, including asphalt, asphaltic sand, and scattered tar clumps located at former oil drilling locations, and the asphaltic sand located within the washes connected to Middle Canyon and Lyon Canyon, respectively, shall be remediated pursuant to the practices set forth in the Soil Management Plan.

MV 4.19-15 During grading activities, any asphalt improved road and/or residual evidence of roads improved by the application of oil to the roadbed shall be remediated pursuant to the practices set forth in the Soil Management Plan and the contaminated soil is to be properly disposed of off-site.

MV 4.19-16 During grading activities, any unidentified structures or pipelines shall be properly assessed and/or remediated in accordance pursuant to the practices set forth in the Soil Management Plan.

3.13.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the identified potentially significant environmental safety-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant environmental safety-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.14 CULTURAL/PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.14.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources. However, the Program EIR further concluded that the recommended mitigation measures would reduce those impacts to a level below significant.

Phase I and II archaeological resource surveys within the Specific Plan area, including the Mission Village project area, were undertaken during preparation of the Specific Plan Program EIR. This information was reviewed at a project-specific level for the Mission Village project to determine if there were archaeological or paleontological effects relative to Mission Village not examined or identified in the Specific Plan Program EIR.

The Phase I survey resulted in the discovery and recording of one prehistoric archaeological site, CA-LAN-2236, within the boundaries of the proposed Mission Village project. The Phase I survey also identified two historical sites within the vicinity of the Mission Village project - the site of the original Newhall Ranch headquarters (CA-LAN-961H) and the site of the Asistencia de San Francisco Xavier (CA-LAN-962H).[12] The site of the Newhall Ranch headquarters falls outside of the Mission Village development area and, therefore, would not be significantly impacted by the project. As to the Asistencia site, no development is proposed for the area, and the site will be dedicated to The Archaeological Conservancy. As such, implementation of the Mission Village project would not result in significant impacts to the Asistencia site.

With respect to the prehistoric archaeological site, a Phase II archaeological study was conducted and CA-LAN-2236 was found to consist of a small, very low-density surface lithic scatter, measuring 300 square meters in size and consisting of six waste flakes found on the ground surface. No temporally diagnostic artifacts or chronometrically datable materials were found on this site, which appears to have served as a non-specialized stone chipping station, probably created in concert with some other economic activity, such as plant gathering or hunting. Phase II fieldwork at this site resulted in the collection of all extant archaeological artifacts from this locale. This has served to completely and adequately mitigate any significant impacts that might occur due to development at this site.

As to paleontological resources, a Phase I paleontological report also was prepared to determine the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources on the proposed Mission Village site. This report focused on a literature and records search, as well as an extensive field survey of the area proposed for development. Development of Mission Village would occur in geologic formations with high and moderate potential for the discovery of fossil remains and, therefore, grading activities associated with development of the proposed Mission Village project could result in significant impacts to the region's paleontological resources absent mitigation. Mitigation previously adopted by the County, in combination with additional proposed mitigation, would reduce any potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources to a level below significant.

3.14.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant cultural/paleontological resources-related impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.14.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.3-1 Not applicable.

SP 4.3-2 Not applicable.

---

[12] The proposed Mission Village project site is approximately 1,854.1 acres in size, including the off-site project-related improvements. The existing water tank area was not addressed in the Phase I and Phase II Archaeological Reports for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. However, the area around the existing water tank has been disturbed and is not in a natural state, thereby drastically reducing the possibility that new cultural or archaeological sites could be disturbed.

SP 4.3-3 In the unlikely event that additional artifacts are found during grading within the development area or future roadway extensions, an archaeologist will be notified to stabilize, recover and evaluate such finds.

SP 4.3-4 As part of an inspection testing program, a Los Angeles County Natural History Museum-approved inspector is to be on site to salvage scientifically significant fossil remains. The duration of these inspections depends on the potential for the discovery of fossils, the rate of excavation, and the abundance of fossils. Geological formations (like the Saugus Formation) with a high potential will initially require full time monitoring during grading activities. Geologic formations (like the Quaternary terrace deposits) with a moderate potential will initially require half-time monitoring. If fossil production is lower than expected, the duration of monitoring efforts should be reduced. Because of known presence of microvertebrates in the Saugus Formation, samples of at least 2,000 pounds of rock shall be taken from likely horizons, including localities 13, 13A, 14, and 23. These samples can be stockpiled to allow processing later to avoid delays in grading activities. The frequency of these samples will be determined based on field conditions. Should the excavations yield significant paleontological resources, excavation is to be stopped or redirected until the extent of the find is established and the resources are salvaged. Because of the long duration of the Specific Plan, a reassessment of the paleontological potential of each rock unit will be used to develop mitigation plans for subsequent subdivisions. The report shall include an itemized inventory of the fossils, pertinent geologic and stratigraphic data, field notes of the collectors and include recommendations for future monitoring efforts in those rock units. Prior to grading, an agreement shall be reached with a suitable public, non-profit scientific repository, such as the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History or similar institution, regarding acceptance of fossil collections.

3.14.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

To further reduce the project's cultural/paleontological resources impacts, the following mitigation measures are incorporated:

MV 4.20-1 Although no other significant cultural resources were observed or recorded, all grading activities and surface modifications must be confined to only those areas of absolute necessity to reduce any form of impact on unrecorded (buried) cultural resources that may exist within the confines of the project area. In the event that previously undetected archaeological, paleontological, and/or historical resources are found during construction, activity in the immediate area of the find shall stop and a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist, as applicable, shall be contacted to evaluate the resource(s). If the find is determined to be a historical or unique archaeological resource, as defined by CEQA, contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation shall be provided. Construction work may continue on other parts of the construction site while historical/archaeological mitigation takes

place, pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(f) and Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(i).

MV 4.20-2 Following recordation of the applicable unit of the Mission Village tract map, the Asistencia de San Francisco (CA-LAN-962H) site shall be dedicated to The Archaeological Conservancy.

MV 4.20-3 Scientific specimens are to become the property of a public, nonprofit educational institution, such as the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History (or similar institution). Most institutions are now requiring, as conditions for accepting the materials, that significant fossils be prepared, identified to a reasonable level, and catalogued before donation. Therefore, to meet these requirements, prior to the start of Project-related grading, an agreement shall be reached with a suitable scientific repository regarding acceptance of the fossil collection.

MV 4.20-4 A trained paleontologist acceptable to Los Angeles County shall be retained to monitor and salvage scientifically significant fossil remains. The duration of these inspections depends on the potential for the discovery of fossils, the rate of excavation, and the abundance of fossils.

(a) The Saugus and Pico Formations have a high potential to yield paleontological resources and will require continuous monitoring during all grading activities. This may require use of multiple paleontologists working on the site at the same time if simultaneous ground disturbing activities are occurring over an extensive area to assure all areas of excavation are being fully monitored for the presence of paleontological resources. The number of required monitors shall be determined by Project's monitoring paleontologist.

(b) The older dissected Pleistocene formations have a moderate potential to yield paleontological resources and will require half-time monitoring during all grading activities by a qualified paleontologist(s).

Periodic review of the paleontological potential assigned to each rock unit shall be conducted at the end of each phase of grading. This reassessment of potential will be used to develop mitigation plans for future phases of development. If fossil production is lower than expected, the duration of the monitoring efforts should be reduced to less than continuous monitoring during all grading activities.

MV 4.20-5 The paleontologist, in consultation with the grading contractor, developer, and Los Angeles County inspector, shall have the power to divert temporarily or direct grading efforts in the area of an exposed fossil to allow evaluation and, if necessary, salvage of exposed fossils.

3.14.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the identified potentially significant cultural/paleontological resources-related impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant cultural/paleontological resources-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.15 FLOODPLAIN MODIFICATION

3.15.1 Potential Significant Impacts

Implementation of the Specific Plan was not forecasted to significantly alter river hydrology or the mosaic of habitats along the Santa Clara River corridor because the effects associated with the proposed floodplain modifications would be infrequent, and would not substantially alter flows, water velocities, and water depths. Therefore, under the Specific Plan, the Santa Clara River would retain sufficient width to enable natural fluvial processes to continue.

Implementation of the Mission Village project, including the installation of proposed infrastructure, urban development and modifications to the Santa Clara River and on-site tributaries, would not result in significant impacts to existing hydrologic conditions. Project-related effects to the Santa Clara River regarding water flow, velocity, water surface elevation and scour would be minimal and localized. Erosion-related impacts to the River and on-site tributaries would have the potential to be significant but would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of previously adopted and proposed mitigation measures.

Impacts to riparian resources resulting from changes to existing hydrologic conditions also would be minimal and localized, and would not result in significant impacts. Implementation of the Mission Village project would not result in a substantial reduction in sediment supplies that are transported to the Santa Clara River and would not result in a significant impact to Ventura County beaches.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project's floodplain modification impacts would be mitigated to a level below significant, and no unavoidable significant impacts would occur.

3.15.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, potentially significant floodplain modification impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

3.15.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

The Specific Plan Program EIR did not include, nor did the Board adopt, any mitigation measures specific to floodplain modification.

3.15.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

MV 4.21-1 Post-peak stormwater runoff discharges from storm drainage systems must be controlled to minimize localized erosion impacts to River geomorphology and riparian habitat. Discharge flows would be regulated using water control features that must capture the runoff from small, frequent flows (i.e., one- and two-year events). Water and hydromodification control features must be designed in accordance with DPW criteria. Where applicable, energy dissipation structures must be incorporated at drainage outlets to the Santa Clara River to minimize discharge velocities and potential localized erosion.

MV 4.21-2 Where practical, the proposed Santa Clara River bridge crossing shall minimize the number and size of piers and/or columns to minimize localized impacts to River and/or tributary geomorphology and riparian resources.

MV 4.21-3 Structural features such as outlets, bank stabilization, grade stabilization structures, bridge abutments, culverts, and other features that may be subjected to River or tributary flows will be constructed of erosion resistant materials such as concrete, soil cement, or secured riprap to ensure long-term stability and reduce the need for routine maintenance and/or rehabilitation/replacement activities and be subject to approval by DPW.

MV 4.21-4 Prior to building permit, in-stream tributary channel design features for Lion Canyon drainage will be incorporated to control potential hydromodification impacts to geomorphology and riparian resources. The design will be based on erosion potential and other hydrologic modeling to determine appropriate equilibrium slope in the post-development condition as described in the Subregional Stormwater Mitigation Plan and be subject to approval by DPW.

MV 4.21-5 Sediment/debris control structures must be constructed downstream of natural watersheds to protect developed area drainage systems from debris flows. The design capacity for sediment/debris control structures must take into account the classifications stated in the debris production maps provided in Appendix A of the DPW 1991 Hydrology Manual. Sediment/debris control structure capacity and transport rates must be based on the specification stated in the DPW Sedimentation Manual.

MV 4.21-6 A Geomorphology Monitoring and Management Plan (Plan) will be prepared to ensure that the modified/re-engineered Lion Canyon drainage comply with the mitigation objectives and design goals outlined in the Newhall Ranch Tributary Channel Design Guidelines (PWA 2008). Specifically, the Plan shall include the measures to be implemented to ensure the integrity of the structural elements and

a state of "constrained dynamic equilibrium."[13] The Plan shall specify the following: (1) a framework to collect baseline data to characterize conditions immediately after construction; (2) a post-development monitoring program; (3) a framework to develop erosion and sedimentation threshold parameters and performance standards that activate adaptive management measures across a series of potential future scenarios; and, (4) contingency plans and appropriate remedial measures in the event that management efforts are not successful. The Plan shall be subject to final approval by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CDFG, and DPW.

3.15.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and ensure that the floodplain modification impacts of the Mission Village project, as identified in the Final EIR, remain at less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant floodplain modification impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.16 WATER QUALITY

3.16.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Specific Plan Program EIR identified certain potentially significant impacts related to water quality. Specifically, the Program EIR determined that implementation of the Specific Plan would significantly increase the potential for erosion and sediment discharge downstream during grading activity. Further, on-going operation of urban uses could result in the release of fertilizers, herbicides, or other types of contaminants that could potentially impact surface water quality. Mitigation measures were adopted to reduce these potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The Mission Village tract map site presently consists of open space, agriculture, and oil and gas extraction wells with associated access roads, and runoff is conveyed via natural drainages and existing concrete channels to ultimately discharge to the Santa Clara River. Construction and operation of the Mission Village project would replace open space, agricultural land, and extraction well pad runoff with urban runoff. The following is a summary of the impacts of the pollutants of concern under wet- and dry-weather conditions in the post-developed conditions:

- **Sediments:** Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System ("MS4") Permit, Construction General Permit, Dewatering General Permit, Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP"), and Low Impact Development ("LID")-compliant Best Management Practices ("BMPs") would be incorporated into the project to address sediment in both the construction phase and post-development. Mean total suspended solids concentration and loads are

[13] In this context, "constrained dynamic equilibrium" indicates that the channels will be designed to periodically change width, depth, and location on the floodplain in response to changing rainfall and vegetation dynamics, but stay within a predefined corridor and not encroach on infrastructure or fill slopes.

predicted to be less in the post-development condition than in the existing conditions. Turbidity in stormwater runoff would be controlled through implementation of a Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") and would be permanently reduced through the stabilization of erodible soils with development. On this basis, the impact of the project on sediments is considered less than significant.

- **Nutrients (Phosphorus and Nitrogen [Nitrate+Nitrite-N and Ammonia-N]):** MS4 Permit, Construction General Permit, Dewatering General Permit, SUSMP, and LID-compliant BMPs would be incorporated into the project to address nutrients in both the construction phase and post-development. Average annual loads for ammonia are predicted to increase from the project due to increased average annual runoff volume. Average annual loads of total phosphorus and nitrate- plus nitrite-N are predicted to decrease. Average concentrations are predicted to decrease for total phosphorus, nitrate-N plus nitrite-N and ammonia. Average concentrations are predicted to be within the range of observed wet weather values for Santa Clara River Reach 5. Average nitrate-N plus nitrite-N and ammonia-N concentrations are predicted to be well below Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board ("LARWQCB") Basin Plan objectives and Total Maximum Daily Load ("TMDL") wasteload allocations. The predicted nutrient concentrations are not expected to cause increased algae growth. On this basis, the impact of the project on nutrients is considered less than significant.

- **Trace Metals:** MS4 Permit, Construction General Permit, General Dewatering Permit, SUSMP, and LID-compliant BMPs would be incorporated into the project to address trace metals in both the construction phase and post-development. The average annual concentrations of all modeled trace metals are predicted to decrease with project development. Average annual trace metal loads are predicted to increase for dissolved copper and total aluminum due to the increase in average annual runoff volume, and are predicted to decrease for total lead and dissolved zinc. These differences in loads and volumes concerning trace metals are due to the change of land use condition (from agriculture, oil and gas extraction, and open space to developed) and the application of LID BMPs. Predicted average annual concentrations of dissolved copper, total lead, dissolved zinc, and total aluminum are below benchmark Basin Plan objectives, California Toxics Rule ("CTR") criteria, and National Ambient Water Quality Criteria ("NAWQC"). Cadmium is not expected to be present at significant levels in runoff discharges from the project. On this basis, the impact of the project on trace metals is considered less than significant.

- **Chloride:** MS4 Permit, Construction General Permit, Dewatering General Permit, SUSMP, and LID-compliant BMPs would be incorporated into the project to address chloride in both the construction phase and post-development. The mean predicted concentration and load of chloride is predicted to increase with development, although the predicted concentration is well below the Basin Plan objective and is near the low end of the range of observed values in the Santa Clara River Reach 5. On this basis, the impact of the project on chloride is considered less than significant.

- **Pesticides:** Pesticides in runoff may or may not increase in the post-development phase as a result of landscape applications. Proposed pesticide management practices, including source control, removal with sediments in LID BMPs, and advanced irrigation controls, would

minimize the presence of pesticides in runoff. During the construction phase of the project, erosion and sediment control BMPs and source controls implemented per General Permit and General De-Watering Permit requirements would prevent pesticides associated with sediment from being discharged. Final site stabilization would limit mobility of legacy pesticides that may be present in pre-development conditions. On this basis, the impact of pesticides is considered less than significant.

- **Pathogens:** Post-development pathogen sources include both natural and anthropogenic sources. The natural sources include bird and mammal excrement. Anthropogenic sources include leaking septic and sewer systems, and pet wastes. Removal of agriculture and ranching operations and a reduction in open space within the project area would reduce the bacteria produced by livestock and wildlife. The project would not include septic systems and the sewer system would be designed to current standards, minimizing the potential for leaks. Thus, pet wastes are the primary source of concern. Pathogens are not expected to occur at elevated levels during the construction phase of the project. The project design features ("PDFs") would include source controls and LID BMPs, which, in combination, should help to reduce pathogen indicator levels in post-development stormwater runoff. On this basis, the project's impact on pathogen and pathogen indicators is considered less than significant.

- **Hydrocarbons:** Hydrocarbon concentrations likely would increase post-development because of vehicular emissions and leaks. In stormwater runoff, hydrocarbons are often associated with soot particles that can combine with other solids in the runoff. Such materials are subject to treatment in the proposed LID BMPs. Source control BMPs incorporated in compliance with the MS4 Permit, the Construction General Permit, and the SUSMP also would minimize the presence of hydrocarbons in runoff. During the construction phase of the project, pursuant to the Construction General Permit, the Construction SWPPP must include BMPs that address proper handling of petroleum products on the construction site, such as proper petroleum product storage and spill response practices, and those BMPs must effectively prevent the release of hydrocarbons to runoff per the Best Available Technology Economically Achievable and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology ("BAT/BCT") standards. On this basis, the impact of the project on hydrocarbons is considered less than significant.

- **Trash and Debris:** Trash and debris in runoff are likely to increase with development. However, the project PDFs, including source control and LID BMPs incorporated in compliance with the MS4 Permit, SUSMP requirements, and the LID Performance Standard, would minimize the adverse impacts of trash and debris. Source controls, such as street sweeping, public education, fines for littering, covered trash receptacles, and storm drain stenciling are effective in reducing the amount of trash and debris that is available for mobilization during wet weather. Trash and debris would be captured in catch basin inserts in the commercial area parking lots and in the LID BMPs. During the construction phase of the project, PDFs implemented per Construction General Permit and Dewatering General Permit requirements would remove trash and debris through the use of BMPs, such as catch basin inserts, and by general good housekeeping practices. Trash and debris are not expected to significantly impact receiving waters due to the implementation of the project PDFs.

- **Methylene Blue Activated Substances (MBAS):** The presence of soap in runoff from the project would be controlled through the source control PDFs, including a public education program on residential and charity car washing and the provision of a centralized car wash area directed to the sanitary sewer in the multi-family residential areas. Project source control PDFs would reduce the impacts of soaps in post-construction runoff. Other sources of MBAS, such as cross connections between sanitary and storm sewers, are unlikely given modern sanitary sewer installation methods and inspection and maintenance practices. During the construction phase of the project, equipment and vehicle washing would not use soaps or any other MBAS sources. Therefore, MBAS are not expected to significantly impact the receiving waters of the proposed project.

- **Cyanide**: In addition to the expected relatively low level of cyanide in untreated stormwater, cyanide in runoff from the project would be readily removed by biological uptake, degradation by microorganisms, and by volatilization in the LID BMPs. Therefore, cyanide is not expected to significantly impact the receiving waters of the proposed project.

- **Bioaccumulation:** According to scientific literature, the primary pollutants that are of concern with regard to bioaccumulation are mercury and selenium. However, selenium and mercury are not of concern in this watershed, so bioaccumulation of selenium and mercury is also not expected to result either during the construction or post-development project phases. On this basis, the potential for bioaccumulation in the Santa Clara River and adverse effects on waterfowl and other species is considered less than significant.

- **Construction Impacts:** Construction impacts on water quality generally are caused by soil disturbance and subsequent suspended solids discharge, or by discharge of certain non-sediment-related pollutants, including construction materials (e.g., paint, stucco, etc.); chemicals, liquid products, and petroleum products used in building construction or the maintenance of heavy equipment; and concrete-related pollutants. These impacts would be minimized through implementation of construction BMPs that would meet or exceed measures required by the Construction General Permit, as well as BMPs that control the other potential construction-related pollutants (e.g., petroleum hydrocarbons and metals). A SWPPP specifying BMPs for the site that meet or exceed BAT/BCT standards would be developed as required by, and in compliance with, the Construction General Permit and Los Angeles County Standard Conditions. Erosion control BMPs, including but not limited to hydro-mulch, erosion control blankets, stockpile stabilization, and other physical soil stabilization techniques, also would be implemented to prevent erosion, whereas sediment controls, including but not limited to silt fencing, sedimentation ponds, and secondary containment on stockpiles, would be implemented to trap sediment and prevent discharge. Non-stormwater and construction waste and materials management BMPs (such as vehicle and equipment fueling and washing BMPs; nonvisible pollutant monitoring; and BMPs to manage materials, products, and solid, sanitary, concrete, hazardous, and hydrocarbon wastes) also would be deployed to protect construction site runoff quality. On this basis, the construction-related impacts of the project on water quality are considered less than significant.

- **Regulatory Requirements:** The proposed project satisfies MS4 Permit requirements for new development, including SUSMP requirements and LID requirements, and satisfies

construction-related requirements of the Construction General Permit and General Dewatering Permit. Therefore, the project would comply with water quality regulatory requirements applicable to stormwater runoff.

Finally, the proposed Mission Village project, including proposed drainage and hydromodification controls, would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Santa Clara River in a manner that would cause substantial erosion, siltation, or channel instability; nor would it substantially increase the rates, velocities, frequencies, duration, and/or seasonality of flows in a manner that causes channel instability or in a manner that harms sensitive habitats or species in the River. Therefore, the impact of the project on hydromodification is considered less than significant.

3.16.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the following mitigation measures, which incorporate project water quality and hydrologic PDFs/BMPs, will ensure that the water quality-related impacts of the project remain at less-than-significant levels:

3.16.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.2-1 All on- and off-site flood control improvements necessary to serve the [Newhall Ranch Specific Plan] NRSP are to be constructed to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Flood Control Division.

SP 4.2-2 All necessary permits or letters of exemption from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for Specific Plan-related development are to be obtained prior to construction of drainage improvements. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.4, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-10 (restoration) and 4.6-11 through 4.6-16 (enhancement).

SP 4.2-3 All necessary streambed agreement(s) are to be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game wherever grading activities alter the flow of streams under CDFG jurisdiction. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.6, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1 through 4.6-10 (restoration) and 4.6-11 through 4.6-16 (enhancement).

SP 4.2-4 Conditional Letters of Map Revision (CLOMR) relative to adjustments to the 100-year FIA flood plain are to be obtained by the applicant after the proposed drainage facilities are constructed.

SP 4.2-5 Prior to the approval and recordation of each subdivision map, a Hydrology Plan, Drainage Plan, and Grading Plan (including an Erosion Control Plan if required) for each subdivision must be prepared by the applicant of the subdivision map to ensure that no significant erosion, sedimentation, or flooding impacts would occur

during or after site development. These plans shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.

SP 4.2-6 Install permanent erosion control measures, such as desilting and debris basins, drainage swales, slope drains, storm drain inlet/outlet protection, and sediment traps in order to prevent sediment and debris from the upper reaches of the drainage areas which occur on the Newhall Ranch site from entering storm drainage improvements. These erosion control measures shall be installed to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.

SP 4.2-7 The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall satisfy all applicable requirements of the NPDES Program in effect in Los Angeles County to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. These requirements currently include preparation of an Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (USWMP) containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. In addition, the requirements currently include preparation of an SWPPP containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works shall monitor compliance with those NPDES requirements.

SP 4.2-8 The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall comply with all appropriate requirements of the County of Los Angeles Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, and comply with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issued General Permit for Construction Activity Storm Water (SWRCB Order 99-08-DWQ), as it may be amended from time to time or replaced by other applicable stormwater permits.

3.16.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measure

MV 4.22-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit, and as a part of the design level hydrology study and facilities plan, the project applicant shall submit to LACDPW for review and approval drainage plans showing the incorporation into the project of those water quality and hydrologic control project design features (i.e., the post-development water quality and hydrologic control BMPs) (the "PDFs"), identified in this [EIR] Section 4.22, which PDFs shall be designed to meet the standards set forth in this [EIR] Section 4.22, including the sizing, capacity, and volume reduction performance standards set forth herein, as summarized in Table 4.22-17 (below).

Table 4.22-17
SUSMP Requirements and Corresponding Project Design Features

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Mission Village PDFs
1. Runoff Flow Control	• Control post-development peak stormwater runoff discharge rates, velocities and duration in Natural Drainage Systems to prevent accelerated downstream erosion	• Hydromodification source controls include minimizing impervious surfaces through clustering development and using parcel-based LID BMPs, regional LID BMPs, and Single Family HSCs (see Figure 4.22-2) to

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Mission Village PDFs
	and to protect habitat-related beneficial uses. • Post-development peak storm water runoff discharge rates shall not exceed the estimated pre-development rate for developments where the increased peak storm water discharge rate will result in increased potential for downstream erosion. • Post-development runoff from the 50-year capital storm shall not exceed the predevelopment peak flow rate, burned and bulked, from the 50-year capital storm.	disconnect impervious surfaces and reduce runoff volumes through evapotranspiration and infiltration. • 50-year capital storm peak flow rate analysis is contained in the "Mission Village Tentative Tract Map 61105 Drainage Concept," prepared by Psomas (Psomas, 2009) (see **Appendix 4.2**), and analysis of flood impacts on the Santa Clara River is contained in the "Flood Technical Report" prepared by Pacific Advanced Civil Engineering, Inc. for the Mission Village project (PACE, 2007) (see **Appendix 4.21**).
2. Conserve Natural Areas	• Concentrate or cluster development on portions of a site while leaving the remaining land in a natural undisturbed condition. • Limit clearing and grading of native vegetation at a site to the minimum amount needed to build lots, allow access, and provide fire protection. • Maximize trees and other vegetation at each site, planting additional vegetation, clustering tree areas, and promoting the use of native and/or drought tolerant plants. • Promote natural vegetation by using parking lot islands and other landscaped areas. • Preserve riparian areas and wetlands.	• The NRSP clusters development into villages, including Mission Village. Approximately 70% (8,335 acres) of the NRSP subregion would remain undeveloped. • Approximately 685 acres of the 1,261.8 acre Mission Village project area would remain as natural river corridor, open space, or parks. • Native and non-native/non-invasive vegetation would be utilized within the development. • The final project stormwater system would include the use of the parcel-based LID BMPs, including, but not limited to, infiltration, bioinfiltration, and biofiltration BMPs placed in common area landscaping in commercial, multi-family residential, institutional, recreational, and park areas, roadway median strips, and parking lot islands (where applicable) and regional infiltration/ biofiltration facilities incorporating natural vegetation. • Riparian buffers would be preserved along the Santa Clara River corridor and Lion Canyon by clustering development upland and away from the River and tributary canyon. • Lion Canyon would be stabilized and restored by the project. The restoration would utilize boulder step-pool structures, biotechnical stabilization, soil cement, turf reinforcement mat (TRM) and limited grading to enhance and restore the Lion

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Mission Village PDFs
		Canyon drainage. The Lion Canyon restoration would also include plantings of upland and riparian vegetation to enhance the habitat-related beneficial uses.
3. Minimize Stormwater Pollutants of Concern	• Minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, the introduction of pollutants of concern that may result in significant impacts generated from site runoff of directly connected impervious areas (DCIA) to the stormwater conveyance system as approved by the building official.	• LID BMPs would be selected to address the pollutants of concern for the Project. These LID BMPs include infiltration, bioinfiltration, and biofiltration BMPs implemented at the parcel-scale, media filters units implemented in right-of-ways, USEPA Green Streets practices implemented in right-of-ways, as feasible, and regional infiltration/ biofiltration facilities. These BMPs are designed to minimize introduction of pollutants to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP). • The project would include numerous source controls, including education programs, animal waste bag stations, street sweeping and catch basin cleaning, an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program for common area landscaping in commercial areas and multi-family residential areas, use of native and/or non-invasive, climate appropriate vegetation, and installation of a car wash pad in multi-family residential areas. • An education program would be implemented that includes both the education of residents and commercial businesses regarding water quality issues. Topics would include services that could affect water quality, such as carpet cleaners and others that may not properly dispose of cleaning wastes; community car washes; and residential car washing. The education program would emphasize animal waste management, such as the importance of cleaning up after pets and not feeding pigeons, seagulls, ducks, and geese. • Vegetated LID BMPs would allow for infiltration of treated stormwater.
4. Protect Slopes and Channels	Project plans must include BMPs consistent with local codes and ordinances and the SUSMP requirements to decrease the potential of slopes and/or channels from eroding and impacting stormwater runoff: • Convey runoff safely from the tops	• Natural slopes and native vegetation on slopes adjacent to the SCR and Lion Canyon would be preserved and/or restored and enhanced. Native and/or non-native/non-invasive vegetation would be used in all plant palettes placed on manufactured/restored slopes.

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Mission Village PDFs
	of slopes and stabilize disturbed slopes. • Utilize natural drainage systems to the maximum extent practicable. • Control or reduce or eliminate flow to natural drainage systems to the maximum extent practicable. • Stabilize permanent channel crossings. • Vegetate slopes with native or drought tolerant vegetation. • Install energy dissipaters, such as riprap, at the outlets of new storm drains, culverts, conduits, or channels that enter unlined channels in accordance with applicable specifications to minimize erosion with the approval of all agencies with jurisdiction, e.g., the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG).	• PDFs, including parcel-based BMPs, regional LID BMPs, and Single Family HSCs, and USEPA Green Streets practices (hydrologic source controls), would reduce flows to natural channels through infiltration and evapotranspiration. • The banks of the Santa Clara River at portions of this site would be stabilized primarily using buried bank stabilization. After the implementation of these measures and other flow control and volume reduction PDFs, the Santa Clara River would be capable of handling the expected flow regime with little or no erosion. • All outlet points to the Santa Clara River would include energy dissipaters per the Newhall Ranch Resource Development and Management Plan. • In-stream stabilization techniques would be employed in Lion Canyon to protect habitat-related beneficial uses, per the Newhall Ranch Resource Development and Management Plan.
5. Provide Storm Drain System Stenciling and Signage	• All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the project area must be stenciled with prohibitive language and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. • Signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping, must be posted at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area. • Legibility of stencils and signs must be maintained.	• All storm drain inlets and water quality inlets would be stenciled or labeled. • Signs would be posted in areas where dumping could occur. • The LACDPW and/or The Homeowners Association or LADPW would maintain stencils and signs.
6. Properly Design Outdoor Material Storage Areas	• Where proposed project plans include outdoor areas for storage of materials that may contribute pollutants to the storm water conveyance system measures to mitigate impacts must be included.	• Pesticides, fertilizers, paints, and other hazardous materials used for maintenance of common areas, parks, commercial areas, and multifamily residential common areas would be kept in enclosed storage areas.
7. Properly Design Trash Storage Areas	All trash containers must meet the following structural or treatment control BMP requirements: • Trash container areas must have	• All outdoor trash storage areas would be covered and isolated from stormwater runoff.

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Mission Village PDFs
	drainage from adjoining roofs and pavement diverter around the areas. • Trash container areas must be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash.	
8. Provide Proof of Ongoing BMP Maintenance	• Applicant required to provide verification of maintenance provisions through such means as may be appropriate, including, but not limited to legal agreements, covenants, and/or Conditional Use Permits.	• The Homeowners Associations or commercial/business owners would be responsible for operation and maintenance of parcel-based BMPs and Single Family HSCs (such as bioretention placed in common area landscaping and downspouts disconnected to percolation trenches). • Los Angeles County Department of Public Works would be responsible for maintenance of USEPA Green Streets practices installed in public right-of-ways and regional LID BMPs.
9. Design Standards for Structural or Treatment Control BMPs	• Post-construction Structural or Treatment Control BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (infiltrate or treat) stormwater runoff using either volumetric treatment control BMPs or flow-based treatment control BMPs sized per listed criteria.	• LID BMPs would be designed to meet or exceed the sizing standards in the Los Angeles County SUSMP requirements. • Volume-based LID BMPs for the project would be designed to capture 80 percent or more of the annual runoff volume per Criteria 2 of the MS4 Permit. • Flow-based BMPs would be sized using Criteria 3, which would provide 80 percent capture of annual runoff volume per criteria of the MS4 Permit. • The size of the facilities would be finalized during the design stage by the project engineer with the final hydrology study, which would be prepared and approved to ensure consistency with this analysis prior to issuance of a final grading permit. • Types of LID BMPs that would be employed include parcel-based BMPs, regional LID BMPs, and Single Family HSCs, USEPA Green Streets practices, media filtration, and a combination thereof.
10B.1. Properly Design Loading/Unloading Dock Areas (100,000 ft^2 Commercial Developments)	• Cover loading dock areas or design drainage to minimize run-on and runoff of stormwater. • Direct connections to storm drains from depressed loading docks (truck wells) are prohibited.	• Loading dock areas would be covered or designed to preclude run-on and runoff. • Direct connections to storm drains from depressed loading docks (truck wells) would be prohibited. • Below grade loading docks for fresh food

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Mission Village PDFs
		items would drain through a Treatment Control BMP applicable to the use, such as a catch basin insert. • Loading docks would be kept in a clean and orderly condition through weekly sweeping and litter control, at a minimum, and immediate cleanup of spills and broken containers without the use of water.
10B.2. Properly Design Repair/Maintenance Bays (100,000 ft^2 Commercial Developments)	• Repair/maintenance bays must be indoors or designed in such a way that does not allow stormwater run-on or contact with stormwater runoff. • Design a repair/maintenance bay drainage system to capture all wash water, leaks, and spills. Connect drains to a sump for collection and disposal. Direct connection of the repair/maintenance bays to the storm drain system is prohibited. If required by local jurisdiction, obtain an Industrial Waste Discharge Permit.	• Commercial areas would not have repair/maintenance bays or the bays would comply with design requirements.
10B.3. Properly Design Vehicle/Equipment Wash Areas (100,000 ft^2 Commercial Developments)	• Self-contained and/or covered, equipped with a clarifier, or other pretreatment facility, and properly connected to a sanitary sewer.	• Areas for washing/steam cleaning of vehicles would be self-contained or covered with a roof or overhang; would be equipped with wash racks and with the prior approval of the sewering agency; would be equipped with a clarifier or other pretreatment facility; and would be properly connected to a sanitary sewer.
10.C. Properly Design Equipment/Accessory Wash Areas (Restaurants)	• Self-contained, equipped with a grease trap, and properly connected to a sanitary sewer. • If the wash area is to be located outdoors, it must be covered, paved, have secondary containment, and be connected to the sanitary sewer.	• Food preparation areas shall have either contained areas or sinks, each with sanitary sewer connections for disposal of wash waters containing kitchen and food wastes. • If located outside, the containment areas or sinks shall also be structurally covered to prevent entry of storm water. Adequate signs shall be provided and appropriately placed stating the prohibition of discharging washwater to the storm drain system.
10.D. Properly design fueling area (Retail Gasoline Outlets)	• The fuel dispensing area must be covered with an overhanging roof structure or canopy. The cover's minimum dimensions must be equal to or greater than the area	• Retail gasoline outlets would comply with design requirements.

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Mission Village PDFs
	within the grade break. The cover must not drain onto the fuel dispensing area and the downspouts must be routed to prevent drainage across the fueling area. • The fuel dispensing area must be paved with Portland cement concrete (or equivalent smooth impervious surface). The use of asphalt concrete shall be prohibited. • The fuel dispensing areas must have a 2% to 4% slope to prevent ponding, and must be separated from the rest of the site by a grade break that prevents run-on of urban runoff. • At a minimum, the concrete fuel dispensing area must extend 6.5 feet (2.0 meters) from the corner of each fuel dispenser, or the length at which the hose and nozzle assembly may be operated plus 1 foot (0.3 meter), whichever is less.	
10.E.1. Properly design fueling area (Automotive Repair Shops)	• See requirement 10.D. above.	• Automotive repair shop fueling areas would comply with design requirements.
10.E.2. Properly design repair/maintenance bays (Automotive Repair Shops)	• See requirement 10.B.2 above.	• Automotive repair shop repair/maintenance bays would comply with design requirements.
10.E.3. Properly design vehicle/equipment wash areas (Automotive Repair Shops)	• Self-contained and/or covered, equipped with a clarifier, or other pretreatment facility, and properly connected to a sanitary sewer or to a permitted disposal facility.	• Automotive repair shop vehicle/equipment wash areas would comply with design requirements.
10.E.4. Properly design loading/unloading dock areas (Automotive Repair Shops)	• See requirement 10.B.1.	• Automotive repair shop loading/unloading dock areas would comply with design requirements.
10.F.1. Properly Design Parking Area (Parking Lots)	• Reduce impervious land coverage of parking areas. • Infiltrate runoff before it reaches the storm drain system. • Treat runoff before it reaches storm	• Commercial, multi-family, institutional, recreational, and park parking lots would incorporate parcel-based LID BMPs located in islands to promote filtration and infiltration of runoff. • Stormwater runoff from parking lots

SUSMP Requirement	Criteria/Description	Corresponding Mission Village PDFs
	drain system.	would be directed to LID BMPs, including infiltration, bioinfiltration, and biofiltration BMPs installed at the parcel scale and regional scale, and/or media filters in compliance with the Project LID Performance Standard.
10.F.2. Properly Design to Limit Oil Contamination and Perform Maintenance (Parking Lots)	• Treat to remove oil and petroleum hydrocarbons at parking lots that are heavily used. • Ensure adequate operation and maintenance of treatment systems particularly sludge and oil removal.	• See above. • Treatment of runoff in LID BMPs would be used to address oil and petroleum hydrocarbons from high-use parking lots. • The Homeowners Associations or Business Owners would be responsible for operation and maintenance of LID BMPs that serve private parking lots.
13. Limitation of Use of Infiltration BMPs	• Infiltration is limited based on design of BMP, pollutant characteristics, land use, soil conditions, and traffic. • Appropriate conditions (groundwater >10 feet from grade) must exist to utilize infiltration to treat and reduce stormwater runoff for the project.	• Per the LARWQCB Clarification Letter (LARWQCB, 2006), generally, the common pollutants in stormwater are filtered or adsorbed by soil, and unlike hydrophobic solvents and salts, do not cause groundwater contamination. In any case, infiltration of 1-2 inches of rainfall in semi-arid areas like Southern California where there is a high rate of evapotranspiration, presents minimal risks. • The proposed LID BMPs allow for infiltration of fully treated runoff only.

Source: Geosyntec, 2010, 2011.

[1] *This requirement is from Part 4, Section D.1 of the MS4 Permit.*

MV 4.22-2 Prior to issuance of a building permit, and as a part of the design level hydrology study and facilities plan, the project applicant shall submit to planning staff for review a Landscape and Integrated Pest Management Plan, identified in this [EIR] Section 4.22, which shall be designed to meet the standards set forth as follows.

A Landscape and Integrated Pest Management Plan shall be developed and implemented for common area landscaping within the Mission Village project that addresses integrated pest management (IPM) and pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines. IPM is a strategy that focuses on long-term prevention or suppression of pest problems (i.e., insects, diseases and weeds) through a combination of techniques, including: using pest-resistant plants; biological controls; cultural practices; habitat modification; and the judicious use of pesticides according to treatment thresholds, when monitoring indicates pesticides are needed because pest populations exceed established thresholds. The Landscape and Integrated Pest Management Plan will address the following components:

1. Pest identification.
2. Practices to prevent pest incidence and reduce pest buildup.
3. Monitoring to examine vegetation and surrounding areas for pests to evaluate trends and to identify when controls are needed.
4. Establishment of action thresholds that trigger control actions.
5. Pest control methods – cultural, mechanical, environmental, biological, and appropriate pesticides.
6. Pesticide management – safety (e.g., Material Safety Data Sheets, precautionary statements, protective equipment); regulatory requirements; spill mitigation; groundwater and surface water protection measures associated with pesticide use; and pesticide applicator certifications, licenses, and training (i.e., all pesticide applicators must be certified by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation).
7. Fertilizer management – soil assessment, fertilizer types, application methods, and storage and handling.

3.16.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and ensure that the water quality-related impacts of the Mission Village project, as identified in the Final EIR, remain at less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant water quality-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

3.17 CLIMATE CHANGE

3.17.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The proposed Mission Village project would result in the emission of greenhouse gases ("GHGs"). EIR Section 4.23 discusses the scientific and regulatory developments surrounding global climate change and provides a quantitative inventory for the emissions that would result from approving Mission Village. In the absence of regulatory criteria, a significance criterion also was developed to assess the impact of the project's GHG emissions. Both project and cumulative impacts were assessed against the identified significance criterion.

The EIR also discusses the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's ("IPCC") conclusion that there is a scientific consensus that global climate change is occurring, and that the frequency of heat extremes, heat waves, and heavy precipitation events likely will increase. Currently accepted models predict that continued GHG emissions at or above current rates will produce more extreme global climate changes during the 21st century than were observed during the 20th century. Relatedly, the EIR also addresses the IPCC's conclusion that human activities have increased atmospheric concentrations of GHGs.

Nonetheless, there are uncertainties. The uncertainties relate to predicting: the actual climate change experienced by various areas of the world; the rate at which air and water temperatures will rise; whether the consequences of global climate change will be sudden or gradual; whether the consequences will be catastrophic or manageable; and whether international, national, state, and local measures will effectively reduce GHG emissions.

The emissions inventory for the proposed Mission Village project considers eight categories of GHG emission sources that would result from approval of the Mission Village project: (1) emissions due to land use/vegetation changes; (2) emissions from construction activities; (3) emissions associated with residential building use; (4) emissions associated with nonresidential building use; (5) mobile source emissions; (6) municipal source emissions; (7) area emissions; and (8) emissions associated with recreational center use. The emissions from land use/vegetation changes and construction activities are one-time emissions event, whereas emissions from the other sources would occur annually, throughout the life of the project. The inventory identified approximately 109,331 metric tons ("tones") of carbon dioxide equivalent ("CO2e") one-time emissions, and 60,715 tonnes of CO2e annual emissions. If the one-time emissions are annualized, over 40-years, the annual emissions are 63,448 tonnes per year.

These emission levels were analyzed to determine whether approval of Mission Village would impede compliance with the GHG emissions reduction goals mandated by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill ["AB"] 32), which requires that California's GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. The proposed project's CO2e emissions from all annual sources are 36.6 percent below the level that would be expected if the proposed project were constructed consistent with the assumptions in the California Air Resources Board's projections for 2020 if "no actions are taken" ("CARB 2020 NAT scenario"). (See Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change [Scoping Plan], California Air Resources Board [adopted December 2008].) Moreover, when the one-time land use/vegetation change and construction emissions are included, the proposed project's emissions are still 35.6 percent below the CARB 2020 NAT scenario. As established by CARB's emission forecasts for 2020, a reduction of 29 percent below the CARB 2020 NAT scenario is required to meet the goals of AB 32.

Therefore, the proposed project would not impede implementation of AB 32 as its reduction below the CARB 2020 NAT scenario is greater than that required, and project impacts are less than significant.

The EIR inventory was prepared assuming that all emissions from Mission Village would be "new," in the sense that absent development of Mission Village these emissions would not occur. Given the global nature of GHG emissions, questions arise over whether new global GHG emissions are caused by economic and population growth, and not the local development projects that simply accommodate such growth.

3.17.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the Mission Village project includes numerous project design features that lessen Mission Village's estimated GHG emissions total. In order to ensure that these project design features are implemented, they are

set forth below as mitigation measures to ensure the potential global climate change-related impacts of the project are less than significant:

3.17.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

The Specific Plan Program EIR did not include, nor did the Board adopt, any mitigation measures specific to global climate change.

3.17.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

MV 4.23-1 All residential buildings on the project site that are enabled by approval of the proposed project shall be designed to provide improved insulation and ducting, low E glass, high efficiency air conditioning units, and radiant barriers in attic spaces, as needed, or equivalent to ensure that all residential buildings operate at levels 15 percent better than the standards required by the 2008 version of Title 24. Notwithstanding this measure, all residential buildings shall be designed to comply with the then-operative Title 24 standards applicable at the time building permit applications are filed. For example, if new standards are adopted that supersede the 2008 Title 24 standards, the residential buildings shall be designed to comply with those newer standards and, if necessary, exceed those standards by an increment that is equivalent to a 15 percent exceedance of the 2008 Title 24 standards.

MV 4.23-2 All commercial and public buildings on the project site that are enabled by approval of the proposed project shall be designed to provide improved insulation and ducting, low E glass, high efficiency HVAC equipment, and energy efficient lighting design with occupancy sensors as needed, or equivalent to ensure that all commercial and public buildings operate at levels 15 percent better than the standards required by the 2008 version of Title 24. Notwithstanding this measure, all nonresidential buildings shall be designed to comply with the then-operative Title 24 standards applicable at the time building permit applications are filed. For example, if new standards are adopted that supersede the 2008 Title 24 standards, the nonresidential buildings shall be designed to comply with those newer standards and, if necessary, exceed those standards by an increment that is equivalent to a 15 percent exceedance of the 2008 Title 24 standards.

MV 4.23-3 The project applicant or designee shall produce or cause to be produced renewable electricity, or secure greenhouse gas offsets or credits from a public agency (e.g., CARB; SCAQMD) endorsed market, equivalent to the installation of one photovoltaic (i.e., solar) power system no smaller than 2.0 kilowatts, when undertaking the design and construction of each single-family detached residential unit on the project site.

MV 4.23-4 The project applicant or designee shall produce or cause to be produced renewable electricity, or secure greenhouse gas offsets or credits from a public agency (e.g., CARB; SCAQMD) endorsed market, equivalent to the installation

of one photovoltaic (i.e., solar) power system no smaller than 2.0 kilowatts, on each 1,600 square feet of nonresidential roof area provided on the project site.

MV 4.23-5 Consistent with the Governor's Million Solar Roofs Plan, the project applicant or designee, acting as the seller of any single-family residence constructed as part of the development of at least 50 homes that are intended or offered for sale, shall offer a solar energy system option to all customers that enter negotiations to purchase a new production home constructed in Mission Village on land for which an application for a tentative subdivision map has been deemed complete. The seller shall disclose the total installed cost of the solar energy system option, and the estimated cost savings.

MV 4.23-6 The project applicant shall use solar water heating for all pools located at the Mission Village recreation centers.

MV 4.23-7 The project applicant, in accordance with Los Angeles County requirements, will design and construct the approximately 13,500 square feet fire station and 36,000 square feet public library so as to achieve LEED silver certification.

In addition, mitigation measures recommended in connection with other environmental impact categories (i.e., air quality; biological resources; traffic) would reduce the proposed project's GHG emissions and/or improve the project's capacity to respond to the uncertain effects of global climate change. As these measures are adopted and incorporated into the project mitigation monitoring and reporting program, these measures can be relied upon in this analysis as feasible measures designed to reduce GHG emissions and the impact of global climate change on the project.

3.17.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and ensure that the global climate change-related impacts of the Mission Village project, as identified in the Final EIR, remain at less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant global climate change-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

4.0 FINDINGS ON LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

4.1 PARKS AND RECREATION

4.1.1 Less Than Significant Impact

The Program EIR identified certain potentially significant impacts related to parks, recreation, and trails if the Specific Plan were implemented absent mitigation. Accordingly, the Specific Plan included land for community, neighborhood, and regional parks, an extensive trail system, and also set aside significant areas for permanent open space. The Program EIR concluded that

the inclusion of parkland and the significant public benefits that would be provided reduced any potential impacts to a level below significant.

The proposed Mission Village project includes a public 21.6-acre Community Park, which is consistent with the Specific Plan's Land Use Overlay Community Park designation for the area, that would be located along the eastern side of the proposed Commerce Center Drive near the eastern site boundary. (The park locations in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are overlay designations, which allow park location flexibility in order to situate parks in the best locations to serve future residents as the property develops over time.) The proposed project also includes a 5.2-acre public neighborhood park, a 6.9-acre private Community Recreation Center, 4.6 acres of private recreation area, and a 2.9-acre private park. The proposed project further provides a hierarchy of community, local, and pathway trails, as identified in the Specific Plan, connecting to the Specific Plan's Regional River Trail, which traverses the Santa Clara River. These trails include 18,980 linear feet of community trails, 12,900 linear feet of local trails, and 9,200 linear feet of pathways (7.5 miles of trails). In addition, the project includes 212.6 acres of River Corridor dedication. In sum, the proposed project includes a total of 71.8 acres of park and recreational space, 70 of which are eligible for Quimby Act credit.

Implementation of these project components would result in a parkland provision equivalent to approximately 11.1 acres per 1,000 persons, which is greater than the Los Angeles County (County) and Quimby Act requirements of 3.0 acres per 1,000 persons. The basic Quimby Act parkland obligation for the proposed project is 29.7 net acres of park land; pursuant to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, any acreage by which the proposed project exceeds its Quimby obligation will be credited against other subdivisions within the Specific Plan area. Measured against the identified significance thresholds, the proposed Mission Village project meets County parkland requirements, exceeds Quimby Act parkland standards, and would not result in significant impacts to local parks and recreation facilities by causing substantial physical deterioration to existing recreational facilities. Additionally, the proposed project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

4.1.2 Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures below, while not required to mitigate any potentially significant impacts, are, nevertheless, recommended as part of the project approval to ensure that the Mission Village project will not result in any parks and recreation-related impacts upon implementation:

4.1.2.1 Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

SP 4.20-1 Development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan will provide the following acreages of parks and open area:

- Ten public Neighborhood Parks totaling 55 acres;
- Open Areas totaling 1,106 acres of which 186 acres are Community Parks;
- High Country Special Management Area of 4,214 acres;
- River Corridor Special Management Area of 819 acres;

- A 15-acre lake;
- An 18-hole golf course; and
- A trail system consisting of:
  - Regional River Trail;
  - Salt Creek Corridor;
  - Community trails; and
  - Unimproved trails.

SP 4.20-2 Prior to the construction of the proposed trail system, the Specific Plan applicant shall finalize the alignment of trails with the County Department of Parks and Recreation.

SP 4.20-3 Trail construction shall be in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation trail system standards.

4.1.2.2 Mission Village Mitigation Measures

Because the Mission Village project meets the County parkland requirements and exceeds the Quimby Act requirements, no additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the Specific Plan are required or necessary because the Mission Village project would not result in any significant park and recreation-related impacts.

4.1.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and ensure that the impacts to parks and recreation, as identified in the Final EIR, remain at less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid potentially significant park and recreational-related impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

4.2 MINERAL RESOURCES

4.2.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

Portions of the Mission Village project site located along the banks of the Santa Clara River, and the sites of the proposed utility corridor and water quality basin, are located within a Mineral Resource Zone ("MRZ") 2 zone, which identifies the area as a location with significant mineral deposits present, or a location with a high likelihood of the presence of mineral deposits. The majority of the remainder of the Mission Village site is located in the MRZ-3 zone, which indicates that mineral deposits are expected to occur in this area, but the extent of significance of such deposits is unknown at the present time. The off-site site locations for water tanks are also located in MRZ-3. Two alternative sites are proposed for the electrical substation; each is located in MRZ-1, which is an area characterized as having no significant mineral deposits present or judged to have little likelihood for the presence of minerals. The extension of Magic Mountain

Parkway to the project site would traverse both MRZ-2 and MRZ-3. However, the tract map site, utility corridor, water quality basin, water tank, electrical substation, and the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway sites are not located in active mineral extraction operation areas. Further, the tract map site and proposed sites for the utility corridor, water quality basin, water tank, electrical substation, and extension of Magic Mountain Parkway are not identified as a "locally-important mineral resource recovery site" or a "regionally significant construction aggregate resource area" by the County of Los Angeles General Plan, Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, or Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. In addition, at the time the Newhall Ranch site was designated by the County of Los Angeles as "Specific Plan," which serves as the zoning designation for the property, there were no areas within Newhall Ranch used for mineral extraction. Under the Specific Plan designation, the area currently is zoned for development of various Specific Plan land uses and not long-term mineral extraction activities.

The Specific Plan zoning designation allows for the development of a mixed-use planned community, with sand and gravel extraction activities allowed during tract grading and construction phases on the sites to be developed. Additionally, extraction activities are permitted in the Visitor-Serving (VS) and Open Area (OA) zones under a conditional use permit, which is not proposed. Thus, the current zoning designation for the project site allows the area to be available for mineral extraction uses on a limited basis in areas that are already proposed for, and in association with, development (i.e., on tentative tract map sites). Furthermore, the majority of mineral resources of value are expected to be located in the River Corridor and not on the project site, and the continued availability of these resources would not be significantly affected by the proposed project. Therefore, project implementation will not result in a significant impact in relation to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

4.2.2 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant impacts relating to mineral resources. Accordingly, changes or alterations are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

4.3 EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The Commission finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the following impacts associated with the Mission Village project are less than significant and no mitigation is required:

Environmental Resource Category	***Environmental Impact***
Aesthetics	• No substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.
Agricultural Resources	• No conflict with an existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.
Air Quality	• No conflict with or obstruction of implementation of the applicable

Environmental Resource Category	***Environmental Impact***
	air quality plan. • No creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.
Cultural Resources	• No substantial adverse change in the significant of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. • No disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	• No creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. • No emission of hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. • No site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
Hydrology and Water Quality	• No placement within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. • No exposure of 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. • No inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.
Land Use and Planning	• No physical division of an established community. • No conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
Population and Housing	• No displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. • No displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
Transportation/Traffic	• No resulting change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. • No substantial increase in hazards due to design features of the roadway or incompatible uses. • No inadequate emergency access. • No conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

5.0 FINDINGS FOCUSING ON SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WHICH CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE

5.1 VISUAL QUALITIES

5.1.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The analysis of the Mission Village project's cumulative visual qualities impacts tiers from and incorporates the analysis found in the Specific Plan's Program EIR. Incorporation and reliance on the Program EIR's analysis is appropriate as it has been determined that the project would not have any cumulative effects that were not previously examined as part of the Specific Plan's environmental review. Accordingly, the project, consistent with the analysis in the Program EIR, would result in a significant unavoidable visual impact when considered in conjunction with build-out of all existing, planned, approved, and pending development projects along I-5 and SR-126.

5.1.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available, other than those recommended to mitigate project-specific impacts identified in these CEQA findings, to mitigate the cumulative visual qualities impacts attributable to the Mission Village project to a level below significant.

5.1.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will result in significant cumulative impacts to visual qualities. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which would mitigate, in part, the significant cumulative visual qualities impacts attributable to the project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant cumulative impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these cumulative impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified cumulative visual qualities impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* **Section 8.0**, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable cumulative visual qualities impacts of the project.

5.2 AIR QUALITY

5.2.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

While the proposed project is consistent with the regional growth projections in the AQMP and constitutes a relatively small contribution to the regional emissions, the project emissions and vehicle miles traveled ("VMT") growth would exceed other thresholds indicating cumulative impacts. In particular, because the SoCAB is a nonattainment area for ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$,

the project's construction and operational emissions would contribute to cumulative air quality impacts in the SoCAB. Also, as the project's construction emissions would exceed the project-level threshold of significance for VOCs, NO_X PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, the project's construction emissions would be considered cumulatively considerable, and the cumulative air quality impact would be significant under this criterion. The mitigated operational emissions also are greater than the project-level thresholds of significance for VOCs, NO_X, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$; therefore, operational emissions would be considered cumulatively considerable.

5.2.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available, other than those recommended to mitigate project-specific impacts identified in these CEQA findings, to mitigate the cumulative air quality impacts attributable to the Mission Village project to a level below significant.

5.2.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will result in significant cumulative impacts to air quality. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which would mitigate, in part, the significant cumulative air quality impacts attributable to the project, as identified in the Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce all the identified significant cumulative impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified air quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* **Section 8.0**, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts of the project.

5.3 SOLID WASTE SERVICES

5.3.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

Under the cumulative build-out scenario, the Mission Village project and all forecasted future development are expected to produce 395,553 tons per year of solid waste. This quantity represents the cumulative solid waste generation under a worst-case scenario, without any recycling activities in place. The project's share of 8,451 tons per year would represent 2.1 percent of this total.

New landfills would need to be developed and/or other waste disposal options implemented in order to accommodate this future growth. However, as land suitable for landfill development/expansion is quantitatively finite and limited, due to numerous environmental, regulatory and political constraints, the Mission Village project's contribution to such impacts is considered cumulatively considerable.

5.3.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that the State of California, *via* the California Integrated Waste Management Act, requires cities and counties to reduce the amount of solid waste entering existing landfills through the use of recycling, reuse, and waste prevention efforts. In addition, many jurisdictions have adopted construction and demolition debris recycling ordinances to reduce the amount of construction waste. The Commission finds that these legislative efforts will substantially lessen the cumulative solid waste services impacts identified in the Mission Village Final EIR. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the cumulative impacts identified in the Mission Village Final EIR to a less-than-significant level.

5.3.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will result in significant cumulative impacts to solid waste services. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the identified significant cumulative impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified solid waste services impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* **Section 8.0**, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable cumulative solid waste services impacts of the project.

5.4 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

5.4.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

Build-out of the Specific Plan and other reasonably foreseeable future related cumulative development in the region would result in the conversion of agricultural soils to non-agricultural uses. Given that implementation of the Mission Village project, including development of the tract map site and related off-site improvements, would convert 160.7 acres of Prime Farmland, 30.1 acres of Unique Farmland, 0.6 acre of Farmland of Statewide Importance, 2.5 acres of Farmland of Local Importance, and 875.6 acres of Grazing Land to non-agricultural uses, the project's contribution to the conversion of agricultural land in the region to non-agricultural uses is considered cumulatively considerable.

5.4.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the cumulative impacts identified in the Mission Village Final EIR to a less-than-significant level.

5.4.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will result in significant cumulative impacts to agricultural resources. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the identified significant cumulative impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, these impacts must be considered unavoidably significant. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(3), as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Commission has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other

considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and the identified agricultural resources impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (*see* **Section 8.0**, below), which outweigh the significant unavoidable cumulative agricultural resources impacts of the project.

6.0 FINDINGS FOCUSING ON SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

6.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES

6.1.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts analysis presented in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR considered the cumulative geologic, soil, and geotechnical impacts associated with buildout of the entire Specific Plan, including the Newhall Ranch WRP. The Specific Plan EIR determined that geologic, soil, and geotechnical impacts tend to be site specific, rather than cumulative in nature and that each development site would be subject to, at minimum, uniform site development and construction standards relative to seismic and other geologic conditions prevalent within the region. The Program EIR recognized that when development plans would be developed for a specific site, appropriate and site-specific studies would be done to identify geotechnical and soils impacts, and to recommend appropriate mitigation.

Because any potential geotechnical impacts that may result with development of the Mission Village project site would be site specific in nature, and because development of the proposed project, as well as the development of all surrounding projects, is required to be consistent with applicable Los Angeles County and Uniform Building Code requirements relative to potential geologic hazards, the proposed Mission Village project would not result in significant cumulative geologic, soil or geotechnical impacts.

6.1.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that no additional mitigation measures are required to ensure that cumulative impacts resulting from the project remain at a level below significant.

6.1.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to geotechnical and soil resources. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.2. HYDROLOGY

6.2.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

All projects within the Santa Clara River's tributary watershed and unincorporated Los Angeles County would be subject to the same general requirements as the Mission Village project relative to potential hydrology impacts. These development requirements include those imposed by the LACDPW Flood Control Division, which are designed to ensure that upstream or downstream

flooding, downstream erosion, and sedimentation do not occur. Furthermore, these projects also would be subject to other requirements that the LACDPW may specifically identify as needed due to the unique topographic and geologic characteristics of individual project sites. Therefore, the project would not result in significant cumulative flooding, erosion, and/or sedimentation impacts.

6.2.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that because other development projects within Los Angeles County would be subject to the same requirements as the Mission Village project, and additional requirements would be imposed on a case-by-case basis by the LACDPW, no additional mitigation measures are required to ensure that cumulative impacts resulting from the project remain at a level below significant.

6.2.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to hydrology. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.3 BIOTA

6.3.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact analysis for biological resources resulted in three different cumulative impact determinations:

1. The contribution of the proposed Mission Village project to a potential cumulative impact in the watershed resulting from present and reasonably foreseeable projects, including the RMDP/SCP project, could be cumulatively considerable, absent mitigation. Implementation of the mitigation measures required by both the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR and the mitigation measures recommended in the Mission Village EIR would reduce the contribution of the proposed Mission Village project to cumulative impacts to a level less than cumulatively considerable.

2. The contribution of the proposed Mission Village project to a potential cumulative impact in the watershed resulting from present and foreseeable projects, including the RMDP/SCP project, would not be cumulatively considerable. This determination was made where the resource affected by the RMDP/SCP project comprises a very small proportion of the resource impacts in the watershed.

3. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, including the RMDP/SCP project, including the proposed Mission Village project, do not result in potential significant watershed-level impacts. This determination was made when the resource is still common to abundance it its geographic range and/or substantial habitat for the species would remain in the watershed.

Impacts would be cumulatively considerable, absent mitigation, for a majority of the biological resources, including vegetation communities; common wildlife as a whole; most of the federally- and state-listed threatened and endangered and all California Fully Protected species; wildlife habitat linkages, corridors, and crossings; most California Species of Special Concern; many California Special Animals, Watch List species, Specially Protected Mammals, and CDFG Trust Resources; and four special-status plants.

The mitigation measures required by both the Specific Plan and Mission Village EIRs would reduce impacts to these resources to a level below cumulatively considerable. To offset the loss of vegetation communities and habitat for species, these mitigation measures generally include the dedication and maintenance of existing natural lands in the Open Area, River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, High Country SMA/SEA 20, and Salt Creek area, totaling approximately 9,753 acres. For riparian resources, these measures include replacing the functions and services of riparian communities that may be lost through construction. For both wildlife and plant species, mitigation includes measures to control for long-term secondary effects, including controls on public access to dedicated open space areas; controls on pet, stray, and feral cats and dogs; termination of grazing activities (except for the purpose of resource management); controls on invasive plant and animal species (including Argentine ants, brown-headed cowbirds, bullfrogs, African clawed frogs, and crayfish); controls on pesticides (including rodenticides); controls on hydrological alterations and water quality; and controls on nighttime lighting; fencing and signage; and homeowner education about sensitive resources.

The contribution of the proposed Mission Village project to potential significant cumulative impacts at the watershed level would not be cumulatively considerable for most special-status biological resources, including southern steelhead and several special-status plants. In addition, significant cumulative impacts to a majority of wildlife and plant species at the watershed level would not occur. Although the contribution of the proposed Mission Village project would not be cumulatively considerable in these cases, the identified mitigation measures, nonetheless, would reduce on- site impacts to these resources.

In summary, although the Mission Village project, as part of the RMDP/SCP, would result in significant impacts to biological resources absent mitigation, the mitigation measures required by both the Specific Plan and Mission Village EIR, as set forth in these findings, would substantially reduce the identified impacts to a level below significant.

6.3.2 Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures, beyond those identified in these CEQA findings to mitigate project-specific biota impacts, are required to reduce potentially significant cumulative impacts to biological resources to a level below significant.

6.3.3 Findings

The Commission finds that with implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures identified in these findings, the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to biota. Accordingly, additional changes or alterations to the

project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.4 WATER QUALITY

6.4.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

With regards to surface water and groundwater quality, as the effluent generated by the Mission Village project will not produce concentrations of pollutants of concern that would be expected to cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards, the project's incremental effect on surface water and groundwater quality is not significant. Furthermore, other projects would be required to comply with regulations designed by the Los Angeles RWQCB, which assures that regional development will not adversely affect water quality.

As for groundwater recharge, urbanization of the region has been accompanied by long-term stability in groundwater pumping and levels, which is attributed, in part, to the significant volume of natural recharge that occurs in streambeds. The addition of imported State Water Project water to the region also has contributed to groundwater recharge. Therefore, impacts to groundwater recharge are not expected to be cumulatively considerable due to the lack of groundwater depletion and the historic recharge rates.

Finally, as to hydromodification, based upon fluvial and geomorphic studies, the Mission Village project's inclusion of hydromodification controls as project design features, the requirement that future development control water flow through compliance with a regional program, and the natural occurrence of large-scale changes in the Santa Clara River as a response to major episodic events, the project's contribution to cumulative hydromodification impacts is less than significant.

6.4.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that because other projects within Los Angeles County would be subject to the same or similar mitigation measures as the Mission Village project, no further mitigation measures are required to ensure that cumulative impacts resulting from the project remain less than significant.

6.4.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to water quality. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.5 FLOODPLAIN MODIFICATIONS

6.5.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The analysis of the Mission Village project's cumulative impacts resulting from floodplain modifications tiers from and incorporates the analysis found in the Specific Plan's Program EIR.

The Program EIR concluded that the reduction in floodplain area caused by the bank protection would not significantly increase the overall water velocities or water depth because the volume of flow carried in the shallow, slow-moving areas along the margins of the Santa Clara River is small. Further, variations would be localized and limited in scope, especially when viewed in the entirety of the Santa Clara River corridor within the Specific Plan site and downstream. Accordingly, as the overall mosaic of habitats within the River would be maintained, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact.

6.5.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that no additional mitigation measures, beyond those recommended to mitigate biota impacts in these CEQA findings, are required because no significant cumulative impacts to biological resources are anticipated due to the Mission Village project's bank stabilization, Long Canyon Road Bridge, or changes in the floodplain.

6.5.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to floodplain modifications. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.6 TRAFFIC/ACCESS

6.6.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

As approved, the Specific Plan would generate 357,000 average daily trips ("ADT"). The Specific Plan's Program EIR concluded that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant impacts, but that the identified mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to a level below significant.

At project buildout, which is anticipated in Year 2021, Mission Village would generate approximately 58,000 average daily vehicle trips. Consistent with County of Los Angeles, City of Santa Clarita, and Caltrans traffic impact analysis guidelines, the cumulative impacts of the proposed project relative to the capacity of the surrounding roadways were analyzed under two different scenarios: (1) 2021 project buildout cumulative conditions; and (2) long-range (2035) cumulative conditions.

Under 2021 project buildout cumulative conditions, the project, in combination with cumulative traffic, would result in significant impacts at the following intersections (the applicable jurisdiction is listed in parenthetical):

- I-5 SB Ramps & Henry Mayo Drive (SR-126) (Caltrans/County);
- I-5 SB Ramps & Valencia Boulevard (Caltrans/County);
- The Old Road & Rye Canyon Road (County);
- The Old Road & McBean Parkway (County);

- McBean Parkway & Magic Mountain Parkway (City);
- McBean Parkway & Newhall Ranch Road (City);
- Orchard Village Road & McBean Parkway (City);
- Bouquet Canyon Road & Newhall Ranch Road (City); and,
- Commerce Center Drive & SR-126 (County).

Mitigation in the form of fair-share payments towards identified roadway capacity improvements is proposed that would reduce the identified impacts to a level below significant.

Under long-range (2035) cumulative conditions, the project would contribute to significant long-term cumulative impacts at the following intersections:

- I-5 SB Ramps & SR-126 (Caltrans/County);
- The Old Road & I-5 SB Ramps (Caltrans/County);
- I-5 SB Ramps & Magic Mountain Parkway (Caltrans/County);
- I-5 NB Ramps & Magic Mountain Parkway (Caltrans/City);
- I-5 SB Ramps & Valencia Boulevard (Caltrans/County);
- I-5 SB Ramps & McBean Parkway (Caltrans/County);
- I-5 SB Ramps/Marriott Way & Pico Canyon Road (Caltrans/County);
- I-5 NB On/Off & Lyons Avenue (Caltrans/City);
- The Old Road & Rye Canyon Road (County);
- The Old Road & Magic Mountain Parkway (County);
- The Old Road & McBean Parkway (County);
- Tourney Road & Magic Mountain Parkway (City);
- McBean Parkway & Magic Mountain Parkway (City);
- McBean Parkway & Newhall Ranch Road (City);
- Wiley Canyon Road & Lyons Avenue (City);
- Orchard Village Road & Wiley Canyon (City);
- Orchard Village Road & McBean (City);
- Valencia Boulevard & Magic Mountain Parkway (City);

- Bouquet Canyon Road & Newhall Ranch Road (City); and
- Commerce Center Drive & SR-126 (County/Caltrans).

Mitigation in the form of fair-share payments towards identified capacity improvements is proposed that would reduce the project's contribution to the identified impacts to a level below significant.

As identified in the EIR, no significant cumulative impacts would occur to CMP intersections or CMP freeway segments, or to the Interstate 5 (I-5) mainline. However, the potential traffic impacts of the Mission Village project also were analyzed as part of the larger Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP project, which was evaluated in a joint EIS/EIR (SCH No. 2000011025) prepared by the Corps and the CDFG. The EIS/EIR analyzed the potential impacts associated with buildout of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, including Mission Village, the Valencia Commerce Center, and Entrada developments. The EIS/EIR determined that the development facilitated by the RMDP/SCP project would result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to I-5 and includes mitigation measures requiring that the project applicant contribute its fair-share of the costs to implement the I-5 HOV/Truck Lanes SR-14 to Parker Road Improvement Project. Thus, as identified in the EIS/EIR, when Mission Village traffic is considered as part of the larger volume of traffic that would be generated by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and other Westside development, the traffic generated by that larger project, in combination with other cumulative development within the Santa Clarita Valley and the surrounding areas, would result in significant cumulative impacts. To implement the mitigation measures set forth in the EIS/EIR relative to Mission Village, and to ensure that the County is able to monitor and enforce such measures as they relate to the Mission Village project, EIR mitigation measure MV 4.5-29 requires the applicant to enter into an agreement with Caltrans to either construct or pay an equitable share of the costs to implement appropriate improvements.

It also is noted that full buildout of the Specific Plan area, including Mission Village, can occur without Potrero Canyon Road Bridge being in place while maintaining acceptable levels of service ("LOS"). This is due primarily to the fact that the Potrero Canyon Road Bridge was included as part of the Specific Plan for purposes other than maintaining acceptable LOS, such as facilitating access to SR-126, which would still be provided within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan by the Commerce Center Drive Bridge and Long Canyon Road Bridge.

If all of the cumulative development projects considered as part of the impact analysis are approved, each would be required to construct or finance, through the applicable Bridge & Thoroughfare ("B&T") District or otherwise, its fair share of the improvements necessary to mitigate the affected roadways significantly impacted by the respective project. Additionally, project-specific environmental analysis conducted for other cumulative projects is to comply with the requirements of the CMP, which provides lead agencies with the opportunity to assess each project's improvement program to ensure that it meets its mitigation goal. Therefore, by implementing the recommended mitigation measures identified below that are attributable to the proposed project, and provided that the County and City require fair-share participation of the mitigation measures by other projects, no unavoidable significant cumulative traffic/access impacts would occur at any impacted roadway in the project study area, and the project's cumulative traffic impacts would be mitigated to a level below significant.

6.6.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that potentially significant cumulative traffic/access impacts of the Mission Village project are reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

2021 Project Buildout Cumulative Conditions

MV 4.5-3 I-5 Southbound Ramps & SR-126 – Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, the project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to stripe a fourth westbound through lane. (Project Share = 14.3 percent. Please refer to EIR **Appendix 4.5**, AFA Traffic Impact Analysis, Appendix J, for fair-share calculations.)

MV 4.5-4 I-5 Southbound Ramps & Valencia Boulevard – Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, the project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to re-stripe the second westbound free-flow right-turn lane to a third westbound through lane/shared free-flow right-turn lane. (Project Share = 7.5 percent)

MV 4.5-5 The Old Road & Rye Canyon Road – Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, the project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to: (i) add a second northbound through lane and a second southbound left-turn lane; and (ii) convert the northbound and westbound free-flow right-turn lanes to conventional right-turn lanes with overlap phasing. (Project Share = 7.1 percent)

The Old Road & McBean Parkway – The project's compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-1 would mitigate the project's contribution to the identified significant impact and no further mitigation is required.

MV 4.5-6 McBean Parkway/Magic Mountain Parkway – The improvements recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection are to re-stripe for a third eastbound through lane and add a right-turn overlap phase for a westbound right-turn lane. These improvements are located within the Valencia B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvement will be constructed through the Valencia B&T District. However, as the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, at the request of the City, the project applicant will construct the identified improvement and, under such scenario, shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Valencia B&T District for the full cost of the improvement, should the improvement not be constructed by the time it is identified as necessary in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis.

MV 4.5-7 McBean Parkway/Newhall Ranch Road – The improvements recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection are: (i) Re-stripe for a fourth westbound through lane; and (ii) Re-stripe the northbound approach to provide dual right-turn lanes in conjunction with appropriate

pedestrian safety enhancements. These improvements are located within the Valencia B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvements will be constructed through the Valencia B&T District. However, because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, the City desires to reserve the right to modify such mitigation improvements in the future. Therefore, at the request of the City, to facilitate the potential construction of an alternative improvement, the applicant will pay, or utilize existing B&T credits to fund, an amount equivalent to the applicant's percentage cost of the identified improvements as calculated based on project traffic volumes (7%), and under a timetable consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis.

MV 4.5-8 Orchard Village & McBean Parkway – The improvements recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection are: (i) add a separate southbound left-turn lane; (ii) add a separate southbound through lane; (iii) add a separate southbound right-turn lane; and (iv) reconfigure the existing southbound right-turn lane as a shared left-turn through lane, as identified in the mitigation for the Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital expansion project. These improvements are located within the Valencia B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvements will be constructed through the Valencia B&T District. However, because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, the City desires to reserve the right to modify such mitigation improvements in the future. Therefore, at the request of the City, to facilitate the potential construction of an alternative improvement, the project applicant will pay, or utilize existing B&T credits to fund, an amount equivalent to the applicant's percentage cost of the identified improvements as calculated based on project traffic volumes (3%) and under a timetable consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis. (Note: In the event the above improvements are implemented as part of the Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital expansion project, Mission Village would no longer result in significant impacts at this intersection and no mitigation would be necessary.)

MV 4.5-9 Bouquet Canyon Road & Newhall Ranch Road – The improvement recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection is to reconfigure the second eastbound right-turn lane to a shared through/right-turn-lane. This improvement is located within the Valencia B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvement will be constructed through the Valencia B&T District. However, because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, the City desires to reserve the right to modify such mitigation improvements in the future. Therefore, at the request of the City, to facilitate the potential construction of an alternative improvement, the applicant will pay, or utilize existing B&T credits to fund, an amount equivalent to the applicant's percentage cost of the identified improvements as calculated based on project traffic volumes (4%), and under a timetable consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis.

Commerce Center Drive & SR-126 – The project's compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-2 would mitigate the project's contribution to the identified significant impact and no further mitigation is required.

Long-Term (2035) Cumulative Mitigation Measures

I-5 SB Ramps & Henry Mayo Drive (SR-126) – The project's compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-3 would mitigate the project's contribution to the identified significant impact and no further mitigation is required.

MV 4.5-16 The Old Road & I-5 SB Ramps – Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, the project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to: (i) add a second northbound right-turn lane; (ii) add a second southbound left-turn lane; (iii) add a third southbound through lane; and (iv) convert the shared westbound left/right-turn lane to a second westbound left-turn lane and add a right-turn lane. (Project Share = 1.4 percent. Please refer to EIR Appendix 4.5, AFA Traffic Impacts Analysis, Appendix J, for fair-share calculations.)

MV 4.5-17 I-5 SB Ramps & Magic Mountain Parkway – Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, the project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to re-stripe the shared southbound left-turn/through lane to a left-turn lane and the first southbound right-turn lane to a shared through/left-turn lane (Project Share = 19.7 percent)

MV 4.5-18 I-5 NB Ramps & Magic Mountain Parkway – The improvement recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection is to re-stripe the shared northbound through/right-turn lane to a shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane. This improvement is located within the Valencia B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvement will be constructed through the Valencia B&T District. However, as the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, at the request of the City, the project applicant will construct the identified improvement and, under such scenario, shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Valencia B&T District for the full cost of the improvement, should the improvement not be constructed by the time it is identified as necessary in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis.

I-5 SB Ramps & Valencia Boulevard – The project's compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-4 would mitigate the project's contribution to the identified significant impact and no further mitigation is required.

MV 4.5-19 I-5 SB Ramps & McBean Parkway – Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, the project applicant shall fund its fair share of the costs to add a second southbound left-turn lane. (Project Share = 12.6 percent.)

MV 4.5-20 I-5 SB/Marriott & Pico Canyon Road/Lyons Avenue – Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, the project applicant shall fund its fair share of the costs to add: (i) a left-turn phase for the westbound left-turn lane (can be protected/permissive configuration); and (ii) right-turn overlap phasing for the northbound right-turn lane. (Project Share = 4.7% percent.)

MV 4.5-21 I-5 NB On/Off Ramps & Lyons Avenue – The improvements recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection are: (i) re-stripe the third westbound through lane to a right-turn lane; and (ii) re-stripe the second westbound through lane to a shared through/right-turn lane. These improvements are located within the Via Princessa B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvements will be constructed through the Via Princessa B&T District. However, because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, the City desires to reserve the right to modify such mitigation improvements in the future. Therefore, at the request of the City, to facilitate the potential construction of an alternative improvement, the applicant will pay, or utilize existing B&T credits to fund, an amount equivalent to the applicant's percentage cost of the identified improvements as calculated based on project traffic volumes (7%), and under a timetable consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis.

MV 4.5-22 The Old Road & Rye Canyon Road – Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, and in addition to compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-5, the project applicant shall fund its fair share of the costs to: (i) add a third northbound through lane; (ii) add a third southbound through lane; and (iii) add a second and third westbound left-turn lane. (Project Share = 7.1 percent) (Note: This mitigation is supplemental to mitigation MV 4.5-5.)

MV 4.5-23 The Old Road & Magic Mountain Parkway – Consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis, the project applicant shall fund its fair share of the cost to add right-turn overlap phasing for the southbound right-turn lane. (Project Share = 21.1 percent)

The Old Road & McBean Pkwy – The project's compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-1 would mitigate the project's contribution to the identified significant impact and no further mitigation is required.

MV 4.5-24 Tourney & Magic Mountain Parkway – The improvement recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection is to stripe a fourth eastbound through lane. This improvement is located within the Valencia B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvement will be constructed through the Valencia B&T District. However, as the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, at the request of the City, the project

applicant will construct the identified improvement and, under such scenario, shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Valencia B&T District for the full cost of the improvement, should the improvement not be constructed by the time it is identified as necessary in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis.

McBean Parkway & Magic Mountain Parkway – The project's compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-6 would mitigate the project's contribution to the identified significant impact and no further mitigation is required.

McBean Parkway & Newhall Ranch Road – The project's compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-7 would mitigate the project's contribution to the identified significant impact and no further mitigation is required.

MV 4.5-25 Wiley Canyon & Lyons – The improvement recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection is to re-stripe the eastbound right-turn lane to a third through lane (shared through/right-turn lane). This improvement is located within the Via Princessa B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvement will be constructed through the Via Princessa B&T District. However, as the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, at the request of the City, the project applicant will construct the identified improvement and, under such scenario, shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Via Princessa B&T District for the full cost of the improvement, should the improvement not be constructed by the time it is identified as necessary in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis.

MV 4.5-26 Orchard Village & Wiley Canyon – The improvement recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impact at this intersection is to stripe a northbound right-turn lane. This improvement is located within the Via Princessa B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvement will be constructed through the Via Princessa B&T District. However, because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, the City desires to reserve the right to modify such mitigation improvements in the future. Therefore, at the request of the City, to facilitate the potential construction of an alternative improvement, the applicant will pay, or utilize existing B&T credits to fund, an amount equivalent to the applicant's percentage cost of the identified improvements as calculated based on project traffic volumes (2%), and under a timetable consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis. (Note: In the event a northbound right-turn lane is striped as part of the Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital expansion project, the improvement recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impact at this intersection is to add a second southbound left-turn lane and remove the existing southbound right-turn lane.)

Orchard Village & McBean Parkway – The project's compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-8 would mitigate the project's contribution to the identified significant impact and no further mitigation is required.

MV 4.5-27 Valencia Boulevard & Magic Mountain Parkway – The improvement recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection is to add a second westbound left-turn lane by removing or relocating the existing east leg raised median. These improvements are located within the Valencia B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvement will be constructed through the Valencia B&T District. However, because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, the City desires to reserve the right to modify such mitigation improvements in the future. Therefore, at the request of the City, to facilitate the potential construction of an alternative improvement, the applicant will pay, or utilize existing B&T credits to fund, an amount equivalent to the applicant's percentage cost of the identified improvements as calculated based on project traffic volumes (6%), and under a timetable consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis. (Note: In the event a second westbound left-turn lane is added as part of the Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital expansion project, the improvement recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impact at this intersection is to reinstate a dedicated westbound right-turn lane (the Hospital project would remove the existing right-turn lane) and add a third eastbound through lane.)

MV 4.5-28 Bouquet Canyon Road & Newhall Ranch Road – The improvement recommended to mitigate the project's identified significant impacts at this intersection is to restripe the eastbound approach to consist of two eastbound left-turn lanes, four eastbound through lanes, and two eastbound right-turn lanes. This improvement is located within the Valencia B&T District and, therefore, it is expected the improvement will be constructed through the Valencia B&T District. However, because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Clarita, the City desires to reserve the right to modify such mitigation improvements in the future. Therefore, at the request of the City, to facilitate the potential construction of an alternative improvement, the applicant will pay, or utilize existing B&T credits to fund, an amount equivalent to the applicant's percentage cost of the identified improvement as calculated based on project traffic volumes (4%), and under a timetable consistent with the milestones established in the most current County DPW approved Westside Roadway Phasing Analysis. (Note: This mitigation is supplemental to mitigation MV 4.5-9.)

94. Commerce Center Drive & SR-126 – The project's compliance with mitigation MV 4.5-2 would mitigate the project's contribution to the identified significant impact and no further mitigation is required.

MV 4.5-29 State Highways. The applicant shall work cooperatively with Caltrans to determine and provide transportation mitigation needed on State Highway facilities. The applicant shall construct mitigation improvements or pay an

equitable share for mitigation projects to the satisfaction of Caltrans. The applicant shall enter into a traffic mitigation agreement with Caltrans before or within six months of certification of the EIR. (*Note: Caltrans and the applicant have worked together to prepare an agreement under which the applicant will pay to Caltrans, at the time of issuance of project building permits, the project's pro-rata share of the I-5 Improvement Project.*)

6.6.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the potentially significant cumulative traffic/access impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels provided the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita each require fair-share participation from other projects relative to the improvements identified in each respective jurisdiction. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid all potentially significant cumulative traffic/access impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

6.7 NOISE

6.7.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The Mission Village project would result in significant cumulative impacts primarily as a result of increased traffic on SR-126 and other local roadways following build-out of the project and other developments in the Santa Clarita Valley. The increased traffic noise, which would exceed standards set for transient lodging, would significantly impact users of the Travel Village RV Park.

6.7.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that mitigation for cumulative noise impacts to users of the Travel Village RV Park is provided for in Specific Plan mitigation measure SP 4.9-14, which has been recommended to mitigate project-specific impacts. (See infra Section 3.5.) Additionally, the project's incremental contribution to cumulative traffic noise impacts in Ventura County would be mitigated through implementation of the previously adopted Mitigation Measures 4.9-15 and 4.9-16 from the Program EIR. No other cumulative mitigation measures are required.

6.7.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the recommended mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and reduce the potentially significant cumulative noise impacts of the Mission Village project to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the Commission finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid all potentially significant cumulative noise impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

6.8 WATER SERVICE

6.8.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

An adequate independent supply of water is available to serve the Mission Village project, and the project will not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative water supply impacts in the Santa Clarita Valley because it would rely on local groundwater and recycled water from local water reclamation plants and not use or rely on CLWA's SWP supplies. Accordingly, no significant cumulative water supply impacts are expected to result from supplying water to the Mission Village project.

6.8.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that mitigation measures are not required as the Mission Village project will not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to water supplies or services.

6.8.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to water supplies or services. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.9 WASTEWATER DISPOSAL

6.9.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The Mission Village project is not expected to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to wastewater disposal availability because the Valencia WRP and, ultimately, Newhall Ranch WRP, would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the Mission Village project's total predicted wastewater generation of 0.96 mgd. With respect to future development and available capacity, safeguards have been put in place by the CSDLAC to ensure that sewer connection permits are not issued if there is inadequate capacity.

6.9.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that cumulative development would be required to implement similar mitigation and be subject to similar limitations as those identified for the Mission Village project on a project-by-project basis. Therefore, no additional mitigation is recommended or required.

6.9.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to wastewater disposal. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.10 SHERIFF SERVICES

6.10.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

Payment of the applicable law enforcement facilities fees and new tax revenues generated by the project would provide the funds necessary to employ and equip the necessary additional law enforcement officers. All new development projects within the Santa Clarita Valley similarly would be responsible for funding increases in service demands through various tax and funding mechanisms attributable to each respective project. Additionally, although not made necessary by the project, the applicant has entered into negotiations with the Sheriff's Department for the provision of a Sheriff station site that would serve the entire Specific Plan site. Thus, by facilitating establishment of a Sheriff's station in the project vicinity, the proposed project would mitigate any cumulatively considerable impacts to sheriff services. Accordingly, cumulative impacts to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and California Highway Patrol are not expected to be significant.

Additionally, the Mission Village project would not contribute to potentially significant cumulative emergency access impacts because the proposed circulation plan facilitates evacuation in the case of an emergency and otherwise provides adequate site access to emergency personnel. Further, the additional access provided by the project would facilitate regionwide evacuation plans and would be included in the County's Emergency Evacuation Plans, as amended.

6.10.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that because the Mission Village project would fully mitigate any potentially significant project-specific impacts to law enforcement services, and because cumulative development would be subject to the same or similar mitigation obligations as the project, no additional cumulative mitigation measures are required.

6.10.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to sheriff services. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.11 FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

6.11.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

By implementing the adopted Specific Plan mitigation measures, in combination with the recommended project-specific mitigation, the cumulative impacts of the proposed project on fire protection services or fire hazards in the Santa Clarita Valley would be less than significant. Relative to other development projects, if the Santa Clarita Valley builds out consistently with the currently adopted area and general plans, a significant cumulative impact on the current level of fire protection services would occur unless the equipment and personnel resources of the fire department were to increase proportionately. However, impacts resulting from new development

would be reduced by compliance with state and county fire codes, standards and guidelines, and incorporation of project-specific mitigation measures. Moreover, new development in the planning area would be required to participate in the Developer Fee Program, which is the funding mechanism in place at the county-level for mitigating impacts to fire protection services. Therefore, no significant cumulative fire-related impacts are expected as a result of the Mission Village project.

6.11.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that because cumulative development will be subject to the same or similar required mitigation obligations as the Mission Village project, no mitigation measures are required.

6.11.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to fire protection services. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.12 EDUCATION

6.12.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative student generation under the Development Monitoring System (DMS) Build-Out Scenario and the Santa Clarita Valley Build-Out Scenario cannot be accommodated by existing or presently planned facilities that serve the valley; therefore, the impacts of cumulative development on the school districts would be potentially significant if no additional facilities were constructed. However, compliance, as appropriate, with existing School Facilities Funding Agreements and other mechanisms (e.g., Senate Bill [SB] 50, the Valley-Wide Joint Fee Resolution, and/or new school facilities funding agreements), which require that future development pay its fair-share towards the construction of new school facilities to accommodate the increased population, would reduce potential cumulative development impacts on the school districts to a level below significant. Moreover, because the direct impacts of the proposed project would be fully mitigated, the project's contribution to any cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

6.12.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that no additional mitigation measures are required to address the potentially significant cumulative impacts that may result from the Mission Village project in combination with cumulative development as the mitigation measures adopted (see these CEQA findings, above) fully address and mitigate all project-related impacts. Furthermore, the Commission finds that the obligation for other development projects to comply with existing school facilities/funding agreements and/or other school facilities funding mechanisms will ensure that cumulative impacts are not significant.

6.12.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to education. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.13 PARKS AND RECREATION

6.13.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of cumulative development projects would incrementally increase demand for local park facilities. However, the proposed project would meet County parkland requirements and exceed the Quimby Act parkland standards and, therefore, would not contribute to or result in cumulatively considerable impacts. Further, future development projects would be subject to the Quimby Act and County requirements, which would mitigate the demand associated with each future project. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate the current shortage of local parks and would not result in a significant cumulative impact.

6.13.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that as the Mission Village project does not contribute to cumulative park, recreational, or trail impacts in the region, no additional mitigation measures are required.

6.13.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to parks and recreation. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.14 LIBRARY SERVICES

6.14.1 Significant Cumulative Impact

The project's impacts on library services would be fully mitigated through compliance with Specific Plan mitigation measure SP 4.19-1 and, therefore, the project would not contribute to potentially significant cumulative impacts. Additionally, payment of the Library Developer Fee (currently $805.00 per residential unit as of July 1, 2010) by other development projects would mitigate potentially significant impacts on the County Library system to less-than-significant levels.

6.14.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that, because all new residential developments in the unincorporated area of the Santa Clarita Valley will be subject to the library impact fee on a project-by-project basis, no additional mitigation is required.

6.14.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to library services. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.15 UTILITIES

6.15.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The analysis of the Mission Village project's cumulative utilities impacts tiers from and incorporates the analysis found in the Specific Plan's Program EIR, which evaluated the cumulative impacts on energy supply and infrastructure associated with development of the entire Specific Plan area. The Program EIR concluded that the cumulative development scenario would not significantly impact electricity or natural gas. Specific to the project, current projections for energy supply and demand by SCE and the SCGC indicate that these utility providers would have sufficient electricity and natural gas resources to serve the project site. Additionally, the project would comply with statewide energy efficiency requirements, including that several of Mission Village's design features would reduce its demand for energy resources, and further ensure that all impacts to utilities-related resources are less than significant. Moreover, cumulative development would be subject to Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which imposes energy efficiency standards on new development. Therefore, the impacts of the project relative to utilities would not be cumulatively considerable.

6.15.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that because cumulative development would be subject to Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which includes regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission, no further mitigation for cumulative development is required.

6.15.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to utilities. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.16 MINERAL RESOURCES

6.16.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The Newhall Ranch site, which includes the Mission Village project site, is zoned for Specific Plan land uses. Therefore, the County has no plans to utilize the project site for long-term mineral extraction. Accordingly, the project would not result in a long-term cumulatively considerable loss of mineral resources.

6.16.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that mitigation measures are not required because implementation of the Mission Village project would not result in a cumulatively considerable loss of mineral resources.

6.16.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to mineral resources. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.17 ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

6.17.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

As man-made hazards are site-specific issues, the Mission Village project would not result in or contribute to significant cumulative impacts relating to environmental safety.

6.17.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that no mitigation measures are required because implementation of the Mission Village project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to environmental safety.

6.17.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to environmental safety. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.18 CULTURAL/PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

6.18.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

Although cultural resources are present on-site, the feasible mitigation identified in connection with project-specific impacts will ensure that the Mission Village project does not contribute to significant cumulative impacts. Additionally, the mitigation measures would result in a positive impact on cumulative cultural resources; that is, the mitigation measures would result in the acquisition of additional scientific information about the prehistory of the region and the gathered artifacts would be preserved for future analysis, study, and viewing.

6.18.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that the mitigation measures identified in relation to project-specific impacts are all that is recommended or required as the Mission Village project does not contribute to any cumulatively considerable cultural or paleontological impacts.

6.18.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to cultural/paleontological resources. Accordingly, changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

6.19 CLIMATE CHANGE

6.19.1 Significant Cumulative Impacts

The project design features of the Mission Village project would reduce its contribution of GHG emissions; therefore, the project would enable California to meet its goal of returning to 1990 GHG emissions levels by 2020. As a result, the Mission Village GHG emissions are not considered "cumulatively considerable" under CEQA.

6.19.2 Mitigation Measures

The Commission finds that implementation of the project-specific mitigation measures in combination with the project design features would reduce the Mission Village project's GHG emissions such that the project's impacts relative to climate change would not be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, no additional mitigation measures are required.

6.19.3 Findings

The Commission finds that the Mission Village project will not result in potentially significant cumulative impacts relating to climate change. Accordingly, additional changes or alterations to the project are neither required nor incorporated, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1).

7.0 FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The Final EIR concluded that the Mission Village project would result in significant unavoidable impacts relating to visual qualities, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources. Based on considerations of avoiding or substantially lessening these unavoidable significant impacts, as well as consideration of the basic project objectives and public comments, the following alternatives to the project were identified: (i) No Project/No Development Alternative; (ii) No Project/Future Development; (iii) Expanded Spineflower Preserve Alternative; (iv) The 19,750-Unit Alternative (20 Percent Reduction in Development, Same Footprint); and (v) The Cluster Alternative (39 Percent Reduction in Development, Smaller Footprint). Based on the analysis presented in the EIR, the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project/No Development Alternative. However, this alternative is not consistent with the policies and goals

of the Specific Plan, and fails to meet any of the basic project objectives. CEQA requires that if the No Project/No Development Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified, which, here, would be Alternative 3, the Expanded Spineflower Preserve Alternative. Alternative 3 would be the environmentally superior alternative because this alternative entails the least amount of development relative to the proposed project and other alternatives and, correspondingly, would have the least amount of developmental impacts. This alternative also is environmentally superior in that it would increase the amount of area used for spineflower preserves. However, as described below, Alternative 3 does not meet several of the basic project objectives.

7.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 - NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the project site would remain in its present condition and would be used for agricultural purposes, oil and natural gas-related activities, and easements for public utility conveyance. A portion of the site is, or has been, used for agricultural activities, oil and natural gas production, water wells, and utility easements and, therefore, is either in an otherwise disturbed state (e.g., agricultural fields, oil/natural gas well pads), or is presently open space. Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the potential project-related impacts associated with development of the project site would not occur.

In relation to the proposed project, this alternative would have less demand on public services and utilities (i.e., water service, wastewater, solid waste, education, libraries, parks and recreation, fire and police protection, gas and electricity), would not require floodplain modifications and, correspondingly, would create no significant impacts. Project viewsheds would remain the same as the existing condition. The alternative would not generate the traffic, air emissions, and noise associated with the proposed project. Therefore, in contrast to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant unavoidable impacts related to visual qualities, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources.

However, because the proposed project would not be constructed under the No Project/No Development Alternative, none of the project objectives set forth in the EIR would be attained under this alternative.

It also is noted that under this alternative, certain benefits associated with the proposed project would not occur. For example, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in the installation of bank stabilization along the tract map site's northern boundary, thereby allowing continued sedimentation/erosion to occur at these locations; in its current state, there is no flood protection on the tract map site. Additionally, because of ongoing agricultural cultivation and oil/natural gas uses, and existing utility infrastructure, the tract map site presently has limited habitat value with the exception of the Spineflower Preserve and River Corridor Special Management Area (SMA).

7.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 - NO PROJECT/FUTURE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

Under *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B), if disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other

project, then this "no project" consequence (i.e., No Project/Future Development scenario) should be discussed.

Disapproval of the proposed Mission Village project would not necessarily preclude future development of the property. The County Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan on May 27, 2003, consistent with Title 22, Chapter 22.46 of the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. The Specific Plan implements the goals and policies of the General Plan and Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan on a focused, site-specific basis. The Specific Plan permits a maximum of 5,465 dwelling units and approximately 1.299 million square feet of commercial land uses within the planning areas that constitute the Mission Village tract map site.

In addition to being planned for developed uses, the project site is located near existing water, sewer, natural gas, telephone, and cable lines. Further, the site is located within the existing service area of both sheriff and fire department stations, and all public services are readily available to serve future site development. Given that the property currently is planned for residential and commercial land uses that can be served by existing and proposed infrastructure, it is reasonable to assume that the site likely will be developed at some time in the future if the currently proposed project is not approved. In the event that the site is developed in the future as described for this alternative, some, if not most, of the environmental impacts associated with such a development alternative likely would be comparable to those identified for the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project/Future Development Alternative likely would not avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project's identified significant effects.

Whether or not the No Project/Future Development Alternative would attain any of the project objectives is dependent upon the specific type of development that ultimately would occur under this alternative. Therefore, any conclusion in this respect, by necessity, would be speculative.

7.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 - EXPANDED SPINEFLOWER PRESERVE ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would reduce development by 214 single-family dwelling units and 1,208 multi-family dwelling units, along with a reduction of 697,000 square feet of commercial space when compared to the proposed project, for a total of 2,990 dwelling units and 858,000 commercial square feet. The Expanded Spineflower Preserve Alternative would retain the 9-acre elementary school, neighborhood park, library site, fire station, and some of the private recreation areas proposed as part of the proposed project, although construction of the Commerce Center Drive Bridge and extension roadway would be eliminated under this alternative, which would eliminate direct access from the project site to State Route 126 (SR-126) and the Valencia Commerce Center, and also eliminate the project's ability to connect the wastewater system to the Newhall Ranch WRP.

Generally, under Alternative 3, impacts associated with geotechnical and soil resources, water resources, traffic/access, air quality, noise, biota, cultural/paleontological resources, visual qualities, solid waste services, mineral resources, floodplain modifications, and global climate change would be reduced when compared to the proposed project. Alternative 3 would result in fewer impacts than the proposed project.

While Alternative 3 is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project, the Alternative does not meet several of the basic project objectives:

- Land Use Planning Objective No. 2 states, "… Accommodate projected regional growth in a location that is adjacent to existing and planned infrastructure, urban services, transportation corridors, and major employment centers and that avoids leapfrog development." Because Alternative 3 would substantially reduce the number of housing units to be developed, and, therefore, reduce the number of housing units available to accommodate projected regional growth, and would eliminate a major highway extension (Commerce Center Drive) that would connect the project to existing infrastructure, urban services, transportation corridors, and major employment centers, this alternative is not consistent with this project objective when compared with the proposed project.

- Land Use Planning Objective No. 5 states, "Establish land uses that permit a wide range of housing densities, types, styles, prices, and tenancy (for sale and rental)." Alternative 3 is inconsistent with this project objective, as it would result in a substantial reduction in residential units (approximately 32 percent reduction), thereby reducing housing options for the site.

- Economic Objective No. 1 states, "Provide a variety of residential homes, which would respond and adjust to changing economic and market conditions." Alternative 3 does not meet this project objective as the alternative results in a substantial reduction in residential units, thereby accommodating less housing for regional growth purposes.

- Economic Objective No. 2 states, "Provide a tax base to support public services and facilities." Alternative 3 is inconsistent with this project objective, as it would cause a substantial reduction in residential and commercial land use on site, resulting in a substantial reduction in tax base to support the public facilities and services within the project area.

The County's Board of Supervisors already considered Specific Plan alternatives, three of which (Alternatives 3, 5, and 6) reduced development opportunities in part, for the preservation of biological resources. The Board rejected these alternatives as infeasible, in part, because such alternatives did not achieve many of the basic objectives of the Specific Plan, including the significant public benefits associated with implementation of such a plan.

7.4 ALTERNATIVE 4 - 20 PERCENT REDUCTION IN THE NUMBER OF DWELLINGS

This alternative would reduce the number of residential units proposed on the site from 382 single-family and 4,030 multi-family to 306 single-family and 3,224 multi-family, when compared to the proposed project. No other changes to the project description are proposed. This alternative would result in fewer units developed with the remaining undeveloped acreage being used for open space. The development footprint of this Alternative is the same as the proposed project.

Generally, under Alternative 4, impacts associated with hydrology, traffic/access, air quality, noise, water resources, solid waste services, mineral resources, and global climate change would be reduced when compared to the proposed project because fewer dwelling units would be

constructed. On balance, therefore, Alternative 4 would result in fewer impacts than the proposed project.

While Alternative 4 is considered environmentally superior to the project, Alternative 4 does not meet several of the basic project objectives. Project objectives not fully met or impeded by Alternative 4 are listed below.

- Land Use Planning Objective No. 2 states, "… Accommodate projected regional growth in a location that is adjacent to existing and planned infrastructure, urban services, transportation corridors, and major employment centers and that avoids leapfrog development." Because Alternative 4 would reduce the number of housing units to be developed, and, therefore, reduce the number of housing units available to accommodate projected regional growth, this alternative is not consistent with this project objective when compared with the proposed project.

- Land Use Planning Objective No. 5 states, "Establish land uses that permit a wide range of housing densities, types, styles, prices, and tenancy (for sale and rental)." Alternative 4 is inconsistent with this project objective, as it would result in a substantial reduction in residential units (approximately 20 percent reduction), thereby reducing housing options for the site.

- Economic Objective No. 1 states, "Provide a variety of residential homes, which would respond and adjust to changing economic and market conditions." Alternative 4 does not meet this project objective as the alternative results in a substantial reduction in residential units, thereby accommodating less housing for regional growth purposes.

- Economic Objective No. 2 states, "Provide a tax base to support public services and facilities." Alternative 4 is inconsistent with this project objective as it would cause a substantial reduction in residential land uses on site, resulting in a substantial reduction in tax base to support the public facilities and services within the project area.

The County's Board of Supervisors previously considered alternatives to the Specific Plan, one of which reduced development by 20 percent (Alternative 4). The Board rejected this alternative as infeasible, in part, because such alternative did not achieve many of the basic objectives of the Specific Plan, including the significant public benefits associated with implementation of such a plan.

7.5 ALTERNATIVE 5 – CLUSTER ALTERNATIVE

The Cluster Alternative creates a smaller development footprint but retains all of the other aspects of the proposed project development. Given the increased densities, there is a possibility, that 20-story residential complexes could be built. (Note: The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan has a maximum height of 55 feet for high-density units). This alternative would not reduce the number of residential units, commercial square footage or other improvements proposed by the project. Consequently, the cluster alternative would result in higher densities of multi-family units. The Cluster Alternative would retain the 9-acre elementary school, 20-acre community park, 5-acre

neighborhood park, library, and fire station. Bank stabilization would continue to be required as proposed by the project.

Generally, under Alternative 5, impacts associated with hydrology, biota, cultural/paleontological resources, mineral resources, and floodplain modifications would be reduced when compared to the proposed project. On the other hand, this alternative would have greater impacts associated with visual qualities and noise. However, on balance, Alternative 5 would result in fewer impacts than the proposed project.

While Alternative 5 is considered environmentally superior to the project, Alternative 5 does not meet several of the basic project objectives. Project objectives not fully met or impeded by Alternative 5 are listed below.

- Land Use Planning Objective No. 4 states, "Provide development and transitional land use patterns that do not conflict with surrounding communities and land uses." Alternative 5 would create very high density residential units which would conflict with surrounding communities and land uses (proposed Landmark Village and Westridge) and, therefore, does not meet this project objective.

- Land Use Planning Objective No. 5 states, "Establish land uses that permit a wide range of housing densities, types, styles, prices, and tenancy (for sale and rental)." Alternative 5 is inconsistent with this project objective, as it would result in creating very high density units which would be contained mostly in high rise structures, which would reduce multi-family housing options for the site.

- Economic Objective No. 1 states, "Provide a variety of residential homes, which would respond and adjust to changing economic and market conditions." Alternative 5 does not meet this project objective as it would require increased densities and, thereby, potentially limit the type of residences that could be built on the project site.

- Economic Objective No. 2 states, "Provide a tax base to support public services and facilities." Alternative 5 is inconsistent with this project objective as it would cause a limitation in the types of multi-family residential units on site, which may be difficult to market to the consumer, resulting in a reduction in tax base to support the public facilities and services within the project area.

The County's Board of Supervisors previously considered alternatives to the Specific Plan, one of which (Alternative 3) clustered the same amount of development on a smaller footprint and which eliminated development within the Santa Clara River, including the 100-year floodplain. The Board rejected this alternative as infeasible, in part, because such alternative did not achieve many of the basic objectives of the Specific Plan, including the significant public benefits associated with implementation of such a plan.

A summary comparison of impacts associated with the project alternatives is provided in EIR **Table 5.0-3**, **Alternatives Impact Comparison Matrix**, reproduced below. The table lists each of the project alternatives, each of the environmental impact categories, and notes whether the

respective alternative's impacts are greater than, similar to, or less than those of the proposed project.

Table 5.0-3
Alternatives Impact Comparison Matrix

Environmental Topic	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
	No Project/No Development	No Project/Future Development	Expanded Spineflower Preserve	20% Reduction in the Number of Dwelling Units	Same number of Units as the Project, Smaller Development Footprint
Geotechnical and Soil Resources	L	S	L	S	S
Hydrology	L	S	L	L	L
Traffic/Access	L	S	L	L	S
Air Quality	L	S	L	L	S
Noise	L	S	L	L	G
Biota	L	S	L	S	L
Cultural/Paleontological Resources	L	S	L	S	L
Visual Qualities	L	S	L	S	G
Water Service	L	S	S	L	S
Wastewater Disposal	L	S	G	S	S
Solid Waste Services	L	S	L	L	S
Education	L	S	S	S	S
Library Services	L	S	S	S	S
Fire Protection Services	L	S	S	S	S
Parks and Recreation	L	S	S	G	S
Water Quality	S	S	S	G	S
Agricultural and Forest Resources	L	S	S	S	S
Sheriff Services	L	S	S	S	S
Environmental Safety	L	S	S	S	S
Mineral Resources	L	S	L	S	L
Floodplain Modifications	L	S	L	S	L
Utilities	L	S	S	S	S
Global Climate Change	L	S	L	L	S

KEY
(Level of Impact in Comparison to the Proposed Project):
G = *Alternative Produces Greater Level of Impact.*
S = *Alternative Produces Similar Level of Impact.*
L = *Alternative Produces Lesser Level of Impact.*

8.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered "acceptable." (CEQA Guidelines §15093, subdivision (a).) CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record. (CEQA Guidelines §15093, subdivision (b).)

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Commission finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, when implemented, will avoid or substantially lessen virtually all of the significant effects identified in the Final EIR for the Mission Village project. However, certain significant impacts of the project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are related to visual qualities, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources. (*See* **Sections 2.0** and **5.0**, above.)

The Commission finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR that are within the purview of the County will be implemented with the project, and that the remaining significant unavoidable effects are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, based upon the facts set forth above, the Final EIR, and the record, as follows:

8.1 SIGNIFICANT OVERRIDING BENEFITS RESULTING FROM THE SPECIFIC PLAN

When the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP initially were approved in 1999, the County Board of Supervisors identified thirty (30) benefits of the project that would compensate for the unavoidably significant project-specific and cumulative impacts. While not required to, as no unmitigated environmental effects were identified, the Board elected to readopt its 1999 Statement of Overriding Considerations upon certification of the Final Additional Analysis for the Specific Plan in 2003. In addition, the Board identified another significant public benefit of the Specific Plan, namely Newhall's agreement to dedicate 1,517 acres of land in the Salt Creek Watershed, located in Ventura County and adjacent to the boundaries of the Specific Plan.

The Commission finds that the Specific Plan benefits, set forth below, are relevant, as the Mission Village project is proposed under and pursuant to the Specific Plan. Further, the Commission finds that the enumerated benefits make acceptable the unavoidably significant environmental impacts identified in these findings.

(1) The project has been designed to preserve over nine square miles of land (6,170 acres, or 51 percent of the site) containing the most significant natural environmental resources, including:

(a) The High Country, which is a major portion of the County's SEA 20; SEA 20 contains six and one-half square miles (4,184 acres), and the project has modified the SEA boundaries to include more total area and land with more valuable natural resources than were originally designated in the SEA by the General Plan;

(b) The Santa Clara River property, which is a portion of the County's SEA 23, and which contains approximately 975 acres, has been planned to minimize the necessity of removing sensitive habitat for flood control purposes and provides valuable habitat for federal and state endangered and sensitive wildlife species; and

(c) The Open Area, consisting of 1,010 acres, preserves significant oak woodlands and savannas, ridgelines, and major landforms.

(2) Preservation of the High Country in conjunction with lands already acquired or planned for public acquisition, including the Santa Clarita Woodlands Park, will result in a distance of over ten miles of preserved and protected Santa Susana Mountains for conservation and recreational purposes, stretching from the I-5 freeway to the Los Angeles County/Ventura County border.

(3) Provisions for the accelerated dedication of the High Country have been added to the revised Specific Plan.

Access to the High Country would generally be provided within 24 months of approval of the Specific Plan by early construction of a trail in the High Country and by the granting of an easement to a joint powers authority for public access and maintenance of that trail.

The Joint Powers Authority would include Los Angeles County, the City of Santa Clarita and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

An open space financing district would also be established under the authority of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, which would provide annual revenues to the Joint Powers Authority for recreation, conservation and related activities in the High Country.

Additionally, the Center for Natural Lands Management would be endowed ($2,000,000 in 1997 dollars) by the applicant for the perpetual conservation management of the resources in the High Country, as well as the River Corridor and Open Area.

Offers of early dedication in fee title of the High Country - at no cost to the Joint Powers Authority- would take place in three equal phases of

approximately 1,400 acres each at the 2,000th, 6,000th and 11,000th residential building permit.

The River Corridor and Open Area (excluding parks which would be dedicated to Los Angeles) would be offered to be dedicated to the Center for Natural Lands Management in phases in accordance with the Specific Plan. Los Angeles County would also be granted an access and conservation easement prior to the offset dedication of the River Corridor and Open Area.

(4) Ultimate removal of commercial grazing from the High Country and from the River Corridor at adoption of the Specific Plan, will enhance the natural resources within those areas.

(5) A River Corridor has been designed to retain the River's significant riparian vegetation and habitat, and, at the same time, provide flood protection in accordance with Los Angeles County standards.

(6) Prominent physical features, such as Sawtooth Ridge, river bluffs and Ayers Rock, have been preserved within the Open Area as landmarks for the community.

(7) Preservation of the High Country will also create a 1/2 mile-wide set back of development along the Los Angeles County/Ventura County line, thereby increasing the width of the Salt Creek movement corridor adjacent to Ventura County.

The 1/2 mile-wide set back of development from the County line results in a wide corridor linking the River Corridor and the High Country SMAs in Los Angeles County.

(8) The revised Specific Plan also calls for a 1/8th mile-wide setback of development adjacent to Ventura County north of SR-126 to provide a transition between project development on Newhall Ranch and rural/agricultural land uses in Ventura County.

(9) The revised Specific Plan calls for an affordable housing component developed between the applicant and the County's Community Development Commission and Department of Regional Planning, and it requires that 2,200 dwelling units be made available as "very low," "low" or "moderate" income housing. This component includes an aggressive marketing program and compliance monitoring by the County's Community Development Commission staff. The affordable housing component for Newhall Ranch is above and beyond the requirements of the County's General Plan and Area Plan.

(10) The City of Santa Clarita's proposals regarding the use of "buried bank stabilization" techniques and contour grading, as well as ridgeline

protection, have been incorporated into the revised Specific Plan. Such provisions are above and beyond the requirements of the County's General Plan and Area Plan.

The applicant is also voluntarily committing to comply with the City's proposal to participate in a Valley-wide freeway mitigation funding program should such a program be adopted by both Los Angeles County and the City of Santa Clarita - even though such a program was not determined to be a necessary mitigation requirement of either the Final EIR or revised Specific Plan.

(11) Provisions have been made for improved parks, libraries and fire stations in accordance with the revised Specific Plan - all of which are above and beyond the mitigation required by CEQA or the Final EIR, or the exactions required of other development.

(12) The project's single ownership, size and density make possible the planning and financing of a comprehensive resource management plan.

(13) The Asistencia, the most important historical site in the Santa Clarita Valley, will be preserved and deeded to the Archaeological Conservancy for permanent ownership and management at no expense to the County, state or taxpayers.

(14) The community has been designed to provide a comprehensive array of land uses for a balanced community of homes, employment, shopping, commercial and public services, cultural facilities, education and recreation. The size and single ownership of the Newhall Ranch site provide opportunities to develop a comprehensive master-plan community in which land uses are properly sited, and infrastructure and public services are planned in advance and coordinated with regional infrastructure and public services.

(15) The Newhall Ranch design includes "livable community" concepts, including the following:

a) The community is divided into five separate villages to provide a small town feel and sense of community among residents;

b) The Land Use designations include a Mixed-Use category for the creative combination of commercial, public, recreational and residential uses;

c) Shared parking programs are planned in such a way as to reduce the need for large expansive parking lots and encourage Mixed-Use development;

d) Over 50 miles of pedestrian and bicycle trails will be constructed, linking the villages and the community to the regional trail system;

e) Recreation is not only included for the overall community, but is located within individual neighborhoods;

f) Home occupations are permitted, allowing residents to telecommute or operate businesses from their residences, which reduce the need for commuting to central business districts;

g) Approximately 59 percent of all homes will be constructed within walking distance (one-quarter mile) of village or commercial centers;

h) A park-and-ride facility is planned; and

i) Bus pull-ins are provided.

(16) The project's trail system will link the community of Val Verde to the project, thereby allowing that community access to and use of the project's extensive trail system.

The applicant has also entered into an agreement with the Val Verde Civic Association which has been incorporated into the revised Specific Plan. The agreement imposes various requirements upon the applicant which are above and beyond the mitigation requirements of either the Final EIR or the revised Specific Plan.

(17) A public lake within the Potrero Valley Village will provide regional recreational use and visual enjoyment, as well as community recreation.

(18) A golf course within the Potrero Valley Village will provide regional recreational benefits.

(19) The Business Park, Commercial, and Mixed-Use Land Uses designations will provide approximately 18,795 permanent jobs, which will allow employment opportunities for the community and the region and help the County achieve its economic goals.

(20) Construction of a new WRP will generate recycled water; the construction of a recycled water system and use of recycled water on-site will reduce the demand for potable water supplies.

(21) The location and construction of three new fire stations will provide faster and better regional fire protection to Val Verde and other communities in the immediate area, in addition to fire services for the project.

(22) The project will generate an estimated fiscal surplus between $251 to $301 million to the County during construction and $17 to $20 million annually thereafter (the range of fiscal surplus depends upon the final outcome of Proposition 218 in court decisions and elections).

(23) The project will generate an estimated fiscal surplus to the adjacent City of Santa Clarita of $27.9 million during construction and $1.8 million annually thereafter.

(24) An estimated $140 million from fuel and other tax revenues would be generated for the construction and maintenance of regional and state transportation facilities during construction and $11 million thereafter.

(25) Location of the project and design of the community will result in an estimated reduction in vehicle miles traveled as compared to more conventional subdivision design.

(26) The project design (Villages, clustering, Mixed-Use, variety of transportation modes, on-site employment, and proximity to regional employment) will result in the reduction of air emissions in comparison to a planned community without the project's design features.

(27) The applicant has voluntarily entered into school mitigation agreements with the Newhall School District, the Castaic Union School District, and the William S. Hart Union High School District. These agreements call for payments that are far in excess of the current development fees required by state law. Based on a review of the agreements, the Board has noted that they represent the most generous school mitigation packages ever seen from an applicant in Los Angeles County.

(28) The project provides a broad spectrum of housing which will help to meet the long-term housing needs of Los Angeles County, a major goal of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and will satisfy a wide array of economic and social needs, lifestyles. Project housing includes:

a) Rental apartments;

b) Condominiums;

c) Townhomes;

d) Attached and clustered single-family homes;

e) Detached single-family homes;

f) Larger executive and estate homes; and

g) Second Units on larger lots to allow for extended families and more affordable housing opportunities.

(29) The project implements portions of the County Highway Plan by the construction of Commerce Center Drive between SR-126 and Magic Mountain Parkway and Pico Canyon Road within the project.

(30) The project is estimated to generate significant Congestion Management Plan credits thereby benefiting the County's efforts to continue to qualify for state and federal transportation funds.

8.2 SIGNIFICANT OVERRIDING BENEFITS RESULTING FROM THE MISSION VILLAGE PROJECT

The proposed Mission Village project also will result, independently, in noteworthy benefits, identified below, which compensate for and make acceptable the unavoidable significant environmental impacts that would result from project implementation. These benefits include:

(1) The project will provide a range of quality housing opportunities, including 351 single family units, 3,704 multi-family units, as well as on-site recreation and landscaped areas, that contribute to meeting the projected housing needs in the Santa Clarita Valley and the region.

(2) The project will provide commercial/retail space to contribute to meeting the commercial space needs in the Santa Clarita Valley and future residents of the project.

(3) The project will result in the creation of approximately 5,000-6,000 permanent jobs within its commercial and mixed use areas.

(4) Consistent with the Specific Plan, the project will result in a conservation and public access easement over, and the ultimate dedication of, that portion of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 located within the project site to the Center for Natural Lands Management or a joint powers authority consisting of the County, City of Santa Clarita, and Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

(5) Consistent with the Specific Plan, the project will result in a conservation and public access easement over, and the ultimate dedication of, approximately 1,400 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20 to a joint powers authority consisting of the County, City of Santa Clarita, and Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

(6) The project will adhere to a green building performance standard that will ensure that all structures exceed the existing Title 24 requirements by at least 15 percent.

(7) The project incorporates solar technology or equivalent into single family residential structures, public buildings, and the commercial buildings.

(8) The project will include numerous public facilities, including an elementary school, fire station, library, bus transfer station, parks, trails, paseos, and recreation areas.

(9) The project will create a highly livable, sustainable, pedestrian-friendly environment that encourages alternative means of transportation.

(10) The project will preserve significant natural resources and open areas.

(11) The project will provide for the construction of Commerce Center Drive Bridge, an important transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance.

(12) The project will provide off-site roadway and intersection improvements to the arterial highway system, benefiting residents and businesses within the region.

(13) The project will encourage the use of drought-tolerant and fire-retardant plants in landscaping, and thereby promote water conservation.

(14) The project's residents and businesses would generate revenue in the form of sales taxes, property taxes, fees, *etc.* that would be available to the County to fund on-site public services.

On balance, the Commission finds that these overriding considerations, as identified in conjunction with the environmental review of impacts stemming from the Specific Plan and the Mission Village project, are acceptable when measured against the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR.