STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *TR062053*
CASES: *RENVT200500006*
ROAKT200500010
RCUPT200500016

* * * * **INITIAL STUDY** * * * *

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *December 20, 2006* Staff Member: *Christina D. Tran*
Thomas Guide: *N/A* USGS Quad: *Lebec*
Location: *Terminus of Gorman Post Road northerly of Highway 138, east of I-5 Freeway, Gorman*

Description of Project: *Application for TR062053 to develop 531 single family residential lots on 422.05 acres; two residential ranch lots on 306.50 acres; 18 open space lots on 1874.52 acres; six debris basin lots on 8.13 acres; one water tank site on 7.13 acres; one sewer pump lot on 0.89 acre; five private and future street lots on 99.13 acres; and improvements to Gorman Post Road over 7.03 acres. Application also includes a CUP request for Hillside Management, density controlled development and SEA; and an OTP to remove 2,375 and encroach upon 1,677 oak trees. Golden Valley Municipal Water District (GVMWD) in Gorman will provide water via onsite wells. Sewage disposal will utilize interconnected sewer and pump system onsite and a proposed off-site wastewater treatment plant that will be constructed and operated by GVMWD. Approximately 13,000,000 cubic yards of cut is proposed which will be balanced onsite. There will be an additional 70,000 cubic yards of cut at the offsite wastewater treatment plant which will be balanced at that site.*

Gross Acres: *Residential site (2,725.38 acres) plus off-site wastewater treatment plant site (16 acre)*

Environmental Setting: *Project site consists of 19 existing parcels that are primarily undeveloped and located within the Tehachapi Foothills SEA and adjacent to open space linkage and wildlife corridor. Onsite natural biological resources consist of oak woodland, native grassland, wetlands, riparian woodland, California condor, Tehachapi slender salamander, red legged frog, Southwestern pond turtle. Bear Canyon and Crane Canyon drainage courses traverse the project site as well as numerous tributaries. Surrounding land uses consist of Golden State Freeway (I-5), State Highway 138, Hungry Valley State Vehicular Recreation Area to the west, Quail Lake to the southeast, West Branch California Aqueduct, vacant land, and single family residences. Project site has utility towers and transmission lines, underground gas lines, Pacific Oil pipelines, and telecommunication conduits.*

Zoning: *W (Watershed), A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture, min. 5 ac. lot), A-1-5 (Light Agriculture, min. 5 ac. lot)*

General Plan: *SEA, Open Space, Non-urban*

Community/Area wide Plan: *Non-urban 1 and Open Space (Antelope Valley Area Plan)*

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
CP02-236	*Storage & export of water, caretaker residence (approved, pending litigation)*
CP03-362	*So. Cal. Edison to construct microwave dish/tower (3-8-04 approved)*
SP02-232	*Centennial SP, mixed-use development for up to 23,000 residential units (pending)*
CP02-196	*Cemetery (pending)*
Kern County	*Frazier Park Estates, 800 units (pending)*

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☒ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - ☒ Los Angeles Region
  - ☒ Lahontan Region
- ☒ *Caltrans*
- ☒ *Department of the Navy*
- ☒ *U.S. Marine Corps*
- ☒ *U.S. Fish & Wildlife*

Trustee Agencies

- ☒ State Fish and Game
- ☒ State Parks *(Hungry Valley District)*

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ National Forest (*Angeles & Los Padres)*
- ☒ *Edwards Air Force Base; FAA*
- ☒ *A.V., Gorman, & El Tejon SD*
- ☒ *A.V. College; A.V. Trails; CSUF*
- ☒ *NAHC; Local Nat. Am. Indian Tribes*
- ☒ *SCV Historical Society*
- ☒ *Kern Co. (Planning Dept. , Waste Management & Sheriff)*
- ☒ *CA St. Water Res. Control Board; Dept. of Water Resources*
- ☒ *CA DHS – Drinking Water Prog.*
- ☒ *AQMD; AVAQMD; & A.V. Air Pollution Control Dist.; CHP*
- ☒ *ARB; DOGG; SHPO; DTSC*
- ☒ *Frazier Park Publ. Utility Dist.*
- ☒ *Rivers & Mtn. Cons.; Pine Mtn. Town Hall; Pine Mtn. Club Prop. Owners Assoc.; Mtn. Comm. Town Council; Pacific Crest Trail Assoc.; S.C. Woodlands Prk. Consortium; CA Native Plant Soc.; S. Coast Wildlands; Sierra Club; Center For Bio. Diversity; Kern Audubon Soc. ; TriCounty Watchdogs; League of Women Voters*
- ☒ *Lake of the Woods MWC; Mil Potrero MWC; Lebec Co. WD; A.V. E. Kern Water Agency; Golden Valley MWD*

Regional Significance

- ☒ SCAG Criteria
- ☒ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ Fire Department
- ☒ *County Parks & Recreation*
- ☒ *County Sanitation Districts*
- ☒ *County Library*
- ☒ *County Sheriff*
- ☒ DPW: *Traffic & Lighting; Drainage & Grading; Land Development (NPDES review and water supply); GMED; Environmental Programs; Waterworks & Sewer Maintenance*
- ☒ Health Services: *Environmental Hygiene; Rural Mountain*

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
					Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	**FACTOR**	Pg				Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☐	☐	☒	*San Andreas Fault*
	2. Flood	6	☐	☐	☒	*100-year flood area*
	3. Fire	7	☐	☐	☒	*Fire zone 4*
	4. Noise	8	☐	☐	☒	*Fwy I- 5 and Hwy 138 near site; new houses*
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	☐	☐	☒	*NPDES requirement*
	2. Air Quality	10	☐	☐	☒	*Substantial grading in hillside area*
	3. Biota	11	☐	☐	☒	*SEA 59, oak trees, wildlife corridor*
	4. Cultural Resources	12	☐	☐	☒	*Drainage courses and oak trees*
	5. Mineral Resources	13	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	☐	☐	☒	*Fwy 5 & Lancaster Rd. are sec. priority rte.*
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	☐	☐	☒	*533 residential units proposed*
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	☐	☐	☒	*Large scale subdivision proposed*
	3. Education	18	☐	☐	☒	*Potential capacity problem*
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	☐	☐	☒	*Nearest fire station is about 5 miles away*
	5. Utilities	20	☐	☐	☒	*Water supply is inadequate, solid waste*
OTHER	1. General	21	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	☐	☐	☒	*Underground gas lines, oil pipelines*
	3. Land Use	23	☐	☐	☒	*SEA and hillside conformance criteria*
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	☐	☐	☒	*Travel to neighboring communities for shopping*
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	☐	☐	☒	*Biota, geotechnical, flood, water quality*

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: *SEA; Other Non-urban & Agricultural; Non-urban Hillside*
2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☒ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The Addendum EIR is required to analyze only the factors changed or not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Christina Cran Date: 12-20-06

Approved by: Daryl Koutnik Date: 20 DECEMBER 2006

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? *Site adjacent to and within San Andreas Fault (Special Studies Zone – Lebec Quad)*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? *Site has steep slopes and is within approximate hillside boundary*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? *Site has steep slopes and is within approximate hillside boundary*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	☒	☐	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%? *13,000,000 cubic yards of cut and fill proposed onsite and 70,000 cubic yards of cut and fill at the offsite wastewater treatment plant*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No Impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *Bear Canyon, Crane Canyon and numerous tributaries*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *Numerous drainage courses onsite*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? *Hillside area with many drainage courses*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off? *Hillside area with many drainage courses*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? *Drainage pattern will be redirected*
f.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? *100-year flood areas, flood hazard limit located onsite*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)? *Fire Zone 4*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? *Hillside area with some long and winding roads proposed*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? *Access off of Gorman Post Road*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? *Public water supply and pressure may be inadequate and will utilize onsite water wells*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8
☒ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
				Freeway 5 to the west and Highway 138 to the south are in proximity to project site
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
c.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
				Very few noise sources in area
d.	☒	☐	☐	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
				Construction noise
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Control (Title 12 – Chapter 8) ☒ Uniform Building Code (Title 26 - Chapter 35)

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? *Onsite water wells proposed as a source for public water system that will be operated by GVMWD*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
	☐	☐	☐	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? *533 home subdivisions are subject to NPDES requirements*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? *533 home subdivisions are subject to NPDES requirements*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Other factors? *Numerous drainage courses onsite, large scale subdivision project, and two ranch lots proposed*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)? *531 single family residences and two residential ranch lots proposed*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance? *531 single family residences and two residential ranch lots proposed*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? *Approximately 13,000,000 cubic yards of grading proposed onsite; approximately 70,000 cubic yards of grading at the offsite wastewater treatment plant; potential odor from ranching operation*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? *Approximately 13,000,000 c.y. of grading proposed onsite and 70,000 c.y. proposed offsite*
g.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? *Approximately 13,000,000 c.y. of grading proposed onsite and 70,000 c.y. proposed offsite*
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Project Design ☒ Air Quality Report

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural? *Project site is located within SEA #59: Tehachapi Foothills*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas? *Approximately 13,000,000 c.y. of grading proposed onsite and 70,000 c.y. proposed offsite*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is a drainage course located on the project site that is depicted on USGS quad sheets by a dashed blue line or that may contain a bed, channel, or bank of any perennial, intermittent or ephemeral river, stream, or lake? *Bear Canyon, Crane Canyon, and numerous tributaries*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)? *Oak woodlands, native grasslands, wetlands, riparian woodlands*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? *Canyon oak, valley oak, and blue oak*
f.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? *California condor, Tehachapi slender salamander, red legged frog, southwestern pond turtle*
g.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? *Wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage*

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ ERB/SEATAC Review ☒ Oak Tree Permit

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? *Drainage courses and oak trees*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? *Two historic sites, one prehistoric site, one prehistoric isolate, and one historic isolate were discovered during the archaeological survey (September 2006)*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed? *Freeway 5 and Highway 138 are second priority routes*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features? *Site is undeveloped and located along second priority routes*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? *Rural community in the area*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? *Potential impact on current dark skies in area*
f.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)? *Extensive grading and landform alteration*

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
				Access to site will be off of Gorman Post Road
b.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
				Long, winding mountain roadway
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
				Proposed lots are remote and long winding access roads
e.	☐	☐	☒	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
				533 single family residences proposed
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors?
				Proposed development would have to travel to neighboring communities such as Kern County, Santa Clarita, and Lancaster for shopping purposes

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☒ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
				Large scale subdivision proposed
b.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
				Large scale subdivision proposed
c.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors?
				New wastewater treatment plant proposed to be constructed and operated by GVMWD

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
				Proposal exceeds current school capacity
b.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
				Potential capacity problems at individual schools
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
				Increased demand on existing facilities
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Site Dedication ☒ Government Code Section 65995 ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
				Station 77 located at 46833 Peace Valley Road is less than 5 miles from site
b.	☒	☐	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
				Nearest fire station is approximately 5 miles away; may increase demand on existing law enforcement facilities; closest CHP station is the Valencia office
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☒ Fire Mitigation Fee

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? *Public water supply may be inadequate, onsite water wells proposed*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? *Public water supply and pressure may be inadequate*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? *Construction waste and household waste, limited landfill capacity*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? *Schools, library, fire/sheriff*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	☒	☐	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community? *Few scattered residents in rural community*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

To be discussed under Land Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed? *Project site contains underground gas lines and Pacific Oil pipelines*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	☐	☐	☒	Other factors? *Numerous Edison towers and transmission lines located within site*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	☒	☐	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☒	☐	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	☐	☐	☐	Other?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors?

Change in character of community

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? *Extensive circulation system proposed*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)? *No employment opportunities in the immediate area*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents? *No recreational facilities in area beside off-road vehicle park*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors? *Proposed development would have to travel to neighboring communities such as Kern County, Santa Clarita, and Lancaster for shopping purposes*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment,** or **recreational** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? *Biota, cultural resources*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. *Traffic, visual, education, utilities, sewage disposal, fire/sheriff services, land use, population/housing/employment/recreation*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? *Water quality, geotechnical, flood, fire hazard, noise, air quality, environmental safety*

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact