



\* \* \* \* **INITIAL STUDY** \* \* \* \*  
**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

**I.A. Map Date:** March 28, 2005      **Staff Member:** Hsiao-ching Chen

**Thomas Guide:** 4462 D 2-3, E 2-3, F 2-3      **USGS Quad:** Mint Canyon

**Location:** 15600 Sierra Highway, 2,000 feet north of Vasquez Way, Mint Canyon

**Description of Project:** \_\_\_\_\_

*The proposed project is a request for a Tentative Tract Map and a Hillside Management and Density Control Conditional Use Permit to allow for the creation of seventy-five (75) single-family residential lots ranging in size from .46 to 2.01 acres, four debris basin lots, three open space lots, and one water tank lot (at the elevation of 2,070 msl) totaling 83 lots. On- and off-site infrastructure for public water and sewer services will be constructed. A single primary access road for ingress and egress onto Sierra Highway will serve the proposed residences. The proposed project would be constructed in three phases and an estimated 300,000 cubic yards of grading will be balanced on site. In addition to annexation to the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, an off-site water system improvement project is required to provide potable water for TR47573: an 18-inch diameter water line will be installed from an existing water line's current terminus to the Tract boundary on the north/west side of Sierra Highway within the existing Sierra Highway road easement in the southbound lane. Total length of the pipeline is 10,175 linear feet. The maximum length of pipeline installed each day is 300 feet and the pipeline trench line is a maximum of 5 feet wide and 10 feet deep. The total working days to complete this pipeline project are estimated to be 35 days. This pipeline project will take place prior to grading of the project site in order to provide water to the site for fugitive dust control*

**Gross Acres:** Approximately 245.8 acres

**Environmental Setting:** \_\_\_\_\_

*The project site is located north west of Sierra Highway, and north of the city of Santa Clarita, and 2,000 feet north of Vasquez Way in the Mint Canyon area. The site is south of the Angeles National Forest boundary, and east of Vasquez Canyon Road. Commercial uses lie to the south of the project site along Sierra Highway, single-family residences are located to the south and west, and vacant land lies to the north, south and east of the site. The project area is undeveloped and has variable slopes, hillside gradients and valleys. Approximately 57% of the site's 245 acres are within a hillside management area (slopes greater than 25%). Areas of native and non-native vegetation cover the site. There are also portions of the property that have been altered by grading and off-road vehicle use. There is a jurisdictional blue line stream and several other small streams on the subject property that run into Mint Canyon Creek located to the south of the project site. Proposed access road crosses Mint Canyon Creek.*

**Zoning:** A-1-1, C-3

**General Plan:** R: Rural

*N 2: Non-Urban 2; HM: Hillside Management; W: Floodway/Floodplain*

**Community/Area wide Plan:** (Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan)

**Major projects in area:**

**PROJECT NUMBER**

**DESCRIPTION & STATUS**

03-249 / TR 060259

492 single-family residential units on 500 acres NE of Canyon Country; Pending

03-301 / TR 060359

50 single-family residential units on 81 acres N/NW of Canyon Country; Pending

96-044 TR 48086

552 residential units on 586 acres; Approved by RPC; Authorized by BOS

97-009/TR 36943

197 residential units, 1 park lot on 225 acres; Approved 12/09/1998

03-248/PM 27011

2SF on 7.2 acres; Pending

89-156/TR 47574

7 single family lots; Approved 07/02/2002

86-258/TR 44344

68 single family lots, 1 park/open space lot on 43 acres; Recorded 1989

04-75/TR060922

1,325 single-family lots, 1 school site, park lands, and open space; Pending

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

**REVIEWING AGENCIES**

**Responsible Agencies**

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

**Special Reviewing Agencies**

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns.
- City of Santa Clarita
- William S. Hart High School District
- Sulphur Springs Union School District
- Newhall County Water District

**Regional Significance**

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- 
- 
- 

**Trustee Agencies**

- None
- US Fish & Wildlife Service
- State Fish and Game
- 
- 

Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society

- SCOPE
- Southern California Edison
- Santa Clarita Water Division
- Sand Canyon HOA
- CHP, CA Water Network

**County Reviewing Agencies**

- Subdivision Committee
- Sanitation Districts
- DPW: Watershed Mgmt. Div.; Traffic & Lighting Division; Geotechnical & Mat. Engineering Division; Land Development Division; Environmental Programs Division; Design Division; Waterworks/Sewer Maintenance Division
- Health Services: Environmental Hygiene Program
- Fire Department
- Public Library
- Sheriff Department
- Parks & Recreation

<b>IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX</b>		<b>ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)</b>				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
			Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation			
					Potentially Significant Impact	
<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>Pg</b>				<b>Potential Concern</b>
<b>HAZARDS</b>	1. Geotechnical	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Liquefaction; Earthquake Induced Landslides; Hillside area; near Mint Canyon fault; 300,000 c.y. grading</i>
	2. Flood	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Blue line stream; 100 year flood area</i>
	3. Fire	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Fire Zone 4</i>
	4. Noise	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Construction &amp; operational noise</i>
<b>RESOURCES</b>	1. Water Quality	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>NPDES compliance; runoff; blue line stream</i>
	2. Air Quality	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Short-term construction &amp; long-term operational emissions; 300,000 c.y. grading</i>
	3. Biota	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Undeveloped hillside; Removal of and impact to significant habitat and native species</i>
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Stop work condition to be imposed</i>
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Undeveloped hillsides</i>
<b>SERVICES</b>	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Increased daily vehicle trips; road construction</i>
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Expansion of public sewer trunk line necessary</i>
	3. Education	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Increase in local student population; limited student capacity at local districts; library service</i>
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Fire protection and public safety services</i>
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Sewer system expansion; fire protection &amp; public safety services; solid waste</i>
<b>OTHER</b>	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>CUP for Density Controlled Development and Hillside Management</i>
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Growth inducement</i>
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Geotechnical, flood, water quality, air quality, biota, traffic/access, sewage disposal, education, public safety services, growth inducement, visual</i>

**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.

- Development Policy Map Designation: 7: Non-Urban Hillside
- Yes  No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- 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 EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Hsiao-ching Chen Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: Daryl Koutnik Date: \_\_\_\_\_

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.

This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filing 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).

**HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? <hr/> <i>Within 1/2 mile of Mint Canyon Fault (LA County Safety Element Plate 1: Fault Rupture Hazards and Historic Seismicity); Liquefaction area (LA County Safety Element: Liquefaction Susceptibly); Liquefaction Zone &amp; Earthquake-Induced Landslides Zone (State of California Seismic Hazards Zones map, Mint Canyon Quadrangle)</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? <hr/> <i>Earthquake-Induced Landslides Zone (State of California Seismic Hazards Zones map, Mint Canyon Quadrangle). However, no evidence of landslide was found on the project site according to the project-specific geotechnical investigation.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? <hr/> <i>Approximate Hillside Boundary (LA County Safety Element Plate 5: Landslides Inventory)</i>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? <hr/> <i>Liquefaction area (LA County Safety Element: Liquefaction Susceptibly); Liquefaction Zone &amp; Earthquake-Induced Landslides Zone (State of California Seismic Hazards Zones map, Mint Canyon Quadrangle)</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%? <hr/> <i>300,000 c.y. of cut and 300,000 fill are anticipated on site; approximately 57% of the site has slopes over 25%.</i>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

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

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size       Project Design       Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Applicant shall comply with all requirements set forth by the SCM from the Department of Public Works.

Geo report including mitigation measures dated 7/28/04 by Gorian and Associates pending review.

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is there a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? <hr/> <i>Unnamed blue line stream and other smaller streams run through the site and into Mint Canyon Creek located south of the project site.</i> <hr/>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? <hr/> <i>Portion of the site is located in a 100 Year Flood Area (Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plate 6: Flood &amp; Inundation Hazards Areas)</i> <hr/>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? <hr/>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off? <hr/> <i>Project site is located in a 100 Year Flood Area (Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plate 6: Flood &amp; Inundation Hazards Areas)</i> <hr/>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? <hr/> <i>There is a blue line stream on the property and several other streams running on the site that will be filled.</i> <hr/>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? <hr/> <hr/>

### 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

Applicant shall comply with all requirements set forth by the SCM from the Department of Public Works.

Drainage concept/SUSMP Study dated June 2004 by Diamond West Engineering cleared.

### 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)? <i>Project is located in Fire Zone 4 (Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element: Wildland &amp; Urban Fire Hazards)</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? <i>New roads will need to be constructed to serve the 75 residential units on single means of access.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? <i>There is no public water serving the project site; infrastructure will be constructed for water supplied from Santa Clarita Water Division.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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

*Applicant shall comply with all requirements set forth by SCM from the Fire Department.*

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? <i>Project located adjacent to Sierra Highway, which is approximately 1/4 mile east of the closest proposed residential units.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? <i>The project is a residential development and the closest residential community is approximately two miles from the project/grading area.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>Construction and operational noise</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

Noise Ordinance No. 11,778       Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size     Project Design (development setback from Sierra Highway)     Compatible Use

*Current Average Daily Trip (ADT) on Sierra Highway north of Vasquez Canyon Rd is 10,328 vehicles, which will produce a background CNEL value of about 67 dBA at 50 feet from the roadway center line. At 3 decibels of attenuation per doubling of distance, the sound level would be about 58 dBA CNEL at the residence located closest to Sierra Highway.*

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? <i>Santa Clara Watershed is impaired but public sewer is proposed for the project.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? <hr/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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 <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course? <hr/>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>NPDES compliance is required; increase in amounts of runoff; existing drainage courses on site.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>NPDES compliance is required; increase in amounts of runoff; existing drainage courses on site.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <hr/>

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
<input type="checkbox"/> Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

<input type="checkbox"/> Lot Size	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Design	<input type="checkbox"/> Compatible Use
-----------------------------------	---	---

*Applicant shall comply with all requirements set forth by the SCM from Department of Public Works.*

---

*Drainage concept/SUSMP cleared for public hearing.*

---

**CONCLUSION**

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than significant with project mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than significant/No impact
--	---	--

**RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- |    | Yes                                 | No                                  | Maybe                               |   |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?<br><i>Closest residential lots are approximately 1/4 miles to the east of the project site.</i>  |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 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?<br><i>The pipeline project, which is to be done prior to grading of the subdivision construction (unmitigated): ROG-8.5 lbs/day, NOx-56.56 lbs/day, CO-70.08 lbs/day, SO2-0.00 lbs/day, PM10-2.79 lbs/day. Project construction emissions(w/mitigation): ROG-65.22 lbs/day, NOx-95.52 lbs/day, CO-142.95 lbs/day, SO2-0.07 lbs/day, PM10-1.48 lbs/day; Project operational &amp; area emissions (unmitigated): ROG-13.32 lbs/day, NOx-11.14 lbs/day, CO-118 lbs/day, SO2-0.12 lbs/day, PM10- 8.09 lbs/day.</i> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?<br><i>300,000 cubic yards of grading are proposed on site.</i>  |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?<br><i>Santa Clarita Valley is a non-attainment area.</i>  |
| f. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 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 emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?<br><i>Project is likely to create cumulatively considerable net increase of pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin.</i>  |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Other factors?  |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Project Design     Air Quality Report

*URBEMIS2002 modeling results on file. See attached mitigation measures for detail.*

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>The project site is undeveloped with natural habitats.</i>
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas? <i>All vegetation will be removed for future development and fire clearance on a minimum of 60 acres of the project site.</i>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site? <i>An unnamed blue line stream and other smaller streams tributary to Mint Canyon run through the project site.</i>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)? <i>Riversidean sage scrub, California scrub oak, California sage scrub, needlegrass</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? <i>Scrub oaks</i>
f.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? <i>Species found on the project site: Palmer's grapplinghook; Other sensitive species found in the area: San Diego horned lizard, coastal California gnatcatcher, slender-horned spineflower, San Fernando Valley spineflower, slender mariposa lily, Catalina mariposa lily, Plummer's mariposa lily.</i>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? <i>Local wildlife movement corridor through the upper Mint Canyon drainage</i>

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size       Project Design       ERB/SEATAC Review       Oak Tree Permit

*Revised Biological Resources Assessment including mitigation measures dated July 4, 2004 by Frank Hovore & Associates on file.*

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>There is a drainage course on the subject property.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size       Project Design       Phase 1 Archaeology Report

*A Phase I Archaeological Report was prepared for a previously proposed project on the subject property. No further study was recommended in the report prepared by Greenwood & Associates dated June 1996. Stop work condition to be imposed.*

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? _____ _____

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size       Project Design

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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? <hr/>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? <hr/>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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? <hr/>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <hr/> <hr/>

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size             Project Design

---

---

---

---

**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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>Sierra Highway is scenic</i> <hr/>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? <i>Mint Canyon Trail is proposed in the area but alignment is uncertain.</i> <hr/>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features? <i>Project site is 245.8 acres in size and is undeveloped with characteristic sandstone peaks.</i> <hr/>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? <hr/>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? <hr/>
f.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)? <i>There will be grading on 60 acres of the site; some hillsides will be substantially altered.</i> <hr/>

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size                     
  Project Design                     
  Visual Report                     
  Compatible Use

*There are undeveloped hillsides on the site; commercial properties exist to the south.*

*Landscape plan (see Biota Mitigation) to be reviewed and approved by DRP and FD prior to issuance of grading permit.*

---

### 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)? <i>75 single-family residences to be accessed via Sierra Highway. Sierra Highway and Soledad Canyon intersection is congested.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? <i>New road construction is planned as part of the proposed project to provide a single access road.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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? <i>DPW letter of 8/22/05 concluded that the project will not have significant impacts to the CMP monitored locations in the area.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>Potential cumulative impact to the Eastside B&amp;T District.</i>

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Project Design     Traffic Report     Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

*A Traffic Study including CMP analysis and traffic conditions dated October 27, 2004 by RBF Consulting has been submitted to DPW T&L. DPW letter of 8/22/05 conclude no significant impact with traffic infrastructure conditions.*

**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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?<br><i>The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts operate two water reclamation plants (WRPs), the Saugus WRP and the Valencia WRP, which provide wastewater treatment in the Santa Clarita Valley. These facilities are interconnected to form a regional treatment system known as the Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System. The SCVISS has a design capacity of 28.1 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 18.7 mgd.</i>                   |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?<br><i>The wastewater flow originating from the proposed project would have to be transported to the Districts' trunk sewer by local sewer(s) that are not maintained by the Districts. The wastewater generated from the project will be conveyed via a new sewerline constructed as part of the project to the Soledad Canyon Truck Sewer, Section 5. This 18-trunk sewer has a design capacity of 5.7 mgd and conveyed a peak flow of 2.3 mgd when last measured in 2003.</i> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors?  |
- 
- 

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

- Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130
- Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

*Project includes annexation to the Sanitation Districts and construction of extension of sewage collection lines from intersection of Sierra Highway and Vasquez Canyon Road to the project entrance and then to the residential subdivision.*

---

*“Verification of Capacity for Existing Sewer System Located in the City of Santa Clarita Accounting for Additional Flow From TR52990 and TR47573” (Sewer Area Study) pending review.*

---

**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. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?<br><i>William S. Hart High School District and Sulphur Springs School District are operating over capacity.</i> <hr/>   |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?<br><i>Mint Canyon Elementary School which currently has 380 students is the closest elementary school to serve the site.</i> <hr/>   |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create student transportation problems?<br><i>It is anticipated that most students will arrive by private vehicles.</i> <hr/>   |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?<br><i>Project site will be served by County Library District 1 and is within the Canyon Country Jo Anne Darcy Library service area. The library is a 12,864 sq.ft. facility and has a current collection of 109,796 books and other materials.</i> <hr/> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Other factors?<br><hr/> <hr/>   |

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Site Dedication     Government Code Section 65995     Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

*Project will yield an estimated 90 new students from K-12. Current developer fee for Planning Area 1 is \$677 per dwelling unit. The applicant shall pay applicable developer school and library fees prior to issuance of any building permit as conditions of approval.*

---

**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?  
*Approx. 5 miles to Fire Station 107: 18239 Soledad Canyon Road., Canyon Country; Santa Clarita Valley Sheriff Station: 23740 Magic Mountain Pkwy., Valencia, California 91355, which is approximately 10-12 miles from the site.*

b.    Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?

c.    Other factors?  
*CHP local office servicing the project area: 27858 Golden State Hwy, Santa Clarita, CA 91384*

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Fire Mitigation Fee

*See discussion under Fire Mitigation*

**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. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 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?<br><i>It is anticipated that infrastructure will be constructed to provide connection to the Santa Clarita Water Division; no infrastructure currently exists on site. Annexation to the district will be required.</i>   |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?<br><i>Water supplies are limited in the region and water will be supplied through Santa Clarita Water Division.</i>   |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?<br><i>There is a major Southern California Edison electrical transmission network adjacent to the project site.</i>   |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?   |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 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)? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Other factors?   |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

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

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size       Project Design

*A copy of the Main Extension Contract effective date 12/9/04 with the Santa Clarita Water Division on file. A 10,175 liner feet of pipelines will be installed to provide project's water supply infrastructure. A water tank is proposed at the elevation of 2,070 feet, which meets the SCWD requirements, on the proposed Lot 83.*

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community? <hr/> <i>Undeveloped hillside areas will be developed for urban residential use.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <hr/> <hr/>

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

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

**MITIGATION MEASURES** /  **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size       Project Design       Compatible Use

*Please see discussion under the Visual factor.*  

---

---

---

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Toxic Clean-up Plan

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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:
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hillside Management Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

*Project includes a Hillside CUP request.*

---

---

---

**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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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)? <hr/> <i>New water and sewer infrastructure is required.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <hr/> <hr/>

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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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?
				<i>Biota</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
				<i>Biota, provision of public safety services (Fire), Cultural Resources</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
				<i>Air quality, water quality</i>

## 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