March 19, 2003

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
Room 383, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: **NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN AND WATER RECLAMATION PLANT**: RETURN ON WRIT OF MANDATE, ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS, REVISED ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS, AND REVISED PROJECT APPROVALS
General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments Nos. 94-087-(5)
Zone Change No. 94-087-(5)
Newhall Ranch Specific Plan
Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5)
Final Additional Analysis (SCH# 95011015)

Fifth Supervisorial District

Newhall Zoned District

Petitioner: Newhall Ranch Company
A Division of The Newhall Land and Farming Company
23823 Valencia Boulevard
Valencia, CA 91355

Dear Supervisors:

At its October 24, 2001 meeting, the Regional Planning Commission adopted a resolution (attached) recommending that the Board of Supervisors hold a public hearing, certify the Additional Analysis for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant and approve the related project approvals. Following that action, a hearing was set before your Board for November 27, 2001, which was continued until January 29, 2002. Prior to that date, on January 10, 2002, the California Court of Appeals issued a ruling setting aside an Environmental Impact Report Prepared by the Castaic Lake Water Agency relating to the purchase of 41,000 acre feet per year of water entitlement by that agency, whose water was, in part, relied on as a source of water supply for Newhall Ranch. Therefore, on January 22, 2002, the Board delayed its hearing and continued it until an adequate water source could be demonstrated. The California Superior Court has since ruled that the Castaic Lake Water Agency may utilize the entitlement of the 41,000 acre feet of water for planning purposes.

Since that time, the Department of Regional Planning and County Counsel determined that there was new information regarding the Newhall Ranch project, including the acquisition of a new source of water by the applicant and the discovery of additional San Fernando spineflower on the site. At your August 6, 2002 meeting, your Board continued the hearing until January 28, 2003 and then again until March 25, 2003 for staff to prepare and circulate the Revised Draft Additional Analysis addressing the water supply and spineflower issues, and to prepare responses to comments received on that document.

This case is now being returned to you following the preparation of the Draft Additional Analysis, Revised Draft Additional Analysis and Final Additional Analysis (responses to comments) pursuant to a Writ of Mandate by Honorable Roger D. Randall of the Kern County Superior Court. As discussed below, the attached Final Additional Analysis together with the previously distributed Draft and Revised Draft Additional Analyses, respond to the issues contained in the Court's Writ and are submitted for your consideration and action upon which the County Counsel will return the case to the Court.

Following is a brief history of the case, a summary of the Additional Analysis, Revised Additional Analysis and significant issues raised during the Regional Planning Commission's hearing process.

PRIOR COUNTY ACTIONS/DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

In 1994, the applicant began processing a request for the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant and related project approvals. Following review by County staff and the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report, the Regional Planning Commission conducted a public hearing over multiple days regarding the Newhall Ranch EIR and related project components in 1996 and 1997. On December 17, 1997, the Commission unanimously: (a) certified the Newhall Ranch EIR; (b) recommended approval of the proposed General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and the Zone Change; and (c) approved the Newhall Ranch Conditional Use Permit and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map.

Thereafter, in 1998 and 1999, the Board of Supervisors conducted additional hearings regarding Newhall Ranch. On March 23, 1999, the Board of Supervisors unanimously: (a) certified the Newhall Ranch Final EIR; (b) adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations; (c) approved the Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant; and (d) approved the various project approvals for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant.

NEWHALL RANCH LITIGATION

The County's Specific Plan approvals were challenged in court by Ventura County, environmental groups and others in four separate lawsuits, which raised numerous environmental and planning law claims. The Newhall Ranch litigation challenged both the County's adoption of the Newhall Ranch project approvals and its certification of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR. The litigation was transferred to a neutral County and heard by the Honorable Roger D. Randall of the Kern County Superior Court [*United Water Conservation District v. County of Los Angeles, et al.*, Case No. 239324 RDR ("the Newhall Ranch litigation")]. The California Attorney General also joined in the Newhall Ranch litigation in support of Ventura County and the environmental groups.

On August 1, 2000, the Court upheld approval of the Specific Plan and WRP and the Final EIR certification with respect to many of the issues raised in the Newhall Ranch litigation. However, the Court ordered the County to void its certification of the Final EIR but only with respect to the specific issues listed below and to conduct an additional analysis under CEQA in order to:

(1) Extend the traffic impact analysis that was used in the EIR to evaluate the project's impacts on Ventura County arterial roadways exiting State Routes 23 and 126 until the 1 percent impact standard is reached;

(2) Determine the effect on the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek wildlife corridor caused by the shifting of wildlife into the Salt Creek corridor;

(3) Address the Specific Plan's impacts on biological resources in the Santa Clara River corridor associated with channelization and bank hardening;

(4) Demonstrate that adequate water sources will be available for build-out of the Specific Plan, which may be achieved by securing other water sources consistent with CEQA and/or by developing a factual basis providing substantial evidence from which the County can adequately assess environmental impacts of the ASR alternative and its ability to meet water needs; and

(5) Address the alternative of siting the Newhall Ranch WRP off-river, including an analysis of the biological impacts of that siting.

The Court also ordered the County to set aside the project approvals, but only as those approvals relate to SEA 23 and the County's Development Monitoring System ("DMS") as it applies to water supplies, and to take action to:

(6) Ensure consistency of the Specific Plan with the County General Plan policies requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23; and

(7) Ensure consistency of the Specific Plan with the County's General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies.

Consequently, the Court partially set aside approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP, and Final EIR certification, **but only with respect to the issues identified above**.

BOARD ACTION IN RESPONSE TO COURT DECISION

In response to the Court's decision, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution partially setting aside the Newhall Ranch land use approvals and Final EIR certification. In addition, the Board's Resolution required that specific action be taken to comply with the Court's decision and writ.

Specifically, the Board directed County staff to oversee preparation of additional environmental analysis under CEQA ("Additional Analysis"). The Additional Analysis was required to address each of the specific issues described in the Court's decision and writ.

The Board also directed County staff to publish a Notice of Availability of the Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis, and to circulate the Draft Additional Analysis for at least a 45-day public review and comment period.

In addition, the Board directed that noticed public hearings be held before both the Regional Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to review and consider the Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis and the project approvals, as required by the Court's decision and writ.

DRAFT ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

In response to the Board's Resolution, County staff caused to be prepared the Draft Additional Analysis, dated April 2001, to the partially certified Final EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP. The purpose of the Draft Additional Analysis was to address the specific issues identified in the Court's decision and writ. The Draft Additional Analysis specifically included environmental impact analysis and proposed mitigation relating to, among other topics:

(1) Traffic on Ventura County arterials exiting SR-23 and SR-126 (Section 2.1);

(2) Salt Creek Corridor issues (Section 2.2);

(3) Floodplain modifications (Section 2.3);

(4) SEA 23 General Plan Consistency Analysis (Section 2.4);

(5) Newhall Ranch Water Resources (Section 2.5); and

(6) Water Reclamation Plant Alternatives (Section 3.0).

The Draft Additional Analysis also included two additional volumes containing technical studies and other important information.

Pertinent portions of the Draft Additional Analysis were reviewed and considered by the County's Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee ("SEATAC"). County staff independently reviewed, considered and revised the Draft Additional Analysis prior to distribution. The Draft Additional Analysis along with a complete copy of the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR-- was then made available for review at the County and several libraries in both Los Angeles and Ventura Counties for a 130-day public review and comment period.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION HEARINGS ON THE ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

On April 18, 2001, the County published its Notice of Availability of the Draft Additional Analysis and filed a Notice of Completion with the Office of Planning and Research. The Notice of Availability stated that the County would accept public comments on the Draft Additional Analysis for a 60-day period; however, the Commission ultimately extended the public review and comment period for the Draft Additional Analysis to 130 days. The Commission received, evaluated and responded to all comments on the Draft Additional Analysis, which were presented to the Commission in the Final Additional Analysis, Volumes I and II, dated October 2001. The Commission conducted a tour of the site on June 16, 2001 and held hearings on June 20, 2001, July 16, 2001, and August 27, 2001 before taking action on October 24, 2001 to forward the case to the Board with their recommendation for certification of the Final Additional Analysis and approval of the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant and related entitlements.

REVISED DRAFT ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

Since public circulation of the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis in October 2001, portions of the Draft Additional Analysis have been revised at the direction

of the County. The Revised Draft Additional Analysis was circulated for 70 days, commencing on November 27, 2002 through February 4, 2003. County staff independently reviewed, considered and revised the Revised Draft Additional Analysis prior to distribution.

The Revised Draft Additional Analysis has been prepared to reassess the sources of water for the Specific Plan, to provide an update regarding sensitive plant species, including the spineflower, occurring on the Specific Plan site, to provide additional alternatives to the Specific Plan, and to correct minor errors in the prior Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001).

The following sections of the Draft Additional Analysis have been revised and replaced in the Revised Draft Additional Analysis:

- Executive Summary;
- Section 1.0 Introduction and Project Description; and
- Section 2.5 Water Resources.

In addition, the following two new sections have been added to the Revised Draft Additional Analysis:

- Section 2.6 Spineflower and Other Sensitive Plant Species; and
- Section 2.7 Additional Alternatives.

The Revised Draft Additional Analysis was also reviewed and discussed by the County's Significant Ecological Areas Technical Advisory Committee, charged with providing input on biotic-related matters to the Regional Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The focus of their review was on the document's sections pertaining to the spineflower and its preservation and protection. The Committee expressed a desire to have more specific studies/surveys/standards and mitigation measures incorporated into project-level applications, but understood the function of this document in providing an overall program perspective. A copy of the meeting minutes is attached as Exhibit J.

Provided below is a brief summary of portions of the water supply and spineflower information presented in the Revised Draft Additional Analysis. A complete executive summary of the Additional Analysis is attached to this report as Exhibit C.

Water Resources

An adequate supply of water is available to meet the demands of the Specific Plan without creating significant environmental impacts, and the proposed Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program is feasible. The County of Los Angeles and the Newhall Ranch applicant are responding to the Court's decision and direction to demonstrate availability of identified water supplies by now relying on two primary sources of water supply –7,038 acre-feet per year of Newhall's agricultural water, and 1,607 acre-feet per year of water purchased from the Nickel Family LLC in Kern County (the "Nickel water"). Nickel water is 100 percent reliable on a year-to-year basis, and not subject to the annual fluctuations that can occur in dry year conditions. Because these two independent primary water sources meet the potable water needs of the Specific Plan, no potable water would be needed from State Water Project (SWP) and Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA). The non-potable demand would be met by the use of reclaimed water supplied by the Newhall Ranch water reclamation plant and the reclaimed water supplied by CLWA.

Furthermore, Newhall Ranch has undertaken several major steps to enhance the reliability of the water supply for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Specifically, the Newhall Ranch applicant has accomplished the following:

- Secured 7,648 acre-feet per year (AFY) of additional SWP water entitlement from landowners who are served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency.

- Purchased 55,000 AF of groundwater banking storage capacity, which includes the ability to use up to 4,950 AF of water during dry years as a water supply from the Semitropic Water Storage District.

- Determined through comprehensive groundwater testing that the local Saugus aquifer can be successfully used for groundwater banking through an aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) program.

- Along with members of the "Downstream Water Users," including the United Water Conservation District, forwarded a unanimously supported request to the State Department of Water Resources (DWR) to amend the 1978 Castaic Creek Flood Flow agreement, thereby making these flows available for use in groundwater banking and for other appropriate beneficial water uses. This step improves the potential to use Castaic Creek flood flows.

- Determined that CLWA could provide the applicant with supplemental water supplies, if needed.

Spineflower and Other Sensitive Plant Species

Existing Conditions - A total of 10 sensitive plants have been observed on the Newhall Ranch site. Of those 10, four are unconfirmed at the time of this writing due to seasonal limitations or ongoing discussion among botanical experts. The six confirmed sensitive plants include: Peirson's morning-glory, Island mountain-mahogany, San Fernando Valley spineflower, Southern California black walnut, Southwestern spiny rush, and Short-joint beavertail cactus. Of these, the only plant on the state's endangered species list is the spineflower. The four unconfirmed sensitive plants include: Club-haired mariposa lily, Slender mariposa lily, Marcescent dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *marcescens*) or Santa Monica Mountains dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *ovatifolia*), and Los Angeles sunflower. Three unconfirmed plants will require current year flowers to positively identify. Because of the similarity of morphological characteristics between several species and subspecies of sunflower potentially occurring in this region, the specific taxonomic identity of observed sunflower has not been confirmed at this time. If confirmed, it is a plant that was thought to be extinct.

As indicated in the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, spineflower has been observed at three general locations on Newhall Ranch: Grapevine Mesa, Airport Mesa and San Martinez. Approximately 6.3 acres (or 0.05 percent) of the 11,963-acre Newhall Ranch is known to support spineflower.

Direct and Indirect Impacts of the Specific Plan - Some populations of the spineflower are in locations that could be directly or indirectly affected by development associated with Specific Plan implementation, while other populations are located within areas that will be protected as open space. Based on field survey estimates, approximately 6.1 acres of habitat supporting spineflower plants are located within a development-related land use area; and 0.18 acres of habitat supporting spineflower plants are located in proposed open space areas in the Grapevine Mesa area. The short-joint beavertail cactus, *Calochortus* and *Dudleya* observations occurred in areas proposed for development under the Specific Plan. Surveys would need to be conducted during next year's blooming season to confirm the exact species of these taxa. A population of *Helianthus* was also discovered in a wetland area along the Santa Clara River. However, impacts to *Helianthus* are not considered significant because the population is located within an Open Area, which would prohibit development in that area.

An additional seven plant species that are state- or federally-listed as threatened or endangered, and 10 species listed by the CNPS as a List 1 or List 2 species, were not observed but were determined to have at least a moderate potential to occur within the Specific Plan area (DUDEK 2002).

Indirect impacts to sensitive plants would occur to those habitat areas adjacent to or within proposed development areas, after implementation of the project-specific subdivision maps and associated grading plans. Indirect impacts to sensitive plants are normally associated with the following factors:

(a) Non-native invasive plant species;
(b) Non-native invasive animal species;
(c) Vegetation clearing for fuel management or creation of roads and trails;
(d) Trampling;
(e) Changes in hydrological conditions (i.e., increases in water supply due to urban irrigation and runoff);
(f) Chemical pollutants (e.g., herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers); and
(g) Increased fire frequency.

Absent implementation of the Newhall Ranch mitigation program described in Section 2.6 of the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, impacts to any plants located within the Specific Plan area that are state- or federally-listed as threatened or endangered (e.g., the spineflower) or listed as CNPS List 1 or List 2 plant species (e.g., the cactus), are regarded as significant impacts under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures - The Revised Draft Additional Analysis contains a comprehensive mitigation program for the spineflower and other sensitive plant and animal species. This program was independently reviewed by both County staff and the California Department of Fish and Game. A summary of the types of actions/mitigation measures to be followed to address impacts to sensitive species, including the spineflower, include:

- Spineflower Special Study Mitigation Overlay;
- Spineflower Preserves;
- Connectivity, Reserve Design and Buffers;
- Preserve Protection/Fencing;
- Preserve Protection/Hydrological Alterations;
- Engineering, Design and Grading Modifications;
- Fire Management Plan;
- Water Flow Diversion and Management Program;
- A Biological Monitor;
- Construction Impact Avoidance Measures, including water control, storm water flow redirection, and treatment of graded slopes;
- Reassessment Requirement;
- Newhall Ranch Monitoring and Management Program;
- Translocation/Reintroduction Program; and
- Notification of and Limitation on Ongoing Agricultural Activities.

Because actions are to be taken that would be sufficient to minimize impacts to the spineflower, the impacts to the spineflower are considered significant, but mitigable under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The Revised Draft Additional Analysis also provides for the mitigation of impacts to the other sensitive plant species that may be located on Newhall Ranch.

Since circulation of the RDAA, including the above mitigation program, the applicant, California Department of Fish and Game and the Los Angeles County District Attorney announced a final settlement of all outstanding issues, including those relating to the finding of spineflower on Newhall Ranch. The settlement resulted in the dedication by conservation easement of over 64 acres as a permanent spineflower preserve. The dedication area protects more land than spineflower actually occupies, and it includes both a management plan and an erosion control plan to be funded by the applicant. The applicant also agreed to improve California Department of Fish and Game access to Newhall Ranch and to biological surveys and reports. (See, "Civil Compromise Agreement," dated February 11, 2003. A copy of this Agreement is provided inVolume IV, Appendix AF, of the Final Additional Analysis.) In addition, the applicant will be required to perform additional plant surveys as part of the subdivision map process. The applicant also will be required to implement the spineflower mitigation program, as outlined above, in connection with the Specific Plan, if approved.

The Conservation Easement constitutes further mitigation for impacts to the spineflower by securing, in perpetuity, portions of the Newhall Ranch property "to protect the spineflower and its habitat, and to create, within the Conservation Easement, buffer areas surrounding spineflower populations" on the subject property. (See, Conservation Easement Deed, dated February 12, 2003, p. 2. A copy of this easement is provided in Volume IV, Appendix AG, of the Final Additional Analysis.)

FINAL ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS (Including Responses to Comments)

As indicated above, the Revised Draft Additional Analysis was circulated for the public's review for a 70-day period, from November 27, 2002 to February 4, 2003. Public agencies and interested parties submitted comments on the document. In response, the County prepared responses to the written comments received, and circulated to the Board and the public Volumes III and IV of the Final Additional Analysis (recall that Volumes I and II of the Final Additional Analysis were prepared for the Regional Planning Commission in October 2001). Volumes III and IV of the Final Additional Analysis were distributed to commenting agencies and others on or before March 14, 2003. Copies of those documents have also been made available for review at all regional facilities of the County of Los Angeles Public Library, and the Ventura County public libraries in Piru, Fillmore, Santa Paula and Ventura.

REVISED AND ADDITIONAL MITIGATION MEASURES

Since the Newhall Ranch EIR was originally adopted by the Board of Supervisors in March 1999 and as a result of the comments received during the public review process as well as consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, County staff and/or the Regional Planning Commission have recommended adopting many new mitigation measures and conditions of approval as well as revising several mitigation measures originally adopted by the Board.

New mitigation measures occur in the topical areas of spineflower and other sensitive plant species, water resources, and for the Water Reclamation Plant. Revised mitigation measures occur in the topical areas of flood (water quality), spineflower and other sensitive plant species, and water resources (revisions to measures are provided in underlined and strikeout text). In addition, several additional conditions of approval have been recommended to the Board by the Commission. A complete list of the new and revised mitigation measures is presented in Exhibit I attached to this report. If adopted, these revised and additional mitigation measures would be made part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant Mitigation Monitoring Plans to ensure enforcement by the County during implementation of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

County staff also directed the applicant to take various steps to ensure that all environmental information has been disclosed as part of the Newhall Ranch environmental review process. A summary of those recommended actions is found in the Final Additional Analysis, Volume III, Topical Response 7: The Use of Confidentiality Agreements and Disclosure of Information Regarding Spineflower. In addition, County staff has revised and added new mitigation measures in response to the public review and comment process. County staff also recommends that the Board of Supervisors consider imposing the following additional conditions in connection with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in order to ensure continued disclosure of environmental information:

(a) Require the applicant to submit a signed statement, filed concurrently with the filing of any departmental development application, obligating the applicant to disclose to the Department of Regional Planning the existence of any endangered or threatened species that are known or suspected to exist on the subject property.

(b) Require the applicant to report to the Department of Regional Planning the results of all on-site biological surveys within thirty (30) days after completion of the survey work.

(c) Require the applicant to schedule a consultation meeting between the Department of Regional Planning, the applicant and environmental consultant(s) to discuss the results of the survey work, and to ensure public disclosure of the survey results in the required environmental documentation for the proposed project.

If adopted, these conditions could be made part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN TESTIMONY

Subsequent to the preparation of the Responses to Comments Volumes III and IV of the Final Additional Analysis (separate cover), additional written testimony has been received and attached as Exhibit K.

RECOMMENDATION

At the time of the hearing, in the event that your Honorable Board approves the recommendations of the Commission, it would be appropriate for the Board to take public testimony on the revised project and environmental documentation, close the public hearing on the environmental documentation and direct staff to respond to public comments as necessary.

Respectfully Submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

James E. Hartl, AICP

Director of Planning

Frank Meneses, Acting Administrator

Current Planning Division

FM:LRS

c: Executive Officer, for distribution

Attachments:

Exhibit A Regional Planning Commission Resolution

Exhibit B Revised Draft Additional Analysis, Vols I and II (under separate cover)

Exhibit C Revised Draft Additional Analysis Executive Summary

Exhibit D Volumes I through IV of the Final Additional Analysis (under separate cover)

Exhibit E Additional CEQA Findings including Revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant

Attachment A: Mitigation Monitoring Plans, Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant

Attachment B: Statement of Overriding Considerations (previously adopted)

Exhibit F Regional Planning Commission Recommended Additional Findings and Order for CUP 94-087-(5) as it relates to SEA 23

Exhibit G Regional Planning Commission Recommended Conditions of Approval for CUP 94-087-(5) as it relates to SEA 23

Exhibit H Additional Conditions/Mitigation Measures Recommended by the Regional Planning Commission

Exhibit I Revised and Additional Mitigation Measures, and Additional Conditions of Approval

Exhibit J Minutes from January 14, 2003 SEATAC Meeting

Exhibit K Subsequent written testimony

RESOLUTION OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES RECOMMENDING THE ADOPTION OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 94-087-(5) SANTA CLARITA VALLEY AREA PLAN AMENDMENT 94-087-(5) ZONE CHANGE 94-087-(5) AND NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN AS THOSE APPROVALS RELATE TO SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AREA 23 AND DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM POLICIES REGARDING WATER SUPPLIES

WHEREAS, on June 30, 1994, and thereafter, The Newhall Land and Farming Company ("Newhall"), submitted applications to the Department of Regional Planning of the County of Los Angeles for General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments 94-087-(5), the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Zone Change 94-087-(5), Conditional Use Permit 94-087-(5) and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 24500-(5) for the project entitled the "Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant;" and

WHEREAS, the subject property, Newhall Ranch, is an 11,963-acre site located in the northwestern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County and within the County's Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area; and

WHEREAS, the Newhall Ranch project approvals, as described below, would allow for both the adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), relating to proposed large-scale, mixed-use planned development, and construction of a Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"), as a part of the proposed Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with preparation of the Specific Plan, WRP and related project approvals, as described below, and in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub.Res.Code §21000 *et seq.* ("CEQA")) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal.CodeRegs. §15000 *et seq.* ("the Guidelines")), the County caused to be prepared the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant Environmental Impact Report ("Newhall Ranch EIR") (SCH No. 95011015); and

WHEREAS, after preparation and public circulation of the Newhall Ranch EIR, the Regional Planning Commission ("the Commission") conducted concurrent public hearings regarding the Specific Plan, WRP, related project approvals, as described below, and the Newhall Ranch EIR on October 9, 1996; November 4, 1996 (field trip/public testimony); November 6, 1996; November 26, 1996; January 16, 1997; February 18, 1997; April 23, 1997; June 11, 1997; and December 17, 1997; and

WHEREAS, on December 17, 1997, the Commission unanimously: (a) certified the Newhall Ranch EIR; (b) adopted the Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Plan; (c) adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations; (d)

recommended approval of the proposed General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, and Zone Change; and (e) approved the Conditional Use Permit and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors conducted concurrent public hearings regarding the Newhall Ranch EIR and the General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments, Zone Change, Specific Plan, Conditional Use Permit and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map on March 24, 1998; July 28, 1998; and November 24, 1998; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors duly considered the decisions and recommendations of the Commission, the public testimony for and against the Newhall Ranch project, the recommendations and testimony of both the Department of Regional Planning and Department of Public Works, and the Newhall Ranch EIR and related documents, including the documentation within the files of both departments; and

WHEREAS, on March 23, 1999, the Board of Supervisors unanimously: (a) certified the Newhall Ranch EIR; (b) adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations; (c) approved the Mitigation Monitoring Plans; and (d) approved the Newhall Ranch General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments, Zone Change, Specific Plan, Conditional Use Permit and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (collectively, the "Project Approvals"); and

WHEREAS, on or about April 21, 1999, the County of Ventura, *et al.*, the United Water Conservation District, the Sierra Club, *et al.*, and Maria Vega, *et al*., filed petitions for writ of mandate challenging the County's approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and related Project approvals and its certification of the Newhall Ranch EIR ("the Newhall Ranch litigation"); and

WHEREAS, on May 31, 2000, after a two-day hearing before the Honorable Roger D. Randall of the Kern County Superior Court, the Court issued a Ruling, followed by a Statement of Decision, Peremptory Writ of Mandate ("Court's writ") and Judgment on August 1, 2000, in connection with the Newhall Ranch litigation; and

WHEREAS, the Court's writ directed the County and its Board of Supervisors to do the following:

(a) Void certification of the Newhall Ranch EIR (SCH No. 95011015), but only with respect to the specific issues described in paragraphs 2 (a) through (e) of the Court's writ;

(b) Suspend any and all specific Project activity or activities that could result in an adverse change or alteration to the physical environment, unless and until the County and its Board of Supervisors have taken the actions specified in the Court's writ to bring those actions into compliance with CEQA in accord with the Court's Statement of Decision with regard to the specific issues identified in the Court’s writ;

(c) Set aside approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, General Plan and Santa Clarita Areawide Plan Amendments 94-087-(5), Zone Change 94-087-(5) and Conditional Use Permit 94-087-(5), but only as those approvals relate to Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") 23, and to Los Angeles County's Development Monitoring System ("DMS") as it applies to water supplies;

(d) Take action to ensure that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan policies of the County requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23 and the General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies; and

(e) File a return to the Court's writ within 90 days after completing the actions taken to comply with the requirements of the Court's writ.

WHEREAS, in response to the Court's writ, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution which, among other things:

(a) Voided the Board's certification of the Newhall Ranch EIR, but only with respect to the specific issues described in paragraphs 2 (a) through (e) of the Court's writ;

(b) Suspended any and all specific Project activity or activities that could result in an adverse change or alteration to the physical environment, unless and until the County and the Board of Supervisors have taken the actions specified in the Court's writ to bring those actions into compliance with CEQA and the Court's Statement of Decision, with regard to the specific issues in the Court's writ;

(c) Set aside approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, General Plan and Areawide Plan Amendments 94-087-(5), Zone Change 94-087-(5) and Conditional Use Permit 94-087-(5), but only as those approvals relate to SEA 23 and Los Angeles County's DMS policies regarding water supplies;

(d) Directed that actions be taken to ensure that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan policies of the County requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23, and the General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies; and

(e) Directed County staff to prepare, or cause to be prepared, an additional environmental analysis under CEQA that would address each of the specific issues described in the Court's writ and Statement of Decision.

WHEREAS, in response to the Board's Resolution, County staff caused to be prepared the Draft Additional Analysis to the Final EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant ("Draft Additional Analysis"), which addressed the

specific issues identified in the Court's writ and Statement of Decision. On November 13, 2000, County staff distributed the Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of the Draft Additional Analysis to various public agencies and other interested groups, and received responses to the NOP. On April 19, 2001, County staff caused to be prepared and circulated the Notice of Availability of the Draft Additional Analysis, and caused the Draft Additional Analysis, Volumes I through III, in conjunction with the Newhall Ranch EIR, to be circulated for public review; and

WHEREAS, the public review and comment period on the Draft Additional Analysis was to occur for a 60-day period, commencing on April 20, 2001 to June 19, 2001 (15 days longer than required by CEQA). The Commission held public hearings on Newhall Ranch and the Draft Additional Analysis on June 16, 2001 (field trip), June 20, 2001, July 16, 2001 and August 27, 2001. During the public hearing on July 16, 2001, the Commission extended the public comment period on the Draft Additional Analysis through August 27, 2001 (for a total public review period of 130 days); and

WHEREAS, the Commission reviewed and considered the Draft Additional Analysis, Volumes I through III, including public comments, and written responses to those comments, all of which was presented in the Final Additional Analysis to the Newhall Ranch EIR ("Final Additional Analysis"); the Commission also reviewed the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, in conjunction with the additional analysis performed in response to the Court's decision and writ; and

WHEREAS, the Commission concludes as follows:

1. The Final EIR (SCH No. 95011015) for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant remains valid and certified with respect to all issues, except those specified in the paragraphs 2 (a) through (e) of the Court's writ.

2. The Commission's December 17, 1997 Resolution recommending approval of the Newhall Ranch General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments, Zone Change and Specific Plan remains valid in all respects, except as it relates to SEA 23 and the County's DMS policies regarding water supplies.

3. The Board of Supervisors' March 23, 1999 approvals of the Newhall Ranch General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments, Zone Change, Specific Plan and Conditional Use Permit remain valid in all respects, except as they relate to SEA 23 and the County's DMS policies regarding water supplies.

4. The Board of Supervisors' March 23, 1999 approval of Vesting Tentative Parcel Map 24500 remains valid in its entirety, as the Court's writ did not set aside any portion of that approval.

5. Based on the information presented in the Final Additional Analysis and on the entire record before the Commission, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP

are sensitive to and compatible with the biotic resources within the existing boundaries of SEA 23.

6. Based on the information presented in the Final Additional Analysis and on the entire record before the Commission, the bridge crossings to be constructed within the existing boundaries of SEA 23 in connection with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are essential for the safe and adequate circulation of traffic for the Specific Plan and the region, and further numerous County General Plan goals and policies regarding transportation, land use and other important issues of public interest. The roadway bridges also provide an opportunity for utilities to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan without additional disturbance to riparian resources. Various alternatives to the bridge crossings were considered, including a "no project" alternative, consistent with General Plan policies and CEQA.

7. Based on the information presented in the Final Additional Analysis and on the entire record before the Commission, the bridge crossings will be constructed in the most environmentally sensitive manner. Each bridge will comply with County engineering requirements and will be strategically located and designed to provide maximum transportation effectiveness while minimizing impacts upon critical resources, habitat areas and animal movement paths in the riparian corridor.

8. Based on the information presented in the Final Additional Analysis and on the entire record before the Commission, there is sufficient water supply for the demand of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and all pending, approved and recorded projects subject to the County's General Plan DMS requirements. In addition, the DMS analysis contained in the Final Additional Analysis demonstrates that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site is located immediately adjacent to existing development and the retail water service area of the Valencia Water Company. It is also within the wholesale service area of the Castaic Lake Water Agency. Therefore, the Specific Plan is considered consistent with the County's DMS policies as they relate to water supplies.

9. The project is consistent with the infrastructure portion (Urban Services Analysis) of the Development Monitoring System, since there are adequate water supplies with implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the Final Additional Analysis to the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR (SCH No. 95011015).

10. Accordingly, the project:

(a) Avoids premature conversion of undeveloped land to urban uses because it is proximate to and a natural extension of existing development;

(b) Promotes a distribution of population consistent with service system capacity, resource availability, environmental limitations and accessibility;

(c) Directs urban development and revitalization efforts to protect natural and man-made amenities and to avoid severe hazard areas, such as flood prone areas, active fault zones, steep hillsides, landslide areas and fire hazard areas;

(d) Encourages the efficient use of land through a more concentrated pattern of urban development, including the focusing of new urban growth into areas of suitable land;

(e) Ensures that new development in urban expansion areas will occur in a manner consistent with stated plan policies and will pay for marginal public costs that it generates; and

(f) Focuses intensive urban uses in five villages that are located to effectively provide services throughout the Specific Plan area, including transportation facilities.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors for the County of Los Angeles take the following actions:

1. Certify that the Final Additional Analysis has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the State and County guidelines and the Court's decision and writ in the prior Newhall Ranch litigation and that the Final Additional Analysis reflects the independent judgment of the Board;

2. Review and consider the information contained in the Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015) in conjunction with its review of the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR;

3. Adopt the Additional CEQA Findings for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, which include a determination that the On Site Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts) for the Water Reclamation Plant site, as described in subsection 3.5.4 of the Final Additional Analysis, is the environmentally superior WRP site alternative;

4. Approve and adopt the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Specific Plan, incorporated into the Final Additional Analysis, and pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, find that the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation;

5. Find that the General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments 94-087-(5), Zone Change 94-087-(5) and the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita

Valley Area Plan, including the policies regarding the protection of natural resources in SEAs, including SEA 23, and General Plan DMS policies regarding water supplies;

6. Adopt General Plan Amendment 94-087-(5) amending the Land Use Policy maps of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan as depicted on Exhibits 1 through 14 attached to, and described in, the Board's March 23, 1999 Resolution, as those amendments relate to SEA 23 and the County's General Plan DMS policies regarding water supplies;

7. Adopt Zone Change 94-087-(5) changing the zoning classifications on the property as described in the Board's March 23, 1999 Resolution, as that zone change relates to SEA 23 and the County's General Plan DMS policies regarding water supplies;

8. Adopt the amended Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, as described in the Board's March 23, 1999 Resolution, as it relates to SEA 23 and the County's General Plan DMS policies regarding water supplies.

I certify that the foregoing was adopted by a majority of the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles, on _____, 2001.

_____
Rosie O. Ruiz, Secretary
Regional Planning Commission
County of Los Angeles

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In April 2001, the County of Los Angeles publicly circulated the Draft Additional Analysis for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") (SCH No. 95011015). In October 2001, the County then publicly circulated a Final Additional Analysis (consisting of Comments and Responses to Comments) as part of Additional Analysis review proceedings before the County of Los Angeles Regional Planning Commission. As discussed more fully below, the purpose of the Additional Analysis is to address six issues raised by the trial court in litigation regarding the adequacy of the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR. Since public circulation of the Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis and Final Additional Analysis, additional information has been presented, which resulted in the County's decision to revise and recirculate portions of the Draft Additional Analysis.

This Revised Draft Additional Analysis has been prepared to describe changes to the sources of water for the Specific Plan, to provide an update regarding sensitive plant species occurring on the Specific Plan site, to provide additional alternatives to the Specific Plan and to correct minor errors in the prior Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001). The three revised sections indicated below are intended to replace the corresponding sections in the prior Draft Additional Analysis. For example, the Water Resources section (**Section 2.5**) presented in this document completely replaces the Water Resources section (**Section 2.5**) presented in the prior Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001). Only those portions of the prior Draft Additional Analysis, revised as noted below, are included in this Revised Draft Additional Analysis. Edited copies of the three revised sections, showing the revisions made in underline and strikeout format, are available for review at the County of Los Angeles Public Library and County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90012. Contact Mr. Lee Stark.

The following sections of the Draft Additional Analysis have been revised and replaced:

- **Executive Summary**,
- **Section 1.0 Introduction and Project Description**, and
- **Section 2.5 Water Resources**.

In addition, the following two new sections have been added to the Draft Additional Analysis:

- **Section 2.6 Spineflower and Other Sensitive Plant Species**, and
- **Section 2.7 Additional Alternatives**.

Please refer to the April 2001 Draft Additional Analysis for the unchanged portions of the Draft Additional Analysis.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The applicant has prepared the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan which covers a total of 11,963 acres. The Specific Plan as originally approved by the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors includes a potential buildout of 21,615 dwelling units on 4,835 acres (including an 18-hole golf course, 10 neighborhood parks and seven schools), 630 acres of mixed uses (including residential, office, and retail commercial uses), 67 acres of commercial uses, 256 acres of business park uses (including light manufacturing, warehousing and distribution), 37 acres of visitor serving uses, 6,138 acres of open area, 3 community parks on 186 acres, and 367 acres of arterial roads and community facilities (including a new 6.9 million gallon per day water reclamation plant, one library and two fire stations). The Specific Plan would build out over approximately 25 to 30 years, based upon market conditions.

In March 1999, the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors (the County) certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) (SCH No. 95011015), and approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP. Subsequently, various parties challenged the County's certification of the Final EIR and approval of the Specific Plan and WRP in a consolidated action in Kern County Superior Court entitled, *United Water Conservation District v. County of Los Angeles, et al*., Case No. 239324 RDR. The trial court found that the FEIR required additional analysis with regard to the following issues: (1) traffic impacts to Ventura County arterial roadways exiting State Routes 23 and 126; (2) biological impacts to the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek wildlife corridor; (3) biological impacts in the Santa Clara River corridor caused by channelization and bank hardening; (4) adequacy of water sources for the proposed Specific Plan, including impacts caused by employment of the Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) alternative; and (5) the alternative of siting the Specific Plan's Water Reclamation Plant off-river, including an analysis of biological impacts of that siting. The trial court also instructed the County to ensure that the Specific Plan is consistent with the County General Plan policies requiring protection of natural resources in Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) as those standards apply to SEA 23, and the General Plan Development Monitoring System (DMS) policies as they relate to water supplies. Consequently, the Court set aside approval of the Specific Plan and WRP, and FEIR certification, but only with respect to the six issues discussed above. The trial court upheld approval of the Specific Plan and WRP, and the FEIR certification with respect to all other issues raised in the action.

The purpose of this Additional Analysis is to address each of the six issues raised by the trial court. The following provides a summary of the environmental impact analysis and proposed mitigation contained in

each technical section. Included are the questions posed by the trial court along with the answers to the questions posed. Brief summaries of the new Draft Additional Analysis sections are also provided.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AND MITIGATION SUMMARY

Traffic on Ventura County Arterials exiting SR-126 and SR-23

Question: What traffic impact would the Specific Plan have on Ventura County arterials exiting SR-126 and SR-23 if the traffic impact methodologies employed in analyzing the Specific Plan's traffic impacts in Los Angeles County were extended to the analysis of the Plan's traffic impacts on arterial roadways in Ventura County until the 1 percent impact standard is reached?

Answer:

Traffic generated by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan will not cause a significant impact to arterial roadways in Ventura County exiting SR-126 and SR-23 using the one percent standard. It should be noted that the original Newhall Ranch Traffic Analysis contained in the Final EIR was prepared using traffic forecast data from the Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model (SCVCTM). This traffic-forecasting model was developed jointly by the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita to facilitate the analysis of transportation needs in the Santa Clarita Valley. The model was developed as a "windowed" model in which the Santa Clarita Valley study area was extracted as a window of the overall region. As a windowed model, the SCVCTM features only the land use and highway network within the Santa Clarita Valley and has a set of "cordons" which define the edges of the modeled area. These cordons are designated points on the highway network where regional traffic from outside the window enters and exits the modeled area. Since the time the original traffic study was conducted, the Ventura County Transportation Commission has prepared a long-range Ventura Countywide Traffic Model ("VCTM"). The VCTM is based on the regional land use database produced by the Southern California Association of Governments. The database contains land use information on existing and future development patterns for the five county Southern California region. Consequently, it is possible to more accurately determine the Specific Plan's impacts to Ventura County arterial roadways.

The analysis contained in **Section 2.1** of this Additional Analysis demonstrates that the Specific Plan will not have a significant impact (i.e., a one percent or more contribution) on any Ventura County arterial roadways exiting SR-126 or SR-23. Therefore, the Specific Plan will not result in significant impacts to any arterial roads in Ventura County and no mitigation beyond that identified in the Final EIR is required (see **Section 4.0** below for a copy of the Mitigation Monitoring Program). Staff of the Ventura County

Transportation Commission reviewed the analysis presented later in this document and indicated their concurrence with the significance conclusions reached (see letter dated October 4, 2000 in **Appendix 2.1(a)**).

Salt Creek Corridor

Question: What effect does the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan have on the Salt Creek Corridor situated in Ventura County, caused by the shifting of wildlife into the Salt Creek Corridor?

Answer:

The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan will not significantly effect wildlife movement in the Salt Creek Corridor. Wildlife movement within the Salt Creek watershed occurs primarily along the general direction of the drainages between the Santa Susana Mountains and the Santa Clara River Valley. These routes are used because they follow the gentlest topography and more open habitat. Wildlife movement between watersheds to the east and west are easiest at the upper and lower ends of the watersheds. At the lower ends, canyons merge in the Santa Clara River Valley and are generally flat with less steep ridges. At the upper ends of the watersheds, the ridgeline of the Santa Susana Mountains provides less steep connections to the upper reaches of the canyons and adjacent watersheds.

As part of the original approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors established a one-half mile wide buffer south of the Santa Clara River and a one-eighth of a mile buffer north of the river between all development proposed as part of the Specific Plan and the Ventura County line. Direct impacts to habitats in the Potrero Creek watershed in Los Angeles County from the proposed Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are important to the Salt Creek watershed. Habitat loss in the Potrero Creek watershed would potentially cause a shift in some wildlife populations to undisturbed habitats in the Salt Creek watershed in both Los Angeles and Ventura County. Habitat losses in the Potrero Creek watershed would also potentially affect the long-term movement of wildlife within this watershed and within the Salt Creek watershed in both Ventura County and Los Angeles County. However, no direct impacts to that portion of the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County would occur in association with the Specific Plan because no development is proposed there, and all development proposed as part of the Specific Plan would occur no closer than one-half mile to Ventura County.

It is also important to understand that the Specific Plan will build out over a 20 to 30 year period. Consequently, the displacement of wildlife species, primarily larger mammals, would occur incrementally over a much-extended period of time. These larger wildlife species (e.g., mountain lion, deer, bobcat,

and coyote) generally have home ranges that are not confined only to one watershed, and would be expected to be displaced in relatively small numbers. In contrast, the smaller wildlife species will more likely suffer from direct mortality because of land development, and would not be displaced into adjacent watersheds. This time factor allows for a very gradual shift (i.e., over a period of decades) of wildlife use/movement for those animals able to move a distance of more than one-half mile from the Specific Plan area in Los Angeles County to adjacent undeveloped areas, including the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County. These very gradual (and temporary) increases in wildlife use/movement in the Salt Creek watershed in both Los Angeles County and Ventura County would be easier to absorb with wildlife movement over many, many years (i.e., the animals would have more time to adapt to the available resources or would have time to move out of the Salt Creek watershed to adjacent watersheds). Therefore, the direct impacts of habitat loss in the Specific Plan area on wildlife movement within the Salt Creek watershed, and particularly the Ventura County portion given its distance away from proposed development, would not be significant. Please see **Section 2.2** of the Additional Analysis for further information on this topic.

Floodplain Modifications

Question: What are the biological impacts on the Santa Clara River corridor due to channelization, increased flow velocities and bank hardening?

Answer:

The proposed drainage improvements would maintain the key hydraulic characteristics that largely determine the overall mosaic of habitats in the river. Development of the Specific Plan would increase runoff from upland areas due to increased impervious surfaces (e.g., pavement, roads, and buildings). The project has an effect out to a point about four miles downstream of the Specific Plan site in Ventura County. Beyond this point, the Specific Plan has no impacts to flows. The increase in runoff ranges from 3 percent for high flows to 7 percent for the 2-year event. For high frequency floods (2-year, 5-year, and 10-year), the proposed floodplain modifications would not hinder flows or reduce the floodplain area. Instead, these flows would spread across the river channel, unaffected by the bank protection because the river would have sufficient width to allow these flows to meander and spread out further than they would under pre-project conditions.

It is only during more infrequent floods (20-year, 50-year and 100-year events) where flows would spread out to the buried bank stabilization (but no further). This would limit the area of the floodplain during these infrequent flood events, causing inundation over a smaller area because the bank protection will prevent flooding of formerly adjacent floodplain areas. However, the reduction in floodplain area caused

by bank protection does not create a significant increase in overall velocities or water depth, because the volume of flow carried in these shallow, slow-moving areas along the margins of the river is small. Moreover, variations are localized and limited in scope, especially when viewed in the entirety of the river corridor within the Specific Plan site and downstream. Therefore, the overall mosaic of habitats in the river would be maintained because the key hydraulic characteristics would not be significantly different under the Specific Plan. Based on these results, the floodplain modifications associated with the Specific Plan (i.e., bank protection and bridges) would not cause significant changes to key hydraulic characteristics, and therefore, would not alter the amount and "pattern" of aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitats in the river at the Specific Plan site and downstream in Ventura County. Please see **Section 2.3** of this Additional Analysis for further information on this topic.

SEA General Plan Consistency

Question: Is the Specific Plan consistent with the Los Angeles County General Plan policies requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23?

Answer: Yes

The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is considered highly compatible with biotic resources in SEA 23 and is consistent with County of Los Angeles policies related to protection of natural resources in SEAs. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan proposes changes to SEA 23 resulting in a reduction of land area of 471 acres within SEA 23. The revised SEA 23 would contain approximately 819 acres. Approximately 117 acres of the total area transferred involves sensitive habitat. However, the proposed changes to the SEA area must be understood in context. In this case, only a relatively small amount of sensitive habitat area (i.e., 28 acres, or 2 percent of the existing SEA) is being removed from the existing boundaries of SEA 23 due to proposed development. The balance of the land transferred from SEA 23 (443 acres) will be either placed in other permanently preserved open area designations (i.e., SEA 20, Open Area) because it is not riparian in nature, or is proposed for development on land that is, for the most part, already disturbed or not considered sensitive (e.g., existing agricultural fields). In addition to land removed, a total of 59 acres of land is proposed to be added to SEA 23 (530 total acres proposed for removal from the SEA, while 59 acres are proposed for addition for a net reduction in SEA acreage of 471 acres). The transfers were made with consideration to the type and quality of the habitat and the purpose of the SEA 23 (preservation of riparian habitats and associated species).

Approximately 384 acres presently in SEA 23 are proposed for development as part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. However, only a small amount of that land is considered sensitive. The vast

majority of the land is either already in a disturbed condition, in agricultural production or dominated by ruderal or weedy plant species. Approximately 337 acres (or 64 percent of the 530 acres being removed from SEA 23) are in a disturbed condition, 19 acres (or 4 percent of the 530 acres being removed from SEA 23) are dominated by non-sensitive habitat types, and 28 acres (or 5 percent of the 530 acres being removed from SEA 23) are dominated by sensitive habitat types.

The land use plan proposed as part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan has been designed to minimize impacts to sensitive resources, and where avoidance is not possible, to minimize impacts where feasible. A total of 380 acres of sensitive habitat areas exist within SEA 23 and only 28 acres (or seven percent of sensitive habitat areas and two percent of the original SEA) would be directly impacted by development. The remainder would remain protected in open space areas as part of the revised SEA 23, SEA 20 or within the Open Area designations. This is consistent with General Plan compatibility criteria one that requires setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed area. Development on land already disturbed poses no direct impacts to resources found within the SEA. Of the 28 acres of sensitive habitat removed by development in the SEA, 20 acres of sensitive riparian habitat is being removed to accommodate residential, commercial or mixed land uses. However, the affected land represents small patches of disconnected habitat distributed throughout the Specific Plan area rather than a contiguous patch of 28 acres that provides higher habitat value. Based on the information presented, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is compatible with the sensitive resources found within SEA 23. See **Section 2.4** of the Additional Analysis for further information on this topic.

Water Resources

An adequate supply of water is available to meet the demands of the Specific Plan without creating significant environmental impacts, and the proposed Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program is feasible.

Introduction

The County of Los Angeles and the Newhall Ranch applicant are responding to the Court's decision and direction to demonstrate availability of identified water supplies by now relying on two primary sources of water supply – Newhall's historical use of agricultural water to benefit its land in Los Angeles County, and water purchased from the Nickel Family LLC in Kern County (the "Nickel water"). The right of the beneficial use of Newhall's agricultural water resource is well established under California law.[1] This agricultural water will be available as agricultural production until it is phased out by urban development.

---

1 See, the California Supreme Court's decision, *City of Barstow v. Mojave Water Agency* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1224.

There would be a limit placed on the amount of groundwater used so that it would not exceed the amount already used for agricultural purposes. This agricultural water supply has historical long-term availability and reliability and is an established supply. The Alluvial and Saugus aquifers have consistently been at or near their highest levels in the past several years and are not in an overdraft condition. The first source is the applicant's historical alluvial groundwater produced in the County of Los Angeles that is presently committed to agriculture uses. The second source is the applicant's purchase of 1,607 acre-feet per year of water from Nickel Family LLC in Kern County (the "Nickel Water"). This water is 100 percent reliable on a year-to-year basis, and not subject to the annual fluctuations that can occur in dry year conditions. Pursuant to Nickel's contract water rights, the water delivered to Nickel for sale to Newhall must be high quality water, acceptable for delivery into the California aqueduct. In addition, delivery of the water to Nickel being sold to Newhall is mandatory and unaffected by annual hydrologic conditions. The Nickel Water would only be needed on the Specific Plan site in years when all of the Newhall Agricultural Water has been used, which is estimated to occur after the 20th year of project construction. Up to that point in time, the unused Nickel Water would be available for storage in groundwater banking programs on an annual basis, which would then be used as a dry year supplemental supply. The water would be delivered through the Kern County Water Agency and the State Water Project (SWP) system. Because these two independent primary water sources meet the potable water needs of the Specific Plan, no potable water would be needed from State Water Project (SWP) and Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA). The non-potable demand would be met by the use of reclaimed water supplied by the Newhall Ranch water reclamation plant and the reclaimed water supplied by CLWA.

Furthermore, Newhall Ranch has undertaken several major steps to enhance the reliability of the water supply for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Specifically, the Newhall Ranch applicant has accomplished the following:

- Secured 7,648 acre-feet per year (AFY) of additional SWP water entitlement from landowners who are served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency.
- Purchased 55,000 AF of groundwater banking storage capacity, which includes the ability to use up to 4,950 AF of water during dry years as a water supply from the Semitropic Water Storage District.
- Determined through comprehensive groundwater testing that the local Saugus aquifer can be successfully used for groundwater banking through an aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) program.
- Along with members of the "Downstream Water Users," including the United Water Conservation District, forwarded a unanimously supported request to the State Department of Water Resources (DWR) to amend the 1978 Castaic Creek Flood Flow agreement, thereby making these flows available for use in groundwater banking and for other appropriate beneficial water uses. This step improves the potential to use Castaic Creek flood flows.
- Determined that CLWA could provide the applicant with supplemental water supplies, if needed.

The relationships between Newhall Ranch water demand and supply in normal/average and dry years are provided below in **Tables ES-1** and **ES-2**, and are illustrated in **Chart ES-1**.

Analysis

Provided below are the questions posed by the trial court with regard to Newhall Ranch water resources along with the answers to each question posed.

Question: Is Sufficient Water Available for Build-out of the Specific Plan?

Answer: Yes

An adequate amount of water is available to meet the needs of the Specific Plan. In fact, actions being taken by the Specific Plan applicant will result in even more water being made available to the Specific Plan than is needed to meet its water need. The primary sources of water for the Specific Plan consist of existing supplies that are available for use today in the Santa Clarita Valley. To ensure that adequate water is available for the Specific Plan, the Specific Plan will rely on the following sources of water:

(a) Newhall Ranch Water Supplies

- **Existing Newhall Agricultural Water** – The project applicant would meet potable water demands of the Specific Plan by using Newhall's historical alluvial groundwater produced in Los Angeles County which is presently committed to agricultural uses. No additional groundwater would be pumped over historical and present amounts; instead, the water presently used to irrigate crops would be treated and then used to partially meet the potable water needs of the Specific Plan.

- **Nickel Water**. The applicant has secured water under contract with Nickel Family LLC in Kern County. This water is 100 percent reliable on a year-to-year basis, and not subject to the annual fluctuations that can occur in dry year conditions. The water would be delivered through the Kern County Water Agency and the SWP system. The Nickel Water would only be needed on the Specific Plan site in years where all of the Newhall Agricultural Water has been used, which is estimated to occur after the 20th year of project construction. Up to that point in time, the unused Nickel Water would be available for storage in groundwater banking programs on an annual basis, which would then be used as a dry year supplemental supply.

- **Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project.** The project applicant has entered into an agreement to reserve and purchase water storage capacity of up to 55,000 acre-feet in the Semitropic Water Storage District Groundwater Banking Project. The stored water could be extracted in dry years in amounts of up to 4,950 AFY from the project. This supply will be used as a water source for the Specific Plan in dry years only. Sources of water that can be stored in this banking project include, but are not limited to, Nickel Water, Newhall/SWP supplies, and Other CLWA Supplies.

- **Newhall Ranch Reclaimed Water**. Reclaimed water from the Specific Plan's water reclamation plant will be used to meet a portion of the Specific Plan's non-potable water need.

- **CLWA Reclaimed Water**. Planned recycled water from the Valley's two existing water reclamation plants will be used to meet the remainder of the Specific Plan's non-potable water need.

Table ES-1
Newhall Ranch Specific Plan
Normal/Average Year Potable and Non-Potable Water Usage
(acre-feet/year)

	Demand	Supply	
		7,038	Newhall Agricultural Water (a)
		1,607	Nickel Water (b)
Potable	8,645	8,645	
		5,344	Newhall Ranch Reclaimed Water
		3,691	CLWA Reclaimed Water
Non-Potable	9,035	9,035	
Total (c)	**17,680**	**17,680**	

(a) Firm groundwater supply historically and presently used by the applicant for agricultural irrigation purposes on its agricultural land in The County of Los Angeles.
(b) The applicant has secured water under contract with Nickel Family LLC in Kern County. This water is 100 percent reliable on a year-to-year basis, and not subject to the annual fluctuations that can occur in dry year conditions. The water would be delivered through the Kern County Water Agency and the SWP system.
(c) See **Table 2.5-25, Summary of Newhall Ranch Water Demands**.

Additional Programs to Enhance Reliability of Supplies

Groundwater Banking Program for Dry Years (h)			Supplemental Supplies
Saugus Groundwater Banking/ ASR Program (e)	4,500	4,500	CLWA SWP and Other Supplies (g)
		4,566	Newhall/SWP Water (d)
		7,043	Castaic Creek Flood Flows (f)
Total	**4,500**	**16,109**	

(d) Newhall/SWP water (7,648 acre-feet per year of annual entitlement) secured by the applicant from landowners served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency, which would be delivered through SWP facilities to CLWA. This source would be reduced to approximately 59.7 percent in average years as discussed in Section 2.5, Water Resources (4,566 = 7,648 x 0.597).
(e) The Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program involves injecting or "banking" 4,500 AFY of treated Newhall/ SWP water or other available water at times when those sources are readily available in normal/average years. During drought periods, up to 4,100 AFY would be withdrawn from the groundwater bank to partially meet Specific Plan dry year water demand.
(f) Subject to approval by DWR, Castaic Creek flood flows could be used in normal/average years, when available, as a water source for the Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project (through a water transfer), or for the Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program. This supply is variable; in some years, the flood flows are not available.
(g) In addition to Newhall/SWP Water and Castaic Creek Flood Flows, CLWA SWP entitlement and other CLWA supplies could be used as a source of water for injection into the Semitropic and Saugus Groundwater Banks.
(h) CLWA's SWP entitlement is 95,200 acre-feet per year. The amount of the water shown above is not a limitation on the amount of CLWA SWP supplies that could be used as a source of water; however, the CLWA supplies are

only considered a supplemental source for Newhall Ranch, because the applicant has taken steps to secure its own primary potable water supplies.

Table ES-2
Newhall Ranch Specific Plan
Dry Year Potable and Non-Potable Water Usage
(acre-feet/year)

	Demand (c)	Supply	
		7,038	Newhall Agricultural Water (a)
		1,607	Nickel Water (b)
		865	Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project (e)
Potable	9,510	9,510	
		5,344	Newhall Ranch Reclaimed Water
		4,595	CLWA Reclaimed Water
Non-Potable	9,939	9,939	
Total	**19,449**	**19,449**	

(a) Firm groundwater supply historically and presently used by the applicant for agricultural irrigation purposes on its agricultural land in The County of Los Angeles.
(b) The applicant has secured water under contract with Nickel Family LLC in Kern County. This water is 100 percent reliable on a year-to-year basis, and not subject to the annual fluctuations that can occur in dry year conditions. The water would be delivered through the Kern County Water Agency and the SWP system.
(c) Demands are projected to increase in a dry year by approximately 10 percent due to a lack of local rainfall.

Additional Programs To Enhance Reliability Of Supplies

Supplemental Supplies		
	3,044	Newhall/SWP Water (d)
	4,085	Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project (e)
	4,100	Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program (f)
Total	**13,701**	

(d) Newhall/SWP water (7,648 acre-feet per year of annual entitlement) secured by the applicant from landowners served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency, which would be delivered through SWP facilities to CLWA. This source would be reduced to approximately 39.8 percent in dry years as discussed **in Section 2.5, Water Resources** (3,044 = 7,648 x 0.398). This water is not related to CLWA's 95,200 AF entitlement.
(e) The project applicant has entered into an agreement to secure water storage capacity of up to 55,000 acre-feet in the Semitropic Water Storage District Groundwater Banking Project. The stored water would be extracted in dry years in amounts of up to 4,950 AFY from the project. This supply will be used as a water source for the Specific Plan in dry years only. The storage capacity will be filled in the initial years (beginning in year 2005) from available water before Newhall Ranch demand requires this supply. Afterward, further demand for this water in wet/average years, on an as needed basis, could be met by banking excess Newhall/SWP Water, Castaic Creek Flood Flows, CLWA SWP entitlement and other supplies as available.
(f) The Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program involves injecting or "banking" 4,500 AFY of treated Newhall/SWP water or other available water at times when those sources are readily available in normal/average years. During drought periods, up to 4,100 AFY would be withdrawn from the groundwater bank to partially meet Specific Plan water demand.

(b) Supplemental Water Supplies

Even though enough water already exists to meet the needs of the Specific Plan, the applicant has taken the following actions in order to enhance the reliability of Specific Plan water supplies:

- **Newhall/SWP Water** – The applicant has secured 7,648 AFY of water under contract from landowners served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency.
- **Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project** - The applicant has purchased up to 55,000 acre-feet of groundwater storage capacity in the Semitropic Groundwater Bank, located in Kern County, and will utilize in dry years water stored in that bank during average/normal and wet years. Sources of water that could be stored in this banking project include, but are not limited to, Nickel Water, Newhall/SWP supplies, and Other CLWA Supplies.
- **Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program** - In dry years, the applicant will utilize water stored in the proposed Saugus Groundwater Bank (also termed Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR)) in normal and wet years.
- **Castaic Creek Flood Flows** – Subject to approval by the State Department of Water Resources (DWR), Castaic Creek flood flows could be used in wet and normal/average years, when available, as a water source for the Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project (through water transfers) and the Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program. This supply source is variable; in drier years, the flood flows are not available.
- **CLWA SWP and Other Supplies** –A relatively small portion of CLWA's existing SWP Table A water entitlement could be used, if needed, to supplement a portion of the Specific Plan's potable water need. As a SWP contractor, CLWA may also obtain additional SWP supplies from or through DWR in connection with other programs. The CLWA supplies are only considered a supplemental source for Newhall Ranch because the applicant has taken steps to secure its own primary potable water supplies. When available in wet and normal/average years, excess CLWA SWP water and other supplies available to CLWA could be used in addition to Newhall/SWP water and Castaic Creek flood flows as a source of water for storage in the Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project (through water transfers) and the Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program.

The surplus of water created by existing water sources and the actions of the applicant will ensure an adequate supply of water for the Specific Plan without creating significant impacts on existing water supplies or downstream water users. For additional information on this topic, please see **Section 2.5, Water Resources**.

Question: Is the Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program Feasible?

Answer: Yes

The results of injection and recovery tests conducted by the applicant demonstrate that implementing a groundwater banking/ASR program in the Saugus Formation is feasible. The determination that the Saugus Groundwater Banking program is feasible is based on the actual injection and pumping tests

conducted at wells in the Saugus Formation from July 2000 through October 2000, as well as groundwater modeling. (*See*, *Newhall Ranch ASR Impact Evaluation*, CH_2MHill; and *Assessment of the Hydrogeologic Feasibility of Injection and Recovery of Water in the Saugus Formation, Santa Clarita Valley, California*, *Slade*.) The testing and the modeling show that there is no discernible effect on Alluvial water levels or the Santa Clara River, from either Saugus Formation well injection or pumping. For additional information on this topic, please see **Section 2.5, Water Resources, Subsection 2.5.5.3(d)(5)** entitled "**Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program**."

Question: Is the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Consistent with the General Plan Development Monitoring System Policies as They Relate to Water Supplies?

Answer: Yes

The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the County's General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies. This analysis has been completed to determine if sufficient water supplies will be available for the Specific Plan under the County's General Plan Development Monitoring System (DMS) requirements. Because two independent primary water sources have been secured to meet the potable water needs of the Specific Plan, no additional potable water would be needed from State Water Project (SWP) and the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) supplies. For additional information on this topic, please see **Section 2.5, Water Resources, Subsection 2.5.5.4(a)(1)** entitled "**DMS General Plan Consistency**."

Water Reclamation Plant Alternatives

Question: What are the impacts associated with siting the WRP off-river, including an analysis of the biological impacts of that siting?

Answer:

Non-River Alternative-The non-river alternative would entail constructing the WRP at a location more removed from the Santa Clara River than the proposed location. It is expected that slightly less land would be required for the WRP under this alternative (approximately 9 acres compared to 15 acres under the proposed project because the non-river site is not as confined). The WRP would be at a slightly higher elevation and, therefore, would require some pumping, resulting in higher costs for construction, operation and maintenance, and higher energy costs. With the exception of those topics described below, all other environmental impacts associated with this alternative (such as traffic, etc.) are

considered similar to those created by the proposed project and would merely be relocated to another site as a result of this alternative.

Development of the WRP under this alternative would require the conversion of approximately 9 acres of prime farmland. Because construction of the WRP on this alternative site would slightly decrease impacts to agricultural resources by approximately 0.5 acre, the Non-River Alternative is slightly superior to the proposed project from an agricultural resources perspective when considering only the plant itself. However, it should be noted that if the WRP is not constructed on this alternative site, the 9 acres of agricultural land present on the alternative site would still be converted to residential land uses under the Specific Plan. Similarly, if the WRP is constructed at this alternative site and not the proposed project site, the 9.5 acres of agricultural land on the proposed project site would still be converted to urban land uses (i.e., Business Park). Under either the proposed project or this alternative site, all the agricultural land (18.5 acres) would be converted to urban uses regardless of the alternative site selected. Consequently, this alternative is not necessarily environmentally superior to the proposed project with respect to agricultural resource impacts.

From a biological perspective, implementation of this alternative would decrease the magnitude of impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, because the alternative site contains no sensitive habitats. This alternative would result in an increase in energy consumption because it would require a greater amount of energy to pump waste up grade to the treatment plant. A consequence of this increased energy consumption would be the generation of air emissions in amounts incrementally greater than under the proposed project.

This Alternative would be located immediately adjacent to planned Low-Medium Residential land uses, which are incompatible with a WRP. Under the proposed project, the WRP would not be located adjacent to incompatible land uses. Rather, it would be located adjacent to planned Business Park uses. With regard to noise generation and land use compatibility, therefore, the proposed project is environmentally superior to the Non-River Alternative.

In light of these facts, on balance, the Non-River Alternative is considered environmentally superior with regard to impacts on sensitive biological habitats, and is not considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to impacts to air quality, energy consumption and noise. Please see **Section 3.0** of this Additional Analysis for further information on this topic.

NEW DRAFT ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS SECTIONS

Spineflower and Other Sensitive Plant Species

Section 2.6 summarizes the pertinent history and background relating to an endangered plant called the San Fernando Valley spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *fernandina*; "spineflower") and other sensitive plant species on Newhall Ranch, including surveys conducted by the applicant and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). **Section 2.6** includes an analysis of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the spineflower and other sensitive plant species due to development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP. While such an analysis is typically completed at the time subdivision maps allowing construction are proposed, this document addresses potential impacts to spineflower and other sensitive plants at the program level. **Section 2.6** also sets forth a comprehensive set of mitigation measures as part of a program to, in combination with the mitigation measures already presented in the Revised Draft EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP, avoid or minimize impacts to the spineflower and other sensitive plant species that may be found on the site. Environmental documents to be prepared for future subdivision maps will also present measures and/or programs necessary to mitigate potential impacts to spineflower and other sensitive plants.

Existing Setting - A total of 10 sensitive plants have been observed on the Newhall Ranch site. Of those 10, four are unconfirmed at the time of this writing due to seasonal limitations or ongoing discussion among botanical experts. The six confirmed sensitive plants include: Peirson's morning-glory, Island mountain-mahogany, San Fernando Valley spineflower, Southern California black walnut, Southwestern spiny rush, and Short-joint beavertail. Of these, the only plant on the state's endangered species list is the spineflower. The four unconfirmed sensitive plants include: Club-haired mariposa lily, Slender mariposa lily, Marcescent dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *marcescens*) or Santa Monica Mountains dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *ovatifolia*), and Los Angeles sunflower. Three unconfirmed plants will require current year flowers to positively identify. Because of the similarity of morphological characteristics between several species and subspecies of sunflower potentially occurring in this region, the specific taxonomic identify of observed sunflower has not been confirmed at this time. If confirmed, it is a plant that was thought to be extinct.

The original Draft Additional Analysis (2001) discussed the spineflower on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Specifically, the original Draft Additional Analysis described the spineflower's historical range and habitat requirements, and confirmed the presence of spineflower on the Grapevine Mesa location of Newhall Ranch. As part of more recent rare plant surveys, spineflower was also observed at two

additional locations on Newhall Ranch: Airport Mesa and San Martinez. Approximately 6.3 acres (or 0.05 percent) of the 11,963-acre Newhall Ranch is known to support spineflower.

Direct Impacts of the Specific Plan - As indicated above, spineflower was observed in three general locations within the Specific Plan area: Airport Mesa, Grapevine Mesa, and San Martinez. Some populations of the spineflower are in locations that could be directly or indirectly affected by development associated with Specific Plan implementation, while other populations are located within areas that will be protected as open space. Based on field survey estimates, approximately 6.1 acres of habitat supporting spineflower plants are located within a development-related land use area; and 0.18 acres of habitat supporting spineflower plants are located in proposed open space areas in the Grapevine Mesa area. Until more detailed project-level subdivision maps and plans are prepared, it is assumed that all land within an area zoned for development will be converted. Therefore, any spineflower populations within these areas have been determined at this time to be directly impacted (i.e., removed from the site) by buildout of the Specific Plan. As noted above, the short-joint beavertail cactus, a CNPS List 1B plant species, was also observed during the surveys. Two plant taxa were observed during surveys that, due to the dry field conditions during 2002, did not permit definitive identification of these taxa to the species level. These taxa include *Calochortus* and *Dudleya*. Both the *Calochortus* and *Dudleya* observations occurred in areas proposed for development under the Specific Plan. Surveys would need to be conducted during next year's blooming season to confirm the exact species of these taxa.

A population of *Helianthus* was also discovered in a wetland area along the Santa Clara River. Because of the similarity of morphological characteristics between several species and subspecies of *Helianthus* potentially occurring in this region, the specific taxonomic identify of this single population of plants is not yet confirmed at this time. However, impacts to *Helianthus* are not considered significant because the population is located within an Open Area, which would prohibit development in that area.
An additional seven plant species that are state- or federally-listed as threatened or endangered, and 10 species listed by the CNPS as a List 1 or List 2 species, were not observed but were determined to have at least a moderate potential to occur within the Specific Plan area (DUDEK 2002). The locations of any other plant species observed during the course of the spineflower surveys were mapped as illustrated in **Appendix 2.6**.

Impacts to any plants located within the Specific Plan area that are state- or federally-listed as threatened or endangered (e.g., the spineflower) or listed as CNPS List 1 or List 2 plant species (e.g., the cactus), are regarded as significant impacts under CEQA. Impacts to remaining plants are not considered significant if they are not expected to occur onsite, have a low potential of occurring, or are of a relatively low sensitivity**.** If future surveys confirm the *Calochortus* species to be one of the CNPS List 1B plants

potentially occurring in the area, or the *Dudleya* to be one of the federally-listed threatened species known to occur in the region, the loss of occupied habitat of either of these species, directly or indirectly, would be considered a significant impact.

Indirect Impacts of the Specific Plan - Indirect impacts to sensitive plants would occur to those habitat areas adjacent to or within proposed development areas, after implementation of the project-specific subdivision maps and associated grading plans. Specifically, the spineflower and other sensitive plant species are vulnerable to certain indirect effects associated with proposed development of Newhall Ranch. Because the character of the property will be altered from its current grazing and agricultural uses to a master planned community, the viability of the spineflower and other sensitive plant species depends upon an understanding of the indirect effects of proposed development in the vicinity of known sensitive plant populations. Indirect impacts to sensitive plants are normally associated with the following factors.

(a) Non-native invasive plant species;

(b) Non-native invasive animal species;

(c) Vegetation clearing for fuel management or creation of roads and trails;

(d) Trampling;

(e) Changes in hydrological conditions (i.e., increases in water supply due to urban irrigation and runoff);

(f) Chemical pollutants (e.g., herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers); and

(g) Increased fire frequency.

Indirect impacts to spineflower and other sensitive plants, all seven indirect impacts/edge effects are considered significant in connection with the proposed development of Newhall Ranch, absent implementation of the Newhall Ranch mitigation program described in Section 2.6.

Conclusion - Because actions are to be taken that would be sufficient to minimize the take of the spineflower, fully mitigate the loss, and create additional spineflower populations, both onsite and offsite, the impacts to the spineflower are considered significant, but mitigable under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. This finding nevertheless requires the project applicant to obtain an incidental take permit(s) from CDFG after project approval, and the take permit(s) will not be issued unless CDFG makes findings of "no jeopardy" regarding the spineflower. A summary of the types of actions/measures to be followed include:

- Spineflower Special Study Mitigation Overlay,
- Spineflower Preserves,
- Connectivity, Reserve Design and Buffers,
- Preserve Protection/Fencing,
- Preserve Protection/Hydrological Alterations,
- Engineering, Design and Grading Modifications,
- Fire Management Plan,
- Water Flow Diversion and Management Program,
- A Biological Monitor,
- Construction Impact Avoidance Measures, including water control, storm water flow redirection, and treatment of graded slopes,
- Reassessment Requirement,
- Newhall Ranch Monitoring and Management Program,
- Translocation/Reintroduction Program, and
- Notification of and Limitation on Ongoing Agricultural Activities

For additional information regarding all the mitigation measures being required, see Section 2.6, Spineflower and Other Sensitive Plant Species, beginning on page 2.6-41.

Additional Alternatives

In keeping with CEQA's requirement that an EIR assess a range of reasonable alternatives to a project, and given the information regarding the spineflower located on the Specific Plan site and the potential for significant impacts to the plant, this Revised Draft Additional Analysis identifies an expanded analysis of "Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative," and provides three additional alternatives to the Specific Plan that are specifically intended to address potentially significant impacts to the spineflower. These alternatives are referred to as "Alternative 7 – Spineflower Translocation Alternative", "Alternative 8 – Spineflower Avoidance Alternative I" and "Alternative 9 – Spineflower Avoidance Alternative II." Please note that Alternatives 2 through 6 were already adequately analyzed in the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft EIR (March 1999).

Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative - The No Project Alternative is required by the CEQA Guidelines, and it compares the impacts which might occur if the site is left in its present condition with those that would be generated by the proposed Specific Plan. Under the No Project Alternative, the Specific Plan site would remain as vacant land with ongoing oil and natural gas operations; agricultural activities would remain along the Santa Clara River Corridor, on the mesas overlooking the River, and in the wider canyon bottoms; and cattle grazing would remain in Potrero Canyon, along the River, and in other upland and mountainous portions of the Specific Plan site. In addition, Southern California Edison Company and Southern California Gas Company would retain their on-site facilities and the site would continue to be used for motion picture filming.

Although nothing would change within the Specific Plan boundaries under this scenario, the disturbance associated with retaining existing uses on the site would continue. For instance, grazing and ongoing farming activities onsite would continue to disturb the soil surface and existing onsite vegetation. While such disturbances would continue with the No Project Alternative, they would be of lesser magnitude than the Specific Plan, although some areas that would be protected under the Specific Plan would continue to be disturbed under the No Project Alternative.

In addition, under the No Project Alternative, the applicant would continue with its farming/agricultural, grazing and oil and gas operations. The continuation of farming/agricultural operations could also legally intensify over most portions of Newhall Ranch. In particular, the spineflower population areas existing on Newhall Ranch could be converted legally to row crops or dry farming. Similarly, spineflower population areas could continue to be subject to ongoing cattle grazing. On Newhall Ranch, the known spineflower populations occur in agricultural production areas, including farming and cattle grazing. In short, without implementation of the Specific Plan, including its revised mitigation program relating to the spineflower and other sensitive plant species, the onsite spineflower populations could be lawfully damaged or otherwise destroyed in connection with existing and ongoing agricultural/farming/grazing operations.

Based solely on environmental criteria, however, the No Project Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the Specific Plan because the potential Specific Plan-related impacts described in Section 4.0 of Newhall Ranch Revised Draft EIR (March 1999) would not occur. However, by retaining the Specific Plan site under existing conditions, most of the applicant's Specific Plan objectives would not be met and, if development does not occur on the site, the anticipated future demand for housing[2] and commercial services would likely stimulate development elsewhere in the Santa Clarita Valley, including development in less accessible areas of the Valley with environmental resources that may be comparable to or of greater value than those found on the Specific Plan site. Section 2.7 states that because implementation of this alternative would not meet the applicant's objectives for the site and would likely just divert urban development from this site to another, the alternative is not considered acceptable.

Alternative 7 – Spineflower Translocation Alternative (Same Amount of Development, Spineflower Populations Translocated On-site) - The primary purpose of Alternative 7 is to avoid significant impacts to the on-site spineflower populations by actively translocating all known spineflower plants and seed bank to a location on the Specific Plan site suitable for spineflower growth, including the collection of top soils containing spineflower plants and seed bank, so that the top soil could be relocated to the same

---

2 See Southern California Association of Government population projections for project census tracts, Newhall Ranch Revised Draft EIR, Section 4.21, Population, Housing and Employment.

relocation area(s) as the translocated spineflower plants. The basis for this alternative is found in the California Native Plant Protection Act (Fish and Game Code, Sections 1900-1913). Consistent with the legal protections afford by the Native Plant Protection Act, this alternative would protect all known onsite spineflower populations for ten days until CDFG salvages the plants through transplantation or translocation activities within the Specific Plan site.

Under Alternative 7, the Specific Plan site would be developed consistent with the Specific Plan Land Use Plan; the same amount of residential, commercial, industrial and other proposed land uses would occur on the site. However, as part of this alternative, several potential translocation areas are designated on the Specific Plan site. The spineflower potentially impacted by implementation of the Specific Plan, without mitigation, presently occupy over 6 acres of land area. While the amount of land set aside for this purpose has not been quantified, given the overall size of the Newhall Ranch area, at least 24 acres of relocation area could be readily found in onsite locations suitable for this species (24 acres allows for a 4:1 replacement ratio).

Given that Alternative 7 would result in the same amount of development as the proposed Specific Plan, the direct and indirect impacts of Alternative 7 would be the same as the Specific Plan with the exception of potential impacts to the spineflower and other resources that may be located within the translocation area. While all the Specific Plan objectives would be met with this alternative, Alternative 7 may not necessarily be considered environmentally superior to the Specific Plan with respect to spineflower impacts. While plants, along with the topsoil, would be salvaged and moved to areas containing spineflower plants collected and placed in translocation areas, temporary disturbance to most of the spineflower populations would occur during this process. In addition, some of the translocation areas would not have the same degree of connectivity to proposed open area that would occur under the Specific Plan. Conversely, the mitigation plan proposed as part of the Specific Plan would result in the direct preservation in place of significantly more of the known spineflower plant area and would result in several more mitigation features (i.e., connectivity, buffering, providing hydrologic protection of spineflower areas, managing water flow, etc.) than would be provided under this Alternative. Consequently, Alternative 7 is not considered as favorable from a rare plant perspective as the Specific Plan.

Alternative 8 – Spineflower Avoidance Alternative I (21,182 Units, Four Percent Reduction in Residential Development, 13 Percent Reduction in Non-Residential Development, Smaller Footprint) - The primary purpose of Alternative 8 is to avoid or minimize the potentially significant direct and indirect biological impacts to the spineflower created by the Specific Plan by reducing the amount of development and by reducing the footprint upon which such development would occur. Under this

alternative, a setback of 150 feet from populations of spineflower is proposed. In doing so, many other impacts which could occur as a result of site development might also be reduced in magnitude. Alternative 8 proposes 21,182 Residential units, 5.24 million square feet of Commercial uses, a water reclamation plant, and a golf course (It should be noted that the commercial square footage indicated is an estimate only for impact evaluation purposes). Development under Alternative 8 would not occur at or near most areas that have known populations of spineflower. This alternative assumes that a minor "take", or impact, would occur to small spineflower populations that are isolated and/or would occur in other areas to allow for the construction of major infrastructure components, such as the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway through the site to future Potrero Canyon Road would impact the spineflower near Grapevine Mesa. In addition, many of the proposed spineflower mitigation measures proposed in **Section 2.7** would not occur.

Because some of the environmental impacts of the Specific Plan would be avoided or minimized with Alternative 8, it is environmentally superior to the Specific Plan in some respects (e.g., air quality impacts, traffic impacts, noise impacts, etc). However, Alternative 8 has been rejected in favor of the Specific Plan because Alternative 8 too narrowly limits the range of housing opportunities provided and because many of the basic objectives of the Specific Plan identified in the Project Description of this EIR (Revised Draft EIR Section 1.0) would not be achieved. In addition, when compared with the Specific Plan with the proposed mitigation to spineflower impacts, the preserved spineflower populations under this alternative would not be connected to proposed open areas as proposed under the Specific Plan. In addition, grazing activities would continue with Alternative 8 in the High Country SMA and in areas not within spineflower preserve boundaries. Also, the applicant has indicated that the Open Areas of the High Country Special Management Area would not be dedicated for public use, but would remain in private ownership with no provision for public access. From a biological standpoint, the reduction in grading and avoidance of most on-site spineflower populations under Alternative 8 could environmentally outweighs the loss to the public of the High Country Special Management Area. However, this alternative also allows a "take", or impact, to occur to small spineflower populations that are isolated and/or in other areas to allow for the construction of major infrastructure components, such as the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway. When compared with the Specific Plan with the proposed mitigation to spineflower impacts presented in **Section 2.6**, the preserved spineflower populations would not be connected to proposed open areas as proposed under the Specific Plan. Nor would other proposed mitigation measures occur. Specific measures proposed within this Revised Draft Additional Analysis that would not occur with this alternative include:

- the Agency consultation provisions proposed in **Section 2.6**;
- the provision of Spineflower Special Study Mitigation Overlays;

- the creation of managed preserves as described in **Section 2.6**;
- the connectivity and buffer provisions as described in **Section 2.6**;
- the provision for future engineering, design and grading review and modifications;
- the monitoring and management provisions as described in **Section 2.6**; and
- consultation provisions regarding ongoing agricultural activities.

In effect, under Alternative 8 populations of spineflower would essentially be surrounded by proposed development within 150 feet with fencing to prohibit trespass, thereby eliminating any connection to open space areas and the active preserve management and consultation provisions proposed as mitigation in **Section 2.6**. Based on this information, Alternative 8 is not biologically superior to the Specific Plan with respect to impacts to the spineflower. For all the reasons provided in **Section 2.7**, Alternative 8 has been rejected in favor of the proposed Specific Plan as mitigated.

Alternative 9 – Spineflower Avoidance Alternative II (20,281 Units, Eight Percent Reduction in Residential Development, 20 Percent Reduction in Non-Residential Development, Smaller Footprint) - The primary purpose of Alternative 9 is, like Alternative 8, to avoid or minimize the potentially significant direct and indirect biological impacts to the spineflower created by the Specific Plan by reducing the amount of development and by reducing the footprint upon which such development would occur. Under this alternative, a setback of 300 feet from populations of spineflower is proposed. In doing so, many other impacts which could occur as a result of site development might also be reduced in magnitude. Alternative 9 proposes 20,281 Residential units, 4.98 million square feet of Commercial uses, a water reclamation plant, and a golf course (It should be noted that the commercial square footage indicated is an estimate only for impact evaluation purposes). Development under Alternative 9 would not occur at or near most areas that have known populations of spineflower.

Because some of the environmental impacts of the Specific Plan would be avoided or minimized with Alternative 9, it is environmentally superior to the Specific Plan in some respects (e.g., air quality impacts, traffic impacts, noise impacts, etc). However, Alternative 9 has been rejected in favor of the Specific Plan because Alternative 9 too narrowly limits the range of housing opportunities provided and because many of the basic objectives of the Specific Plan identified in the Project Description of this EIR (Revised Draft EIR Section 1.0) would not be achieved. In addition, when compared with the Specific Plan with the proposed mitigation to spineflower impacts, the preserved spineflower populations would not be connected to proposed open areas to the same degree as they would be under the mitigation proposed for the Specific Plan. In addition, grazing activities would continue with Alternative 9 in the High Country SMA and in areas not within spineflower preserve boundaries. Also, the applicant has indicated that the

Open Areas of the High Country Special Management Area would not be dedicated for public use, but would remain in private ownership with no provision for public access. From a biological standpoint, the reduction in grading and avoidance of most on-site spineflower populations under Alternative 9 could environmentally outweighs the loss to the public of the High Country Special Management Area. However, this alternative also allows a "take", or impact, to occur to small spineflower populations that are isolated and/or in other areas to allow for the construction of major infrastructure components, such as the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway. When compared with the Specific Plan with the proposed mitigation to spineflower impacts presented in **Section 2.6**, the preserved spineflower populations would provide a small degree of connectivity to open areas; however, the degree of connectivity would not be as great as would occur under the mitigation proposed for the Specific Plan. Nor would other proposed mitigation measures occur. Specific measures proposed within this Draft Additional Analysis that would not occur with this alternative include:

- the Agency consultation provisions proposed in **Section 2.6**;
- the provision of Spineflower Special Study Mitigation Overlays;
- the creation of managed preserves as described in **Section 2.6**;
- the connectivity and buffer provisions as described in **Section 2.6**;
- the provision for future engineering, design and grading review and modifications;
- the monitoring and management provisions as described in **Section 2.6**; and
- consultation provisions regarding ongoing agricultural activities.

In effect, under Alternative 9 populations of spineflower would essentially be surrounded by proposed development within 300 feet with fencing to prohibit trespass, thereby eliminating any connection to open space areas and the active preserve management and consultation provisions proposed as mitigation in **Section 2.6**. Based on this information, Alternative 9 is not biologically superior to the Specific Plan with respect to impacts to the spineflower. For all the reasons provided in **Section 2.7**, Alternative 9 has been rejected in favor of the proposed Specific Plan as mitigated.

ADDITIONAL CEQA FINDINGS REGARDING THE NEWHALL RANCH FINAL ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS TO THE PARTIALLY CERTIFIED FINAL EIR FOR THE NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN AND WATER RECLAMATION PLANT

Los Angeles County Project No. 94-087-(5)
consisting of:
General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendment No. 94-087-(5)
Zone Change No. 94-087-(5)
Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5)

State Clearinghouse No. 95011015
(for environmental document)

County of Los Angeles
Board of Supervisors

March 2003

ADDITIONAL CEQA FINDINGS REGARDING THE NEWHALL RANCH FINAL ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS TO THE PARTIALLY CERTIFIED FINAL EIR FOR THE NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN AND WATER RECLAMATION PLANT (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 95011015; PROJECT NO. 94-087-(5))

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles ("the County") hereby certifies the adequacy of the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Resources Code §§21000 *et seq.*) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal.Code Regs. §§15000 *et seq.*). The County caused the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis to be prepared as additional environmental analysis to the prior, partially certified Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant (State Clearinghouse ("SCH") No. 95011015).

The purpose of the Final Additional Analysis is to address certain specified issues raised by the Court in litigation regarding the adequacy of the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR. The litigation involved a consolidated action in Kern County Superior Court entitled, *United Water Conservation District v. County of Los Angeles, et al.*, Case No. 239324 RDR, the Honorable Roger D. Randall, presiding ("the Newhall Ranch litigation"). The Final Additional Analysis also presents significant additional environmental information related to water supplies, an endangered plant called the San Fernando Valley spineflower, and other sensitive plant species on the Newhall Ranch property site.

The Final Additional Analysis consists of the following:

(a) Draft Additional Analysis, Volume I (Text, Figures/Tables) and Volumes II-III (Appendices), dated April 2001;

(b) Final Additional Analysis, Volume I (Comments and Responses, *etc.*) and Volume II (Appendix), dated October 2001;

(c) Revised Draft Additional Analysis, Volume I (Text, Figures/Tables/Appendix) and Volume II (Appendix), dated November 2002; and

(d) Final Additional Analysis, Volume III (Comments and Responses, *etc*.) and Volume IV (Appendix), dated March 2003.

The Board of Supervisors finds that the Final Additional Analysis, as defined above, has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the Court's decision and writ in the prior Newhall Ranch litigation. The Board of Supervisors further finds that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the following documents: (a) partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR; (b) the Final Additional Analysis; (c) Los Angeles County staff reports and related documents; (d) the hearing transcripts from the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission meetings; (e) the testimony and submissions from officials and departments of the County, the applicant (as defined below), the public, public agencies, community groups, organizations and individuals; and (f) the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings (as defined further below). Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the

Board of Supervisors has also reviewed and considered the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

The Newhall Ranch record of proceedings, or administrative record, shall include, but is not limited to, the following items:

(a) The prior, partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR (March 1999), including all appendices, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in that EIR;

(b) The partially certified Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Volumes I and II, including all appendices, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in that Plan;

(c) The Final Additional Analysis (as defined above), including all appendices, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in that Analysis;

(d) All reports, project application materials, memoranda, maps, letters, and other planning documents, including attachments, related documents, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in those materials, prepared by the EIR consultant, the project applicant, and Regional Planning staff relating to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Water Reclamation Plant, partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, or the Final Additional Analysis;

(e) All staff reports, attachments and related documents, prepared by the County relating to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Water Reclamation Plant, partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, or the Final Additional Analysis;

(f) Any minutes and transcripts of all public meetings and public hearings held by the County's Regional Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors relating to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Water Reclamation Plant, partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, or the Final Additional Analysis;

(g) All notices issued by the County to comply with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines or any other law governing the processing and approval of the proposed project;

(h) Matters of common knowledge to the County, which include, but are not limited to: (i) Los Angeles County General Plan; (ii) Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan; and (iii) Los Angeles County Subdivision Code (Title 21) and Zoning Code (Title 22), as amended;

(i) The documentation of the decisions made by the Regional Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors relating to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, Water Reclamation Plant, partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, or the Final Additional Analysis;

(j) Relevant portions of the prior Newhall Ranch Administrative Record;

(k) Relevant portions of other records pertaining to related proceedings (*e.g.*, California Public Utilities Commission proceedings and Urban Water Management Plan proceedings); and

(l) Any other written materials relevant to the County's compliance with CEQA, and its decision on the merits of the proposed project, including documents that have been released for public review, and copies of reports, studies or other documents relied on in any environmental documentation prepared for the proposed project and either made available to the public during the public review period, or included in the County's files on the proposed project.

Having considered the foregoing information, the Board of Supervisors hereby makes findings pursuant to Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code, and Sections 15091 and 15092 of the CEQA Guidelines.

I. BACKGROUND

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Newhall Ranch Company, a division of The Newhall Land and Farming Company ("the applicant"), proposes a Specific Plan to guide development of a new community composed of a broad range of residential, mixed-use and non-residential land uses within five villages on the Newhall Ranch property site. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan covers a total of approximately 11,963 acres. The Specific Plan contains the land use plan, development regulations, design guidelines and implementation program necessary to guide the long-term development of the Newhall Ranch community. The Specific Plan serves as the zoning for the Newhall Ranch community. Subsequent development plans and tentative tract maps are required and must conform to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, and the County of Los Angeles General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. A Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP") is also proposed as part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The WRP will provide wastewater treatment, disposal and reclamation of treated water for reuse within the Specific Plan.

With the exception of the WRP, the Board of Supervisors' approval of the Newhall Ranch project approvals would not -- in and of themselves -- allow actual construction of any component of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The applicant will still be required to file subsequent applications for tentative tract maps prior to issuance of any building permits, which would enable actual construction of the Newhall Ranch residential, mixed-use, commercial or business park uses on the Newhall Ranch site. In conjunction with the filing of the subsequent tentative tract maps, the applicant is also required to prepare a tiered EIR for each tract map application allowing for construction.

As directed by the trial court, the Board of Supervisors will consider approval of the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, in the context of the additional environmental analysis contained in the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis.

The revised Specific Plan, as approved by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1999, includes 21,615 dwelling units on 4,835 acres (including an 18-hole golf course, 10 neighborhood parks and seven schools), 630 acres of mixed uses (including residential, office, and retail commercial uses), 67 acres of commercial uses, 256 acres of business park uses (including light manufacturing, warehousing and distribution), 37 acres of visitor serving uses, 6,138 acres of open area, 3 community parks on 186 acres, and 367 acres of arterial roads and community facilities (including a new 6.9 million gallon per day water reclamation plant, one

library and two fire stations). The build-out of the Specific Plan is projected to occur over approximately 25 to 30 years, depending upon economic and market conditions. The build-out of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would eventually result in an on-site resident population of approximately 60,000 persons. The location of the Specific Plan area and WRP site are illustrated on **Figures 1.0-1** and **1.0-2** of the Final Additional Analysis. The approved Newhall Ranch land use plan and statistical summary are shown in **Figure 1.0-3** and **Table 1.0-1**, respectively, of the Final Additional Analysis.

For a detailed description of the Specific Plan, its location, local and regional setting, description of prior actions taken by the Board of Supervisors, and discretionary approvals required, please see the "Background" section of the Board of Supervisors' partially certified "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations Regarding Final EIR (SCH No. 95011015) for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant (Project No. 94-087-(5))," dated February 1999 (hereafter, "the Board's prior CEQA Findings"), pages 1 to 10.

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines require environmental documentation to include a statement of the objectives of a proposed project. Both the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR (Section 1.0) and the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (Section 2.1) identify the objectives for the Newhall Ranch community. Those objectives are also described at pages 10 to 14 of the Board of Supervisors' prior CEQA Findings, pages 10-14. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed these project objectives in connection with its reconsideration of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP.

C. THE PARTIALLY CERTIFIED NEWHALL RANCH FINAL EIR

The Board of Supervisors has considered the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR in connection with its reconsideration of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP. Please see pages 14 and 17 of the Board's prior CEQA Findings for a description of the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR.

D. PRIOR COUNTY ACTIONS/DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("the Commission") conducted numerous public hearings regarding the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR and related project approvals in 1996 and 1997. By December 1997, the Commission had completed its review and consideration of the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR and proposed project approvals. On December 17, 1997, the Commission unanimously: (a) certified the prior Newhall Ranch EIR; (b) recommended approval of the proposed General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and the Zone Change; and (c) approved the Newhall Ranch Conditional Use Permit and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map.

Thereafter, in 1998 and 1999, the Board of Supervisors conducted additional hearings regarding the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR and project approvals. On March 23, 1999, the Board of Supervisors unanimously: (a) certified the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR; (b) adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations; (c) approved the Mitigation

Monitoring Plans; and (d) approved the various project approvals for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant.

For a more detailed discussion regarding the project approvals related to the prior County actions on Newhall Ranch, please see the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, Section 2.0, Environmental and Regulatory Setting, and the Board of Supervisors' prior CEQA Findings, pages 9-10.

II. POST PROJECT-APPROVAL EVENTS

A. NEWHALL RANCH LITIGATION

As stated above, the Board of Supervisors' Specific Plan/WRP approvals were challenged in the Newhall Ranch litigation, based on numerous environmental and planning law claims. The Newhall Ranch litigation challenged both the validity of the Board of Supervisors' adoption of the Newhall Ranch project approvals and its certification of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR. The California Attorney General joined in the Newhall Ranch litigation in support of Ventura County and the environmental groups.

On May 31, 2000, the Court issued its tentative decision. On August 1, 2000, the Court issued its writ of mandate and final judgment. (See, Newhall Ranch Additional Analysis, Volume II, Appendix 1.0(a) [Court's Writ].) As part of its final decision, the Court upheld approval of the Specific Plan, WRP and Newhall Ranch Final EIR certification with respect to many of the issues raised in the Newhall Ranch litigation. However, the Court ordered the County to void its certification of the Final EIR with respect to the specific issues listed below and to conduct an additional analysis under CEQA in order to:

(1) Extend the traffic impact analysis that was used in the EIR to evaluate Los Angeles County traffic impacts, to the project's impacts on Ventura County arterial roadways exiting State Routes 23 and 126 until the 1 percent impact standard is reached;

(2) Determine the effect on the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek wildlife corridor caused by the shifting of wildlife into the Salt Creek corridor;

(3) Address the Specific Plan's impacts on biological resources in the Santa Clara River corridor associated with channelization and bank hardening;

(4) Demonstrate that adequate water sources will be available for build-out of the Specific Plan, which may be achieved by securing other water sources consistent with CEQA and/or by developing a factual basis providing substantial evidence from which the County can adequately assess environmental impacts of the ASR alternative and its ability to meet water needs; and

(5) Address the alternative of siting the Newhall Ranch WRP off-river, including an analysis of the biological impacts of that siting.

The Court also ordered the County to set aside the project approvals, but only as those approvals related to County General Plan SEA 23 policies, and the County's General Plan Development Monitoring System ("DMS") as it applied to water supplies, and to take action to:

(6) Ensure consistency of the Specific Plan with the County General Plan policies requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23; and

(7) Ensure consistency of the Specific Plan with the County's General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies.

Consequently, the Court set aside approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP, and Final EIR certification, but only with respect to the issues identified above. The Court also determined that the vast majority of the County's environmental determinations for Newhall Ranch had been lawfully made and declined to set aside approval of the entire Specific Plan and Final EIR.

B. BOARD ACTION IN RESPONSE TO COURT DECISION

In response to the Court's decision, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution partially setting aside the Newhall Ranch land use approvals and Final EIR certification. (See, Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis, volume II, Appendix 1.0(b) [Board Resolution and related documents].) In addition, the Board of Supervisors' Resolution required that specific action be taken in compliance with the Court's decision and writ.

Specifically, the Board of Supervisors directed County staff to oversee preparation of additional environmental analysis under CEQA ("Additional Analysis") and to require it to address each of the specific issues described in the Court's decision and writ. The Board of Supervisors also directed County staff to publish a Notice of Availability of the Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis, and to circulate the Draft Additional Analysis for at least a 45-day public review and comment period.

In addition, the Board of Supervisors directed that noticed public hearings be held before both the Regional Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to review and consider the Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis and the project approvals, as required by the Court's decision and writ.

C. NEWHALL RANCH DRAFT ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

In response to the Board of Supervisors' Resolution, County staff caused to be prepared the Draft Additional Analysis to the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR. The Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001) consisted of Volume I (Text, Figures/Tables) and Volumes II-III (Appendices). The purpose of the Draft Additional Analysis was to address the specific issues identified in the Court's decision and writ. Specifically, the Draft Additional Analysis included the required additional environmental analysis for, among other topics: (1) traffic on Ventura County arterials exiting SR-23 and SR-126 (Section 2.1); (2) Salt Creek Corridor issues (Section 2.2); (3) Floodplain modifications (Section 2.3); (4) SEA 23 General Plan Consistency Analysis (Section 2.4); (5) Newhall Ranch Water Resources (Section 2.5); and (6) Water Reclamation Plant Alternatives (Section 3.0). The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered both the Draft Additional Analysis and the two additional volumes containing technical studies and other important materials.

Pertinent portions of the Draft Additional Analysis were also reviewed and considered by the County's Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee ("SEATAC"). In addition, County staff independently reviewed the Draft Additional Analysis prior to public circulation. The Draft Additional Analysis -- along with a complete copy of the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR -- was then made available for public review and comment at the County and several libraries for a 130-day review period.

D. THE NEWHALL RANCH FINAL ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS, VOLUMES I-II

The Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis (October 2001), Volume I, contains all of the public comments received on the prior Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis, including written comment letters and oral comments made at public hearings before the Regional Planning Commission. In addition, the Final Additional Analysis, Volume I, contains written responses to the comments received on the Draft Additional Analysis and the Draft Additional Analysis pages that were revised in response to comments. The Final Additional Analysis, Volume II (Appendix), contains technical studies and other important materials responsive to public comments.

The Commission conducted a tour of the Newhall Ranch site on June 16, 2001, and held noticed public hearings on June 20, 2001, July 16, 2001 and August 27, 2001. During the public hearing process, the Regional Planning Commission also reviewed and considered both the Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001) and the Final Additional Analysis (October 2001). At its October 24, 2001 meeting, the Commission adopted a resolution, and other actions, including recommendations to the Board of Supervisors to hold a public hearing, certify the Additional Analysis for the Specific Plan and WRP, and approve the related project approvals.

After the Regional Planning Commission's action, a hearing was set before the Board of Supervisors for November 27, 2001, which was continued until January 29, 2002. Prior to that date, on January 10, 2002, the California Court of Appeal issued a decision setting aside an environmental impact report relating to the purchase of 41,000 acre-feet per year of State Water Project ("SWP") entitlement by the Castaic Lake Water Agency ("CLWA"), which was, in part, relied on as a source of water supply for Newhall Ranch. Therefore, on January 22, 2002, the Board of Supervisors delayed the hearing and continued it until a substitute water source could be demonstrated. Since that time, the Court in the CLWA litigation has decertified the CLWA EIR for the 41,000 acre-feet water transfer, but has allowed CLWA to rely on the 41,000 acre-feet as part of its SWP entitlement.

In approximately May 2002, the Department of Regional Planning and County Counsel determined that significant new information had arisen regarding Newhall Ranch, namely, the acquisition of a new source of water by the applicant, and the discovery of additional spineflower on the Newhall Ranch site. In response, County staff directed the applicant to conduct additional plant surveys, including spineflower, on all developable portions of Newhall Ranch. County staff also directed preparation of the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft Additional Analysis to address both the new water supply acquired by the applicant, and the additional sensitive plants, including the spineflower, located on the Newhall Ranch property.

E. THE NEWHALL RANCH REVISED DRAFT ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

As stated above, since public circulation of the Newhall Ranch Draft Additional Analysis and Final Additional Analysis, additional information arose regarding water supplies and sensitive plant species relating to Newhall Ranch, which resulted in County staff's decision to revise and recirculate portions of the Draft Additional Analysis.

In response to County staff's direction, the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, Volume I, was prepared to describe changes to the sources of water for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan; to provide updated information regarding sensitive plant species occurring on the Specific Plan site, including the spineflower; to provide additional alternatives to the Specific Plan in response to discovery of the spineflower and other sensitive plant species; and to correct minor errors in the prior Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001). The following sections of the earlier Draft Additional Analysis were revised and replaced in the Revised Draft Additional Analysis:

(a) Executive Summary;

(b) Section 1.0, Introduction and Project Description; and

(c) Section 2.5, Water Resources.

In addition, the following two new sections were added to the revised and recirculated Revised Draft Additional Analysis:

(a) Section 2.6, Spineflower and Other Sensitive Plant Species; and

(b) Section 2.7, Additional Alternatives.[1]

The Revised Draft Additional Analysis was reviewed and considered by the County's SEATAC. The focus of SEATAC's review was on the sections of the Revised Draft Additional Analysis pertaining to the spineflower, the spineflower mitigation program and the alternatives in response to the discovery of spineflower.

The Revised Draft Additional Analysis was ultimately circulated for public review and comment for a 70-day period. The Board of Supervisors' public hearing to consider the additional environmental analyses for Newhall Ranch, and the related project approvals, which was scheduled for January 28, 2003 was continued to March 25, 2003. The Board of Supervisors continued the matter, along with instructions to Regional Planning staff to prepare written responses to public comments on the Revised Draft Additional Analysis; extend the written comment period for the 70-day period; and provide the Board of Supervisors with the Final Additional Analysis, including all written public comments and responses to those comments, prior to the March 25, 2003 public hearing.

The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the Newhall Ranch Revised Draft Additional Analysis (November 2002), including the technical studies and other materials used in responding to public comments.

---

[1] All other portions of the Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001) remain unchanged.

F. THE NEWHALL RANCH FINAL ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS, VOLUMES III-IV

In response to the Board of Supervisors' direction, County staff has completed its independent review and consideration of all written responses to public comments received on the Revised Draft Additional Analysis. The Final Additional Analysis, Volumes III and IV, contains the public comment letters on the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, the written responses to comments, the Revised Draft Additional Analysis pages that were revised in response to comments, and the technical studies and other materials used in the responses to comments. The Board of Supervisors has considered the Final Additional Analysis (March 2003).

III. SUMMARY OF MAJOR ISSUES

A. TYPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT USED FOR THE SPECIFIC PLAN AND WRP

As discussed above, the Court ordered the County to further address certain specific issues in an "additional analysis" and the County's Board of Supervisors, pursuant to resolution, directed County staff to prepare "an additional environmental analysis under CEQA." (*See*, Draft Additional Analysis, Appendix 1.0 [Resolution, p. 4, ¶6]). The Board of Supervisors further directed that "[t]he Additional Analysis . . . address each of the specific issues described in the Court's writ and Statement of Decision[.]" *Id.*

The Board of Supervisors also directed County staff to prepare "a Notice of Availability of the Draft Additional Analysis for publication in the appropriate newspapers of general circulation, and to circulate the Draft Additional Analysis for public review and comment for a period of at least 45 days[.]" (*See*, Draft Additional Analysis, Appendix 1.0 [Resolution, p. 4, ¶8].) Finally, the Board directed "that noticed public hearings be held before the Regional Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to review and consider the Draft Additional Analysis and the Newhall Ranch Project approvals, as required by the Court's Writ and Statement of Decision[.]" (*See*, Draft Additional Analysis, Appendix 1.0 [Resolution, p. 5, ¶9].) As shown in these portions of the Resolution, the Board of Supervisors directed County staff to take the actions necessary to comply with the Court's writ and CEQA.

1. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS UNDER CEQA

Some comments on the Additional Analysis asserted that the document did not meet CEQA's "minimum standards" for an EIR. The Board of Supervisors does not concur and finds that the Final Additional Analysis more than complies with the Court's decision and writ, as well as CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. When a public agency prepares an EIR, CEQA requires certain procedures to be followed, including:

(a) Submission of a Notice of Preparation to responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse and others in order to solicit comments on the scope of the Draft EIR (CEQA Guidelines §15082);

(b) Filing of the Draft EIR and a Notice of Completion for the Draft EIR with the Office of Planning and Research (CEQA Guidelines §§15085, 15205);

(c) Publishing of a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR (Public Resources Code §21092; CEQA Guidelines §15087);

(d) Provision for public review and comment on the Draft EIR for at least 45 days (Public Resources Code §21091(a); CEQA Guidelines §15105(a));

(e) Evaluation of and responses to comments on the Draft EIR (CEQA Guidelines §15088); and

(f) Although not required, public hearings may be held. (CEQA Guidelines §15202).

In preparing both the Draft and Final Additional Analysis, the Board of Supervisors finds that the County complied with the procedural requirements identified above. For example, on November 13, 2000, the County prepared and submitted to responsible agencies and others the Notice of Preparation of the Additional Analysis to the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR. (*See*, Draft Additional Analysis, Appendix 1.0(c).) The County received and considered numerous comments on the Notice of Preparation. (*See*, Draft Additional Analysis, Appendix 1.0(d).) The County also provided the both the Draft and Final Additional Analysis to the Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee ("SEATAC") for its review. SEATAC reviewed pertinent portions of both the Draft and Final Additional Analysis and provided comments. *Id.* The County considered SEATAC's comments on both the Draft and Final Additional Analysis, and, in some cases, changes were made to the analysis.

The County also published Notices of Availability of both the Draft and Revised Draft Additional Analysis and filed Notices of Completion with the state Office of Planning and Research. The Notices of Availability stated that both the Draft and Revised Draft Additional Analysis had been completed to address the issues specified in the Court's decision and writ, along with the significant new information relating to water supplies, spineflower and other sensitive plant species, and that a complete copy of the documents, along with the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, were available for public review at the County's Department of Regional Planning, and at numerous libraries in Los Angeles County and Ventura County. *Id.* The Notices of Availability also stated that the County would accept public comments on both the Draft and Revised Draft Additional Analysis for a 60-day period, respectively, which exceeds the 45-day period required by CEQA. *Id.* In fact, as to the Draft Additional Analysis, the Commission extended the public review and comment period for that document to 130 days, nearly three times the 45 days required under CEQA. The Commission received and evaluated all comments on the Draft Additional Analysis and the written responses to those comments. Finally, although not required under CEQA, the County held multiple hearings before the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission (June 16, 2001 [field trip], June 20, 2001; July 16, 2001; August 27, 2001 and October 24, 2001). As to the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, the Board of Supervisors extended the public review and comment period for that document to 70 days. The Board of Supervisors closed the written public comment period as of February 4, 2003, directed County staff to prepare written responses to the public comments, and further directed that staff provide to the Board the Final Additional Analysis, including public comments and responses to comments, prior to the March 25, 2003 public hearing.

2. SUBSTANTIVE REQUIREMENTS UNDER CEQA

The Final Additional Analysis also meets the substantive "content" requirements for an EIR under CEQA. CEQA requires that an EIR contain certain elements, "but the format of the document may be varied." CEQA Guidelines §15120(a). CEQA envisions that EIRs can be varied and tailored to different situations. *See*, *e.g.*, CEQA Guidelines §15160 ("These variations are not exclusive. Lead agencies may use other variations consistent with the guidelines to meet the needs of other circumstances.").

CEQA also does not mandate that a public agency prepare a document called an "EIR." The primary concern under CEQA is that the document comply with the content requirements for an EIR. For example, an EIR may be prepared as part of a "project report," as long as the project report contains "one separate and distinguishable section providing either analysis of all the subjects required in an EIR or as a minimum, a table showing where each of the subjects is discussed." CEQA Guidelines §15120(b). Likewise, a General Plan can serve the purpose of an EIR without being called an EIR as long as "[t]he general plan addresses all the points required to be in an EIR[.]" *See*, CEQA Guidelines §15166. Therefore, a document need not be entitled "EIR" to comply with CEQA, as long as it contains the required elements.

In general, CEQA requires that an EIR include: (i) a table of contents or index (CEQA Guidelines §15122); (ii) a summary (CEQA Guidelines §15123); (iii) a project description (CEQA Guidelines §15124); (iv) a discussion of environmental setting (CEQA Guidelines §15125); (v) a discussion of environmental impacts (CEQA Guidelines §§15126, 15126.2); (vi) a discussion of mitigation measures (CEQA Guidelines §15126.4); and (vii) a discussion of alternatives (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6). The Final Additional Analysis contains all of these required elements.

For example, the Final Additional Analysis contains a detailed table of contents and an executive summary. The Final Additional Analysis also contains a project description. The project description is appropriately limited in length, but only because the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR contains an exhaustive 39-page project description, which is still accurate and applicable. The Final Additional Analysis contains a detailed existing conditions analysis for each issue where such an analysis is appropriate. Likewise, the Final Additional Analysis contains impact analyses where appropriate. The Final Additional Analysis provides a discussion of mitigation measures for each potentially significant environmental impact and, as discussed below, additional alternatives were assessed in response to the discovery of spineflower and other sensitive plant species on the Newhall Ranch property. The Board of Supervisors also has been presented with revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for both the Specific Plan and WRP.

The Final Additional Analysis discusses project alternatives, where appropriate, for the WRP site and for impacts to the spineflower and other sensitive plants on Newhall Ranch. It bears mentioning that the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR contained a thorough and detailed 115-page alternatives discussion, assessing the merits of six different on-site project alternatives, and numerous off-site alternatives (three in detail), in the context of each category of environmental impacts addressed in the document (*see*, Newhall Ranch Final EIR, Section 8.0); and the prior

alternatives analysis remains valid and certified (except with respect to the WRP), despite challenges to the adequacy of that analysis in the Newhall Ranch litigation.

The Board of Supervisors finds that the County followed the Court's direction, as set forth in the Court's decision and writ. In the process, the Board of Supervisors finds that the County met and exceeded the procedural and substantive requirements under CEQA for the preparation and public circulation and review of environmental documents.

The Board of Supervisors also considered several other issues, including those raised at public hearings, in staff reports and in public comments. Some of the other major issues, included but were not limited to: (a) the scope of the Additional Analysis; (b) recirculation of the Additional Analysis; (c) consistency of the Specific Plan to the Draft General Plan Update; (d) perchlorate issues; (e) cumulative water demand analysis; (f) actions taken to ensure consistency with General Plan policies regarding protection of natural resources in Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs"); (g) floodplain impacts; (h) use of confidentiality agreements and disclosure of information regarding spineflower; (i) adequacy of recent spineflower/plant surveys; and (j) other issues addressed in the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings. These issues were reviewed and considered by the Board of Supervisors prior to making a decision with respect to the proposed project. These other issues are summarized further below.

B. SCOPE OF DRAFT ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

The Board of Supervisors has considered the claim that comments on both the Draft and Revised Draft Additional Analysis cannot be limited to the issues addressed in those documents. The Board finds that the prior Newhall Ranch litigation resulted in a Court decision and writ ordering the County to, among other things, conduct an "additional analysis" under CEQA in order to further address the issues specified in the Court's writ. Consistent with the Court's decision and writ, the Board approved a resolution instructing County staff to prepare "an additional environmental analysis" addressing each of the issues specified in the Court's decision and writ. In addition, in response to County staff's direction, the applicant was required to revise and recirculate the Draft Additional Analysis to address significant new information regarding the applicant's acquisition of additional water supplies, and to assess the discovery of additional spineflower and other plant species on the Newhall Ranch property. Based on the information presented in the Final Additional Analysis, the Board finds that the Final Additional Analysis complies with the Court's decision, writ and CEQA.

In addition, the Board of Supervisors believes that it is appropriate to focus its review of the Final Additional Analysis on the issues that the Court found required further analysis, and on the issues that the County deemed to constitute significant new information (water supplies, spineflower and other plant species). The Board also believes that its review is not a *de novo* consideration of Newhall Ranch in its entirety, with the prior environmental documentation and discretionary determinations set aside in their entirety. The Board finds that the Court's decision and writ were intended to bring focus on certain specified issues that were addressed in the Final Additional Analysis and that the Board is not legally required to consider claims, which exceed the scope of that document, except, of course, for significant new information required to be addressed under CEQA, and which was addressed with respect to the new water supplies and the discovery of additional spineflower and other plant species on the Newhall Ranch property.

C. RECIRCULATION OF DRAFT ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

The Board of Supervisors has considered claims that the Draft Additional Analysis is inadequate for not considering "significant new information" since the Court ruled on the adequacy of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR, and that the Draft Additional Analysis must be revised and recirculated to address that new information. These claims focused primarily on sensitive animal and plant species, including: (a) the arroyo toad; (b) the California red-legged frog; (c) the San Fernando Valley spineflower; (d) the Southern steelhead; and (e) the designation of critical habitat for species.

As to the spineflower, the County directed the applicant to conduct new sensitive plant surveys on all developable portions of Newhall Ranch, beginning in May 2002. The survey data was then required to be assessed in the Revised Draft Additional Analysis. (*See*, Revised Draft Additional Analysis, Section 2.6, Spineflower and Other Sensitive Plant Species.) In addition, the County directed the applicant to completely revise its water resources analysis, based on new information concerning the applicant's acquisition of additional water supplies for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. (*See*, Revised Draft Additional Analysis, Section 2.5, Water Resources.) The County's Revised Draft Additional Analysis was then circulated for additional public review and comment for a 70-day period.

As to the other referenced sensitive species, and critical habitat designations, the Board of Supervisors finds that the Final Additional Analysis, and the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, adequately assesses these other sensitive species at the program level. Therefore, the Board finds that no significant new information regarding these species has been presented in comments or otherwise, which requires further circulation or recirculation.

Finally, in response to the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, certain comments claimed that the detection of perchlorate in the Alluvial aquifer constituted significant new information requiring recirculation of the Draft Additional Analysis. The Board does not concur with these claims for the reasons articulated in the Newhall Ranch Final Additional Analysis, **Topical Response 11**: Update Regarding the Status of Perchlorate and Related Issues, and **Topical Response 5**: Perchlorate Issues.

D. CONSISTENCY OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN WITH DRAFT GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

The Board of Supervisors has considered the claim that the Final Additional Analysis is inadequate because it does not demonstrate the Specific Plan's consistency with Los Angeles County's draft General Plan Update, including proposed changes to SEA policies and boundaries. The Board finds that the draft General Plan Update is not yet complete, and will be subject to further public comment, public hearings, public workshops, modification and revision. In addition, final action on the proposed General Plan Update is not anticipated to occur for approximately a year; and, there is no timeline or deadline associated with completion of the General Plan Update because final action is dependent upon public hearings before the Regional Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

CEQA does not require that a project be compared to, or found consistent with, draft plans. Until the draft General Plan Update is approved and adopted, there is no basis for

determining the document's final objectives, policies and guidelines. The completion date for the General Plan Update is uncertain and, until the document is final, it will continue to undergo review and revision. Based on these considerations, the Board of Supervisors finds that a comparison of the Specific Plan with the Draft General Plan Update would be speculative, and the results of such a comparison would be unreliable; and, therefore, such a comparison is not needed or required.

E. PERCHLORATE ISSUES

The Board of Supervisors has considered all of the claims raised concerning the presence of ammonium perchlorate ("perchlorate") in the Santa Clarita Valley groundwater supplies in the vicinity of the former Whittaker-Bermite facility. For example, it has been asserted that, due to the detection of perchlorate, all action on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan should be ceased until the perchlorate is removed. It has also been asserted that the Aquifer Storage and Recovery ("ASR") program in the Saugus aquifer will "spread" the perchlorate to other areas of the aquifer, that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan "depends" on the Saugus aquifer for both "storage" and as a "primary water supply," and that current methods for the treatment of perchlorate at well sites are both expensive and may spread the perchlorate throughout the Saugus aquifer. It has been further asserted that the detection of perchlorate in the groundwater supplies has reduced the production of groundwater to a point where the water agencies have "overstated" those supplies. In addition, it has been asserted that the extent and significance of the perchlorate was not known during the County's review of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR. Based on the information presented in the Final Additional Analysis, the Board of Supervisors does not concur with these and other claims.

The detection of perchlorate was known and disclosed in public records and other documents during the prior Newhall Ranch proceedings. For example, both the CLWA Integrated Water Resources Plan ("IWRP"), dated February 1998, and the 1998 Santa Clarita Valley Water Report disclosed that perchlorate was detected in certain municipal supply wells in the Saugus aquifer. In addition, the Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.5, Water Resources, includes a thorough discussion of the water quality in both the Alluvial aquifer and the Saugus aquifer, addressing such perchlorate issues as the monitoring, sampling and testing of numerous municipal-supply wells in the aquifers, primary health concerns, applicable legal standards, the source of the perchlorate and the laboratory testing that has occurred in the municipal-supply wells.

The Final Additional Analysis also summarizes the state of the perchlorate treatment technology and other important issues relating to perchlorate. The Final Additional Analysis includes the results of the groundwater modeling analysis performed to assess the potential impacts of the Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program on water quality in both the Alluvial and Saugus aquifers, including perchlorate, and concludes that the Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program would not cause spreading of perchlorate in the Santa Clarita Valley under the groundwater pumping program described in the Urban Water Management Plan. The Final Additional Analysis also establishes that treatment options for the removal of perchlorate are available and proven to be feasible.

The Final Additional Analysis also shows that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan does not "depend" on the Saugus aquifer as a "primary" water supply. In fact, the Specific Plan is proposing to provide its own water supply sources, and those sources do not rely on existing Saugus aquifer groundwater supplies. Therefore, the Specific Plan water supply sources do not result in increased pumping of groundwater from the Saugus aquifer.

In addition, evidence presented during the separate California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") proceedings involving Valencia Water Company's application for approval of its updated Water Management Program ("WMP") establishes that it is reasonable for the Valley to rely on the Saugus aquifer as an available source of supply at the levels presented in the WMP. Furthermore, although opponents to the WMP have presented evidence in support of their position, there is considerable expert evidence demonstrating the adequacy of Saugus water supplies. Expert evidence also supports the feasibility of continued use and availability of Saugus water supplies while perchlorate clean-up proceeds.

The Final Additional Analysis contains updated information concerning perchlorate, including the discovery of perchlorate in an Alluvial municipal supply well near the former Whittaker-Bermite facility and its impacts on the region's groundwater supplies. This updated information is presented in the Final Additional Analysis, in **Topical Response 11**: Update Regarding the Status of Perchlorate and Related Issues. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered all such information.

Based on the information presented in the Final Additional Analysis, as well as information provided by the water purveyors in various technical studies, reports and other data, which is contained in the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings, the Board of Supervisors finds that the issue of perchlorate was adequately disclosed and addressed during review of the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR and the Final Additional Analysis. Substantial evidence supports the conclusion that Saugus water supplies are not a "primary" source of Specific Plan water, that the ASR alternative will not spread the perchlorate and that the use of aquifer water supplies is feasible while clean-up proceeds. Based on information provided by the water agencies, the Board also finds that treatment technologies are readily available and proven to remediate perchlorate from the water supplies. In reaching its findings, the Board also considered the fact that these perchlorate issues were previously raised and addressed by the California Public Utilities Commission in separate proceedings involving Valencia Water Company's Water Management Plan, and by the Kern County Superior Court in connection with litigation challenging the adequacy of the *2000 Urban Water Management Plan* prepared by the Santa Clarita Valley water purveyors. Therefore, the Board finds there is no basis for ceasing action on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan until the perchlorate remediation process is completed.

F. CUMULATIVE WATER DEMAND ANALYSIS

The Board of Supervisors has considered the claim that the cumulative water demand analysis presented in the Final Additional Analysis is inadequate because it relied on the projected figures for future water demand in the Santa Clarita Valley contained in the Castaic Lake Water Agency Urban Water Management Plan. It is suggested that the methodology used to quantify future demand in the Urban Water Management Plan underestimates the future need for potable water supplies. The suggestion relies on the household projections made by the

Southern California Association of Governments ("SCAG") in its 1998 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Those projections show a greater number of households within the Santa Clarita Valley than does the 2000 Urban Water Management Plan for the year 2020.

The Board of Supervisors does not concur with the claim that the County's cumulative water demand analysis is inadequate. The Final Additional Analysis does not utilize population projections prepared by SCAG; however, as explained in the Final Additional Analysis, this is not a violation of CEQA or state law. Los Angeles County independently reviewed the information presented in the Urban Water Management Plan and determined it appropriate for use in the Final Additional Analysis as the best and most accurate information available.

In addition, the Revised Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.5, makes clear that the cumulative water demand data presented in the document is provided for informational purposes only. The cumulative demand data is not required by CEQA because the applicant has secured sufficient water sources to serve the Specific Plan through buildout. Those water sources, which are independent of the water sources provided by Castaic Lake Water Agency (*i.e.*, regional/cumulative CLWA/SWP supplies), include either: (i) water already being used by the applicant on an annual basis (*i.e.*, agricultural groundwater); or (ii) "new" water purchased by the applicant for the purpose of serving the water needs of the Specific Plan (*i.e.*, Nickel Water, Newhall/SWP Water, *etc*.). The use of those available supplies does not result in the consumption of the regional/cumulative water supplies of the Santa Clarita Valley. With regard to the former, the supplies are already in use on an annual basis, resulting in no change in regional/cumulative water supplies. As to the "new" supplies identified above, they would not exist but for implementation of the Specific Plan. In such circumstances (*i.e.*, where the impacts will not result, in part, from the project being evaluated in the EIR), an EIR is not required to discuss the cumulative impacts. *See*, CEQA Guidelines §15130(a)(1).

In addition, SCAG's population projections for the Santa Clarita Valley were taken into consideration during preparation of the Urban Water Management Plan and the Final Additional Analysis. The Urban Water Management Plan examined existing land use data, new housing construction information and population data that were compiled from the agency service area. This information was compared to historic trends such as new water service connections and customer water usage information to determine the reasonableness of the projections. At the time the Urban Water Management Plan was prepared, Castaic Lake Water Agency found the SCAG projections to be high when compared with the historic growth rate of new connections within its service area for comparable time periods. For the period up to 2020, SCAG projected an increase in occupied households in the Castaic Lake Water Agency service area of 170 and 240 percent over historical trends, respectively. Consequently, Castaic Lake Water Agency opted to prepare the Urban Water Management Plan using the projections that resulted from its own research, which Castaic Lake Water Agency viewed as more reliable and more realistic than the SCAG projections.

As explained in the Final Additional Analysis, SCAG appears to have acknowledged that the population projections used in its 1998 RTP were too high. In its 2001 RTP, SCAG substantially revised downward its year 2020 population projection for the Santa Clarita Valley compared to its 1998 RTP projection. SCAG's 2001 projection is less than the projection used in

the Urban Water Management Plan. Therefore, the Urban Water Management Plan 2020 water demand is actually the more conservative projection of 2020 demand.

Nonetheless, in response to comments on the Final Additional Analysis, the County performed an additional cumulative water demand analysis using the household projections contained in SCAG's 2001 RTP for the year 2020. (*See*, Final Additional Analysis, **Topical Response 6**.) Based on that analysis, no significant project specific or cumulative water supply impacts would occur even using the SCAG projections, and a surplus of water is still anticipated with buildout of the Santa Clarita Valley, including the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. In reaching its findings, the Board of Supervisors also took into account the recent Kern County Superior Court ruling and decision validating the Urban Water Management Plan, despite similar claims challenging the cumulative water demand analysis found in that plan. For these and other reasons, the Board of Supervisors finds that the County's analysis of cumulative water demand in the Santa Clarita Valley is adequate.

G. ACTIONS TAKEN TO ENSURE CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES REGARDING THE PROTECTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AREAS

The Board of Supervisors has considered the claim that the County has failed to comply with the Court's writ regarding the Specific Plan's consistency with General Plan policies requiring the protection of natural resources in Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs"). The Board does not concur with this claim. In its writ, the Court directed the County to "take action to ensure that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan policies of Los Angeles County requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23[.]" (*See*, Court's writ, Draft Additional Analysis **Appendix 1.0(a)**, p. 5.) In response to the Court's writ, the County has taken actions to ensure consistency with General Plan SEA policies, including, but not limited to:

(1) The County has undertaken further analysis of the impacts to land within existing SEA 23, and has determined that 28 acres of SEA 23 sensitive habitat will be impacted by development, rather than 103 acres, as was believed to be the case during preparation and approval of the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR and during the prior Newhall Ranch litigation challenging that EIR.

(2) The Board of Supervisors is adopting the On-Site Location Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts) for the Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant site. As a result, the amount of SEA 23 sensitive habitat impacted by development will be further reduced to approximately 22.5 acres.

(3) The Board of Supervisors is requiring that the proposed Potrero Bridge be extended by an additional two spans for a total length of 1,500 feet to further minimize intrusion into the floodplain in conjunction with the future bridge design, subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works. This change would move the northern bridge abutment, and the corresponding bank stabilization further out of the river corridor areas. Removing the bridge abutment would result in a reduction in water velocities in the river during major

storm events, thus reducing potential impacts to sensitive riparian biological resources in the Santa Clara River.

(4) The County has further analyzed the buffer areas proposed between development and existing SEA 23 resources. As demonstrated in the Final Additional Analysis, the width of the riparian habitat corridor varies from a minimum of 300 feet to 2,205 feet (0.4 miles) at its widest point. The total buffer area (478 acres) varies in width from a minimum of 135 feet to more than 800 feet, and is three-quarters the size of the riparian habitat area itself. The average buffer width is approximately 400 feet. As can be seen, the buffer widths are greatest where the existing riparian habitat corridor is the narrowest; in some cases two to three times greater. Also, the amount of habitat for the endangered unarmored threespine stickleback ("UTS") fish will be increased as existing farm fields are converted to river bottom as proposed by the Specific Plan in order to allow the passage of the County's Capital Storm event.

As explained at length in the Final Additional Analysis, the Board of Supervisors believes that the above actions are adequate to ensure that the Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan's policies regarding the protection of natural resources within SEA 23, including compatibility with the SEA design compatibility criteria. Other actions pertinent to this issue are addressed in the Board of Supervisors' Conditional Use Permit (No. 98-087-(5)), Findings and Conditions of Approval, and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Specific Plan.

H. FLOODPLAIN IMPACTS

The Board of Supervisors has considered the claim that the Final Additional Analysis fails to adequately address the issue of loss of portions of the 100-year floodplain due to implementation of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The Board does not concur with this claim. Instead, the Board concurs with the assessment of this issue, as stated in the Final Additional Analysis.

In response to comments regarding this issue, the County provided a figure depicting the Specific Plan development proposed within the 100-year floodplain. As depicted on that figure, of the 141 acres of 100-year floodplain to be impacted by Specific Plan development, the bulk of the impacted floodplain acreage (approximately 121 acres) consists of agricultural lands and other disturbed habitat.

The issue before the Board of Supervisors is whether or not the development proposed within the 100-year floodplain is consistent with the General Plan's SEA protection policies, including the General Plan's SEA design compatibility criteria. The Final Additional Analysis demonstrates that the Specific Plan is consistent with those policies and criteria based on the fact that, among other things, a sufficient amount of SEA 23 sensitive habitat will be set aside and the majority of the SEA 23 lands impacted are non-sensitive and disturbed. Likewise, for the 100-year floodplain, a great majority of the land within the 100-year floodplain impacted by development is currently disturbed by agricultural and other uses. The Board of Supervisors finds that the General Plan policies requiring the protection of sensitive natural resources do not apply to such disturbed land, whether they are in the 100-year floodplain or not. Consequently,

the Board finds that the proposed development within the 100-year floodplain is compatible with General Plan policies requiring the protection of sensitive natural resources within existing SEA 23.

I. STAFF REPORT ISSUES

The Board of Supervisors considered the issues presented in the County's staff reports. The Board finds that those issues have been adequately addressed in the staff reports, Final Additional Analysis and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings.

J. CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENTS AND THE DISCLOSURE OF SPINEFLOWER INFORMATION

Numerous comments have been received suggesting that, among other claims, confidentiality agreements signed by the consultants retained by the applicant have precluded the full disclosure of studies, reports and other environmental-related information in connection with the environmental review process for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant. In response to such claims, the Board of Supervisors directed County staff to conduct an investigation regarding the County's CEQA review process and the preparation of the biological resources reports for Newhall Ranch. The investigation included an assessment of whether the use of confidentiality agreements by the applicant, Newhall, has resulted in the withholding of information necessary to review the potential environmental impacts of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and related actions on the spineflower and other sensitive species. The position of County staff, as described below, was included in a staff report from the Department of Regional Planning to the County's Board of Supervisors, dated January 13, 2003 (a copy of which is provided in **Appendix AD** to this Final Additional Analysis).

Based on the findings in that staff report, and for the reasons discussed in the Final Additional Analysis, **Topical Response 7**: The Use of Confidentiality Agreements and Disclosure of Information Regarding Spineflower, and **Topical Response 9**: Spineflower Surveys and the County's Existing EIR Procedures, the Board of Supervisors has concluded that the existence of confidentiality provisions has not prevented the County from completing an appropriate and thorough environmental review regarding the spineflower and other sensitive plant species as they relate to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant. Nevertheless, the Board of Supervisors concurs with County staff in imposing additional conditions on the applicant relating to the use of confidentiality agreements and other related issues. Those conditions are summarized in the Final Additional Analysis, **Topical Response 7**: The Use of Confidentiality Agreements and Disclosure of Information Regarding Spineflower.

K. ADEQUACY OF RECENT SPINEFLOWER SURVEYS

Comments have questioned the accuracy of the San Fernando Valley spineflower surveys conducted by biologists/botanists on the Newhall Ranch site, and have requested that the County require all new surveys on Newhall Ranch by "independent" biologists/botanists. Other comments have included a "chronology" regarding the spineflower, as it relates to the Newhall Ranch site. Based on the results of the County's own investigation, which was directed by the

Board of Supervisors, the Board finds that the spineflower surveys conducted on Newhall Ranch are accurate and complete and no new or additional surveys are needed or required at this time; however, further surveys will be required during the subsequent Newhall Ranch subdivision map entitlement application process.

In the meantime, with the exception of the Water Reclamation Plant, the Newhall Ranch project approvals at this stage do not allow actual construction of any component of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The applicant must still file applications for tentative tract maps prior to issuance of any building permits, which would enable actual construction of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. These project-specific subdivision map entitlement applications will also require additional tiered EIRs in connection with the CEQA public review and reporting requirements.

For further information considered by the Board of Supervisors, please refer to the Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.6, the Appendices to Section 2.6, **Topical Response 9**: Spineflower Surveys and the County's Existing EIR Procedures, and other documents contained in the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings.

L. SPINEFLOWER MITIGATION PROGRAM AND ADDITIONAL MITIGATION THROUGH THE NEWHALL/CDFG CONSERVATION EASEMENT AND AGREEMENT

Comments have suggested that the mitigation program for the spineflower needs to be more definitive and that the mitigation is "improperly" deferred under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Other comments have claimed that the mitigation is "vague and unspecific," and, at times, "speculative." The Board of Supervisors does not concur with these comments, based on the information contained in the Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.6, the Appendices to Section 2.6, and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings.

Since circulation of the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, including the spineflower mitigation program, Newhall, California Department of Fish and Game and the Los Angeles County District Attorney announced a final settlement of all outstanding issues, including those relating to the finding of spineflower on Newhall Ranch. The settlement resulted in the dedication by conservation easement of over 64 acres as a permanent spineflower preserve. The dedication area protects more land than spineflower actually occupies, and it includes both a management plan and an erosion control plan to be funded by Newhall. Newhall also agreed to improve California Department of Fish and Game access to Newhall Ranch and to biological surveys and reports. (*See*, "Civil Compromise Agreement," dated February 11, 2003.) A copy of this Agreement is provided in **Appendix AF** of this Final Additional Analysis. In addition, Newhall will be required to perform additional plant surveys as part of the subdivision map process. Newhall also will be required to implement the spineflower mitigation program, as outlined above, in connection with the Specific Plan, if approved.

The Board of Supervisors finds that the Conservation Easement constitutes further mitigation for impacts to the spineflower by securing, in perpetuity, portions of the Newhall Ranch property "to protect the spineflower and its habitat, and to create, within the Conservation Easement, buffer areas surrounding spineflower populations" on the subject property. (*See*,

Conservation Easement Deed, dated February 12, 2003, p. 2.) A copy of this easement is provided in **Appendix AG** of this Final Additional Analysis.

IV. FINDINGS REQUIRED BY CEQA

Pursuant to Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, no public agency may approve or carry out a project where an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out, unless the public agency makes one or more findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment (hereafter, "**Finding 1**").

(2) Changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency (hereafter, "**Finding 2**").

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

For those significant effects that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the public agency is required to find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

In accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Supervisors adopts these findings as part of its certification of the Final Additional Analysis to the prior, partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR.

V. ORGANIZATION/FORMAT OF FINDINGS

These CEQA Findings are organized in the following manner:

Section 1 of these findings discusses the significant unavoidable environmental effects of the project that cannot be feasibly mitigated to a level of insignificance;

Section 2 discusses the potential environmental effects of the project, which have been mitigated to below a level of significance;

Section 3 contains findings regarding the Final Additional Analysis;

Section 4 discusses the significant cumulative impacts of the project;

Section 5 discusses alternatives to the project;

Section 6 discusses the feasibility of suggested mitigation measures raised in comments received on the Draft Additional Analysis;

Section 7 discusses the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant;

Section 8 discusses the Section 15091 and 15092 findings;

Section 9 discusses the Section 21082.1(c)(3) findings; and

Section 10 discusses the status of the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The Board of Supervisors finds that the findings set forth in each section are supported by substantial evidence in the prior, partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, Final Additional Analysis and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings.

SECTION 1

UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE

After considering the prior, partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, the Board of Supervisors previously determined that, although EIR mitigation measures and conditions of approval imposed on the project would provide substantial mitigation of identified significant environmental effects, some of those environmental effects could not be feasibly mitigated to a level of insignificance. Consequently, in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Supervisors previously adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations to substantiate the County's decision to accept those unavoidable significant effects when balanced against the significant benefits afforded by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant.

The Final Additional Analysis does not identify any unavoidable significant effects that were not identified and fully addressed in the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, and overridden by the Board in its previously adopted Statement of Overriding Considerations. Therefore, no additional discussion of unavoidable significant effects is required for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant.

SECTION 2

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

After considering the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, the Board of Supervisors previously determined that the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant would potentially result in significant environmental effects which, after implementation of mitigation measures and conditions of approval imposed on the project, would be reduced to a level of insignificance. For a complete discussion of the Board's consideration of those effects, please refer to the Board's prior CEQA Findings, Section 2, pages 72 to 125.

In the Final Additional Analysis, the document identified potentially significant environmental effects caused by the Specific Plan with respect to spineflower and other sensitive plant species on the Newhall Ranch property, and the water supplies to be used for the Specific Plan site. As a result, the Board of Supervisors adopts the following additional findings with respect to biota resources and water resources. Except as specified below, the following findings are not intended to amend or supersede the Board of Supervisors' partially certified CEQA Findings. Rather, these findings supplement particular portions of the prior partially certified CEQA Findings as a result of the additional information presented in the Final Additional Analysis. As identified below, the Board of Supervisors also adopts new or revised mitigation measures in some instances.

2.1 BIOTA RESOURCES

2.1.1 POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. Specific Plan impacts to the spineflower and other sensitive plant species include (as previously stated in the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR) potential loss of individual plants due to development, indirect impacts and cumulative impacts. These impacts are more thoroughly addressed in the Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.6. These potential impacts are considered significant, absent implementation of the identified mitigation measures. However, with mitigation in place, the impacts are reduced to below a level of significance.

2.1.2 FINDING. The Board of Supervisors adopts CEQA **Finding 1**: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

2.1.3 FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING. The Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.6, includes a discussion of potential impacts to the spineflower, including a description of the plant species, its historical range, habitat requirements and its known location on the Specific Plan site. In addition, Section 2.6 identifies the applicable significance criteria that is used in assessing project impacts on the spineflower and other sensitive plant species, consistent with CEQA. The section includes an analysis of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the spineflower and other sensitive plant species due to development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant. While such an analysis is typically completed at the time subdivision maps allowing construction are proposed, this document addresses potential impacts to spineflower and other sensitive plants at the program level. The section also sets forth a comprehensive set of mitigation measures as part of a program to, in combination with the mitigation measures already presented in the Revised Draft EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, avoid or minimize impacts to the spineflower and other sensitive plant and animal species that may be found on the site. Environmental documents to be prepared for future subdivision maps will also present measures and/or programs necessary to mitigate potential impacts to spineflower and other sensitive plants. Finally, the spineflower information contained in the Final Additional Analysis is supported by technical studies and reports found in the appendix material (Appendix 2.6) and other documents contained in the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings.

The significant effects identified in the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR and the Final Additional Analysis are mitigated to below a level of significance with the adoption of the previously adopted mitigation measures, as well as the revised mitigation measures and

additional mitigation measures described below. The revised and additional mitigation measures, to which the project applicant has agreed, are adopted to strengthen the overall Newhall Ranch mitigation program for impacts to rare, threatened and endangered plant and animal species. The revised measures are shown below (revisions are shown in ~~strikeout~~ and underline text). The additional mitigation measures are shown below as well.

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

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

All site-specific survey work shall be documented in a separate report containing at least the following information: (a) project description, including a detailed map of the project location and study area; (b) a description of the biological setting, including references to the nomenclature used and updated vegetation mapping; (c) detailed description of survey methodologies; (d) dates of field surveys and total person-hours spent on the field surveys; (e) results of field surveys, including detailed maps and location data; (f) an assessment of potential impacts; (g) discussion of the significance of the rare, threatened or endangered animal or plant populations found in the project area, with consideration given to nearby populations and species distribution; (h) mitigation measures, including avoiding impacts altogether, minimizing or reducing impacts, rectifying or reducing impacts through habitat restoration, replacement or enhancement, or compensating for impacts by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments, consistent

with CEQA (Guidelines §15370); (i) references cited and persons contacted; and (j) other pertinent information, which is designed to disclose impacts and mitigate for such impacts." ~~to define the presence or absence of such species and any necessary mitigation measures shall be determined and applied."~~

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

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

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

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

4) **Development/Disturbance and Further Mitigation**. Prior to any development within, or disturbance to, habitat occupied by rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species, or to any portion of the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay, as defined below, all required permits shall be obtained from both USFWS and CDFG, as applicable. It is further anticipated that the federal and state permits will impose conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law that are beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Final EIR (March 1999), the Newhall Ranch DAA (April 2001) and the Newhall Ranch Revised DAA (2002). It is also anticipated that conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law for project-related impacts on endangered, rare or threatened species and their habitat will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns and techniques associated with project-specific grading at the subdivision map level portion of the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay, as defined below, all required permits shall be obtained from both USFWS and CDFG, as applicable. It is further anticipated that the federal and state permits will impose conditions and

mitigation measures required by federal and state law that are beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Final EIR (March 1999), the Newhall Ranch DAA (April 2001) and the Newhall Ranch Revised DAA (2002). It is also anticipated that conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law for project-related impacts on endangered, rare or threatened species and their habitat will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns and techniques associated with project-specific grading at the subdivision map level.

Spineflower Special Study Mitigation Overlay

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

Spineflower Preserves

4.6-66. Direct impacts to known spineflower populations within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area shall be avoided or minimized through the establishment of one or more on-site preserves that are configured to ensure the continued existence of the species in perpetuity. Preserve(s) shall be delineated in consultation with the County and CDFG, and will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan development footprints for lands within and around the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay (Figure 2.6-8).

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

A sufficient number of known spineflower populations shall be included within the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) in order to ensure the continued existence of the species in perpetuity. The conservation of known spineflower populations shall be established in consultation with

the County and CDFG, and as consistent with standards governing issuance of an incidental take permit for spineflower pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081, subdivision (b).

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

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

Annual viability reports shall be submitted to the County and CDFG for 10 years following delineation of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) to ensure long-term documentation of the spineflower population status within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s). In the event annual status reports indicate the spineflower population within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) is not stable and viable 10 years following delineation of the spineflower preserve(s), the project applicant, or its

designee, shall continue to submit annual status reports to the County and CDFG for a period of no less than an additional 5 years.

Connectivity, Reserve Design and Buffers

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

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

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

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

Buffer configurations may include the width of any adjacent roadway system or associated rights-of-way, because roadways and rights-of-way can afford some protection to the spineflower preserve(s) and contribute to the effectiveness of the buffers by further avoiding or minimizing the potential indirect impacts of future development. In designing buffers that include roads, the design shall take into account edge effects from the roads by assessing, among other factors, the likelihood of disturbance based upon topography, road runoff and adjacent vegetation types.

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

Preserve Protection/Fencing

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

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

The plans and specifications for the permanent fencing and signage shall be approved by the County and CDFG prior to the final phase of

construction of any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to a Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s).

Preserve Protection/Hydrological Alterations

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

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

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

Road Construction Measures

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

(a) Commerce Center Drive;

(b) Magic Mountain Parkway;

(c) Chiquito Canyon Road;

(d) Long Canyon Road;

(e) San Martinez Grande Road;

(f) Potrero Valley Road;

(g) Valencia Boulevard; and

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

Engineering, Design and Grading Modifications

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

Fire Management Plan

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

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

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

Under the final Fire Management Plan, limited fuel modification activities within the spineflower preserves will be restricted to selective thinning

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

Water Flow Diversion and Management

4.6-73. At the subdivision map level, the project applicant, or its designee, shall design and implement project-specific design measures to minimize changes in surface water flows to the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) for all Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to the preserve(s) and buffers, and avoid and minimize indirect impacts to the spineflower. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for each such subdivision map, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit for approval to the County plans and specifications that ensure implementation of the following design measures:

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

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

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

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

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

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

away from the populations will be aligned to avoid the preserve(s) to the maximum extent practicable; and

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

Biological Monitor

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

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

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

Construction Impact Avoidance Measures

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

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

(b) **Storm Water Flow Redirection**. Diversion ditches would be constructed to redirect storm water flows from graded areas away from the Newhall Ranch preserve(s). To the extent practicable,

grading of areas adjacent to the preserve(s) would be limited to spring and summer months (May through September) when the probability of rainfall is lower. Prior to the initiation of grading operations, the project applicant, or its designee, would submit for approval to the County a storm water flow redirection plan that demonstrates the flow of storm water away from the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s).

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

Reassessment Requirement

4.6-76. In conjunction with submission of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map in either Mesas Village or that portion of Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs, the project applicant, or its designee, shall reassess project impacts, both direct and indirect, to the spineflower populations using subdivision mapping data, baseline data from the Newhall Ranch Final EIR and data from the updated plant surveys (see, Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.6-53).

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

Newhall Ranch Monitoring and Management

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

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

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

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

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

Monitoring/Reporting. An annual report will be submitted to the County and CDFG by December 31st of each year. The report will include a description of the monitoring methods, an analysis of the findings,

effectiveness of the mitigation program, site photographs and adoptive management measures, based on the findings. Any significant adverse impacts, signage, fencing or compliance problems identified during monitoring visits will be reported to the County and CDFG for corrective action by the project applicant, or its designee.

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

After any population decline documented in the annual populations census following County re-approval of the Specific Plan, the project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for conducting an assessment of the ecological factor(s) that are likely responsible for the decline, and implement management activity or activities to address these factors where feasible. If a persistent population decline is documented, such as a trend in steady population decline persistent for a period of 5 consecutive years, or a substantial drop in population detected over a 10-year period, spineflower may be introduced in appropriate habitat and soils in the Newhall Ranch preserve(s), utilizing the bulk spineflower seed repository, together with other required management activity or activities. These activities shall be undertaken by a qualified botanist/biologist, subject to approval by the County with the concurrence of CDFG. The project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for the funding and implementation of the necessary management activity or activities, as approved by the County and CDFG.

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

Translocation/Reintroduction Program

4.6-78. To the extent project-related direct and indirect significant impacts on spineflower cannot be avoided or substantially lessened through establishment of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s), and other avoidance, minimization, or other compensatory mitigation measures, a translocation and reintroduction program may be implemented in

consultation with CDFG to further mitigate such impacts. Direct impacts (i.e., take) to occupied spineflower areas shall be fully mitigated at a 4:1 ratio. Impacts to occupied spineflower areas caused by significant indirect effects shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio.

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

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

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

Translocation. Prior to the initiation of grading, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit to the County a translocation program for the spineflower. Translocation would salvage the topsoil of spineflower areas to be impacted due to grading. Salvaged spineflower soil seed bank would be translocated to the candidate spineflower reintroduction areas. The

translocation program shall include, among other information: (a) location map with scale; (b) size of each translocation polygon; (c) plans and specifications for site preparation, including selective clearing of competing vegetation; (d) site characteristics; (e) protocol for topsoil collection and application; and (f) monitoring and reporting. The translocation program shall be submitted to CDFG for input and coordination. Translocation shall occur within the candidate spineflower reintroduction areas onsite and offsite. Successful criteria for each site shall be included in the monitoring/management plan/with criteria for the germination and growth to reproduction of individual plants for the first year a specified period.

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

On-going Agricultural Activities

4.6-79. The project applicant, or its designee, shall engage in regular and ongoing consultation with the County and CDFG in connection with its ongoing agricultural operations in order to avoid or minimize significant direct impacts to the spineflower.

In addition, the project applicant, or its designee, shall provide 30 days advance written notice to the County and CDFG of the proposed conversion of its ongoing rangeland operations on Newhall Ranch to more intensive agricultural uses. The purpose of the advance notice requirement is to allow the applicant, or its designee, to coordinate with the County and CDFG to avoid or minimize significant impacts to the spineflower prior to the applicant's proposed conversion of its ongoing rangeland operations to more intensive agricultural uses. This coordination component will be implemented by or through the County's Department of Regional Planning and/or the Regional Manager of CDFG. Implementation will consist of the County and/or CDFG conducting a site visit of the proposed conversion area(s) within the 30-day period, and making a determination of whether the proposed conversion area(s) would destroy or significantly impact spineflower population in or adjacent to those areas. If it is determined that the conversion area(s) do not destroy or significantly impact spineflower populations, then the County and/or CDFG will authorize such conversion activities in the proposed conversion area(s). However, if it is determined that the conversion area(s) may destroy or significantly impact spineflower populations, then the County and/or CDFG will issue a stop work order to the applicant, or its designee. If such an order is issued, the applicant, or its designee, shall

> not proceed with any conversion activities in the proposed conversion area(s). However, the applicant, or the designee, may take steps to relocate the proposed conversion activities in an alternate conversion area(s). In doing so, the applicant, or its designee, shall follow the same notice and coordination provisions identified above. This conversion shall not include ordinary pasture maintenance and renovation or dry land farming operations consistent with rangeland management.

With implementation of these revised measures, potential impacts to the spineflower occurring, or likely to occur, on the Newhall Ranch site are reduced to below a level of significance.

2.2 WATER RESOURCES

As discussed above, the majority of these findings supplements, rather than revises, the Board of Supervisors' prior CEQA Findings. However, the following findings regarding the Specific Plan's impacts to water resources, addressed in Section 2.5 of the Final Additional Analysis, are the primary exception to that general rule (*see*, Section 5, below). These particular findings (Section 2.2) *replace and supercede* the Board of Supervisors' prior CEQA Findings, pages 97 to 99, Section 2.7, Water Resources. As stated in the Revised Draft Additional Analysis (November 2002), Volume I, Section 2.5 of that document, *replaces and supercedes* Section 2.5 of the prior Draft Additional Analysis (April 2001).

2.2.1 POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. Based on the information contained in the Final Additional Analysis, including Section 2.5 Revised Draft Additional Analysis, implementation of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan could result in potentially significant impacts to one or more of the following issues, absent mitigation: (a) Newhall Ranch reclaimed water use; (b) Castaic Lake Water Agency reclaimed water use; (c) Newhall agricultural water use; (d) CLWA State Water Project water use; (e) Newhall/SWP water use; (f) Nickel Water Use; (g) Semitropic Groundwater Banking; (h) Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program; (i) impacts of Newhall's SWP and Nickel Water on delivery and treatment capacity; (j) biological effects in river corridor of the Specific Plan (including the Saugus/ASR Program); (k) water quality impacts, including chloride, nutrients and perchlorate; (l) liquefaction impacts; (m) Castaic Creek flood flows use; and (n) land surface elevation changes. In addition, Section 2.5 of the Revised Draft Additional Analysis specifically addressed the questions presented by the Court in the Newhall Ranch litigation, including the General Plan Development Monitoring System water supply consistency issues.

2.2.2 FINDING. The Board of Supervisors adopts CEQA **Finding 1**: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

2.2.3 FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING. The facts in support of these findings are provided in Section 2.5 of the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, the Final Additional Analysis and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings. For summary purposes only, the following facts, among others, support the finding that the potentially significant environmental issues identified

in Section 2.2.1 above do not result in any unmitigated significant environmental impacts resulting from the provision of water to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site and that an adequate supply of water is available to meet the demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan without creating unmitigated significant environmental impacts.

Los Angeles County and the applicant are responding to the Court's decision and direction to demonstrate that sufficient water will be available for build-out of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan by relying on the applicant's own primary sources of water supply. The first source is the applicant's historical Alluvial groundwater produced in Los Angeles County that is presently committed to agricultural uses. The second source is the applicant's purchase of water from Nickel Family LLC in Kern County, referred to above as the "Nickel Water." Because these two independent primary water sources meet the potable water needs of the Specific Plan, no potable water would be needed from SWP and CLWA supplies. However, as summarized below, the CLWA/SWP supplies, and other supplemental water supplies have been identified and environmentally assessed because, as stated in the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, Section 2.5, it remains important for the Santa Clarita Valley to hedge against potential regulatory and operational risks that may adversely affect the reliability of water supplies over the long-term.

The right to the beneficial use of its agricultural water resources is well established under California law. This agricultural water will be available for agricultural production until it is phased out by urban development. There would be a limit placed on the amount of groundwater converted to urban uses, so that it will not exceed the amount already used for agricultural purposes. This agricultural water supply has historical long-term availability and reliability and is an established supply. This agricultural water supply will provide a large percentage of the Specific Plan's potable water need. The Alluvial aquifer has been consistently at or near its highest level and is not in an overdraft condition.

The Nickel Water consists of 1,607 acre-feet per year (AFY) of water purchased by the applicant from Nickel Family LLC. This water is 100 percent reliable on a year-to-year basis, and not subject to the annual fluctuations that can occur in dry year conditions. Pursuant to Nickel's contract water rights, the water delivered to Nickel for sale to the applicant must be high quality water, acceptable for delivery into the California aqueduct. In addition, delivery to Nickel of the water being sold to the applicant is mandatory, unaffected by annual hydrologic conditions. Consequently, the Nickel Water is not subject to unpredictable reductions in quality or quantity typical of other water sources. These characteristics make the Nickel Water a dependable water supply source. The water would be delivered through the Kern County Water Agency and the SWP system. The Nickel Water would only be needed on the Specific Plan site in years when all of the applicant's agricultural water has been used, which is estimated to occur after the 20th year of project construction. Up to that point in time, the unused Nickel Water would be available for storage in groundwater banking programs on an annual basis, which would then be used as a dry year supplemental supply. These two sources of supply would balance the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan potable water demand in normal/average years. The non-potable demand would be met by the use of reclaimed water supplied by the Newhall Ranch water reclamation plant (WRP) and reclaimed water that will be supplied by CLWA.

Furthermore, the applicant has undertaken several major steps to enhance the reliability of the water supply for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Specifically, the Board of Supervisors finds that the applicant has undertaken the following:

(a) Secured 7,648 AFY of additional SWP water entitlement from landowners who are served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency;

(b) Purchased 55,000 AF of groundwater banking storage capacity, which includes the ability to request delivery of up to 4,950 AF of potable water during dry years as a water supply from the Semitropic Water Storage District;

(c) Determined through comprehensive groundwater testing that the local Saugus aquifer can be successfully used for groundwater banking through an Aquifer Storage and Recovery ("ASR") program;

(d) Along with members of the "Downstream Water Users," including the United Water Conservation District, a unanimous request has been made to the State Department of Water Resources ("DWR") to amend the 1978 Castaic Creek Flood Flow agreement, thereby making these flows available for use in groundwater banking and for other appropriate beneficial water uses. This has improved the potential to use Castaic Creek flood flows; and

(e) Determined that CLWA could provide the applicant with SWP supplemental water supplies, if needed.

The relationships between Newhall Ranch water demand and supply in normal/average and dry years are provided in **Tables ES-1** and **ES-2**, which are provided below.

ADEQUACY OF WATER SUPPLIES

An adequate amount of water is available to meet the needs of the Specific Plan. In fact, actions being taken by the applicant will result in even more water being made available to the Specific Plan than is needed to meet its water need. The primary sources of water for the Specific Plan consist of existing supplies that are available for use today in the Santa Clarita Valley. To ensure that adequate water is available for the Specific Plan, the Specific Plan will rely on the following sources of water:

(a) Newhall Ranch Water Supplies

The following summary identifies the Newhall Ranch non-potable and potable water supplies needed to serve the Specific Plan site:

Non-Potable Supplies

Newhall Ranch Reclaimed Water. Reclaimed water (also referred to as "recycled water") from the WRP proposed as part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would be used to partially meet the non-potable water demands (*e.g.*, irrigation) of the Specific Plan. The availability of this source would occur in stages, mirroring the staged construction of the WRP on the Specific Plan site.

CLWA Reclaimed Water. CLWA would serve the Specific Plan site with reclaimed water from existing upstream WRPs, consistent with CLWA's draft "Reclaimed Water System Master Plan," which is being implemented in stages. This reclaimed water supply would meet the remaining non-potable water demand of the Specific Plan.

Potable Supplies

Newhall Agricultural Water. The project applicant would meet potable water demands of the Specific Plan by using Newhall's historical alluvial groundwater produced in the County of Los Angeles, which is presently committed to agricultural uses. No additional groundwater would be pumped over historical and present amounts; instead, the water presently used to irrigate crops would be treated and then used to partially meet the potable water needs of the Specific Plan.

Nickel Water. The applicant has secured water under contract with Nickel Family LLC in Kern County. This water is 100 percent reliable on a year-to-year basis, and not subject to the annual fluctuations that can occur in dry year conditions. The water would be delivered through the Kern County Water Agency and the SWP system. The Nickel Water would only be needed on the Specific Plan site in years where all of the Newhall Agricultural Water has been used, which is estimated to occur after the 20th year of project construction. Up to that point in time, the unused Nickel Water would be available for storage in groundwater banking programs on an annual basis, which would then be used as a dry year supplemental supply.

Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project. The project applicant has entered into an agreement to reserve and purchase water storage capacity of up to 55,000 acre-feet in the Semitropic Water Storage District Groundwater Banking Project. The stored water could be extracted in dry years in amounts of up to 4,950 AFY from the project. This supply will be used as a water source for the Specific Plan in dry years only. Sources of water that can be stored in this banking project include, but are not limited to, Nickel Water, Newhall/SWP supplies, and Other CLWA Supplies.

Table ES-1
Newhall Ranch Specific Plan
Normal/Average Year Potable And Non-Potable Water Usage
(Acre-Feet/Year)

	Demand	Supply	
		7,038	Newhall Agricultural Water (a)
		1,607	Nickel Water (b)
Potable	8,645	8,645	
		5,344	Newhall Ranch Reclaimed Water
		3,691	CLWA Reclaimed Water
Non-Potable	9,035	9,035	
Total (c)	**17,680**	**17,680**	

(a) Firm groundwater supply historically and presently used by the applicant for agricultural irrigation purposes on its agricultural land in The County of Los Angeles.
(b) The applicant has secured water under contract with Nickel Family LLC in Kern County. This water is 100 percent reliable on a year-to-year basis, and not subject to the annual fluctuations that can occur in dry year conditions. The water would be delivered through the Kern County Water Agency and the SWP system.
(c) See Table 2.5-25, Summary of Newhall Ranch Water Demands.

Additional Programs To Enhance Reliability Of Supplies

Groundwater Banking Program for Dry Years (h)		Supplemental Supplies	
Saugus Groundwater Banking/ ASR Program (e)	4,500	4,500	CLWA SWP and Other Supplies (g)
		4,566	Newhall/SWP Water (d)
		7,043	Castaic Creek Flood Flows (f)
Total	**4,500**	**16,109**	

(d) Newhall/SWP water (7,648 acre-feet per year of annual entitlement) secured by the applicant from landowners served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency, which would be delivered through SWP facilities to CLWA. This source would be reduced to approximately 59.7 percent in average years as discussed in ***Section 2.5, Water Resources*** *(4,566 = 7,648 x 0.597).*
(e) The Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program involves injecting or "banking" 4,500 AFY of treated Newhall/ SWP water or other available water at times when those sources are readily available in normal/average years. During drought periods, up to 4,100 AFY would be withdrawn from the groundwater bank to partially meet Specific Plan dry year water demand.
(f) Subject to approval by DWR, Castaic Creek flood flows could be used in normal/average years, when available, as a water source for the Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project (through a water transfer), or for the Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program. This supply is variable; in some years, the flood flows are not available.
(g) In addition to Newhall/SWP Water and Castaic Creek Flood Flows, CLWA SWP entitlement and other CLWA supplies could be used as a source of water for injection into the Semitropic and Saugus Groundwater Banks.
(h) CLWA's SWP entitlement is 95,200 acre-feet per year. The amount of the water shown above is not a limitation on the amount of CLWA SWP supplies that could be used as a source of water; however, the CLWA supplies are only considered a supplemental source for Newhall Ranch, because the applicant has taken steps to secure its own primary potable water supplies.

Table ES-2
Newhall Ranch Specific Plan
Dry Year Potable and Non-Potable Water Usage
(acre-feet/year)

	Demand (c)	Supply	
		7,038	Newhall Agricultural Water (a)
		1,607	Nickel Water (b)
		865	Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project (e)
Potable	9,510	9,510	
		5,344	Newhall Ranch Reclaimed Water
		4,595	CLWA Reclaimed Water
Non-Potable	9,939	9,939	
Total	**19,449**	**19,449**	

(a) Firm groundwater supply historically and presently used by the applicant for agricultural irrigation purposes on its agricultural land in The County of Los Angeles.
(b) The applicant has secured water under contract with Nickel Family LLC in Kern County. This water is 100 percent reliable on a year-to-year basis, and not subject to the annual fluctuations that can occur in dry year conditions. The water would be delivered through the Kern County Water Agency and the SWP system.
(c) Demands are projected to increase in a dry year by approximately 10 percent due to a lack of local rainfall.

Additional Programs To Enhance Reliability Of Supplies

	Supplemental Supplies	
	3,044	Newhall/SWP Water (d)
	4,085	Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project (e)
	4,100	Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program (f)
Total	**13,701**	

*(d) Newhall/SWP water (7,648 acre-feet per year of annual entitlement) secured by the applicant from landowners served by a member agency of the Kern County Water Agency, which would be delivered through SWP facilities to CLWA. This source would be reduced to approximately 39.8 percent in dry years as discussed in **Section 2.5, Water Resources** (3,044 = 7,648 x 0.398). This water is not related to CLWA's 95,200 AF entitlement.*
(e) The project applicant has entered into an agreement to secure water storage capacity of up to 55,000 acre-feet in the Semitropic Water Storage District Groundwater Banking Project. The stored water would be extracted in dry years in amounts of up to 4,950 AFY from the project. This supply will be used as a water source for the Specific Plan in dry years only. The storage capacity will be filled in the initial years (beginning in year 2005) from available water before Newhall Ranch demand requires this supply. Afterward, further demand for this water in wet/average years, on an as needed basis, could be met by banking excess Newhall/SWP Water, Castaic Creek Flood Flows, CLWA SWP entitlement and other supplies as available.
(f) The Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program involves injecting or "banking" 4,500 AFY of treated Newhall/SWP water or other available water at times when those sources are readily available in normal/average years. During drought periods, up to 4,100 AFY would be withdrawn from the groundwater bank to partially meet Specific Plan water demand.

(b) Supplemental Water Supplies

As summarized in **Tables ES-1 and ES-2**, above, there are sufficient water supplies to meet the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan demand. However, it remains important for the Santa Clarita Valley to hedge against potential regulatory and operational risks that may adversely affect the reliability of water supplies over the years. Although the purveyors have planned and developed water supplies to maintain reliability into the future even with a repeat of statewide

droughts, the Santa Clarita Valley water agencies are faced with impacts due to the potential future promulgation of increasingly stringent water quality standards, litigation over water supplies and allocations, environmental constraints and changes in SWP operational criteria. These regulatory and operational uncertainties are many times unanticipated developments and not easily quantifiable. However, these types of uncertainties have occurred throughout the history of California's development of water resources. It is expected that they will continue in the future. A major challenge in water planning is to determine the appropriate measures of insurance to safeguard against these uncertainties to enhance supply reliability. One way of providing supply insurance against such risks is to secure additional or supplemental water supplies. The summary provided below identifies some of the important supplemental water supplies that could be available to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan:

Newhall/SWP Water. The project applicant has entered into an agreement to reserve and ultimately purchase 7,648 AFY of additional State Water Project (SWP) water entitlement, which would be delivered through SWP facilities to CLWA and be available to serve the Specific Plan. The same SWP reliability parameters discussed above for CLWA SWP water would apply to this source of water.

Castaic Creek Flood Flows. Subject to approval by DWR, Castaic Creek flood flows could be used as a variable supply source in normal/average years, when available, for the Semitropic Groundwater Banking project (through a water transfer), or for the Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program (from CLWA).

Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project. The project applicant has entered into an agreement to reserve and purchase water storage capacity of up to 55,000 acre-feet in the Semitropic Water Storage District Groundwater Banking Project. Sources of water that could be stored in this banking project include, but are not limited to, Nickel Water, Newhall/SWP supplies, and Other CLWA Supplies. The stored water would be extracted in dry years in amounts of up to 4,950 AFY from the project. Up to 865 AFY of this amount would be used as a primary water source during dry years. The remainder (4,085 AFY) would be available as a supplemental source.

Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program. The Groundwater Banking/Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) program, which involves installation of six wells in the Saugus aquifer, would be used to inject or "bank" 4,500 AFY of treated SWP water or other available water when those sources are readily available in normal/average years. During drought periods, when SWP water supplies or other available sources are curtailed, the ASR wells would then be used to recover up to 4,100 AFY to partially meet Specific Plan water demand. In lay terms, the program would operate much like a local bank. Water would be deposited (injected) into the groundwater basin and later withdrawn (recovered), when needed, in dry years.

CLWA SWP and Other Supplies. A relatively small portion of CLWA's existing SWP Table A water entitlement could be used, if needed, to supplement a portion of the Specific Plan's potable water need. As a SWP contractor, CLWA may also obtain additional SWP supplies from or through DWR in connection with other programs. The other SWP supplies include the Turnback Water Pool program, the Interruptible water

program, Surplus water provisions and Carryover water. These SWP supplies are available in average/normal years as water supply sources for the Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program and the Semitropic Groundwater Banking project. However, the CLWA supplies are only considered a supplemental source for Newhall Ranch because the applicant has taken steps to secure its own primary potable water supplies.

The surplus of water created by existing water sources and the actions of the applicant will ensure an adequate supply of water for the Specific Plan without creating significant impacts on existing water supplies or downstream water users. Several of the identified Specific Plan sources presently exist in the Santa Clarita Valley (*e.g.*, Newhall's agricultural water and CLWA's SWP water) and several of the sources, consistent with CEQA, are reasonably expected to occur as the Specific Plan builds out (*e.g.*, Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant reclaimed water, CLWA reclaimed water, Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program water, Newhall/SWP water, Nickel Water).

FEASIBILITY OF THE SAUGUS GROUNDWATER BANKING/ASR PROGRAM

The results of injection and recovery tests conducted by the applicant demonstrate that implementing a groundwater banking/ASR program in the Saugus Formation is feasible. The determination that the Saugus Groundwater Banking program is feasible is based on the actual injection and pumping tests conducted at wells in the Saugus Formation from July 2000 through October 2000, as well as groundwater modeling. (*See*, Draft Additional Analysis, **Appendix 2.5(c)** [*Assessment of the Hydrogeologic Feasibility of Injection and Recovery of Water in the Saugus Formation, Santa Clarita Valley, California*, Richard C. Slade & Associates LLC, February 2001, including the Technical Appendix *Hydrogeologic Conditions in the Saugus Formation, Santa Clarita Valley, California,* by Richard C. Slade & Associates LLC, February 2001]; and Revised Draft Additional Analysis, **Appendix 2.5(a)** [*Newhall Ranch Updated Water Resources Impact Evaluation*, CH_2MHill, November 2002].)

The testing and the modeling show that there is no discernible effect on Alluvial water levels or the Santa Clara River, from either Saugus Formation well injection or pumping. For additional information on this topic, please refer to the Revised Draft Additional Analysis Section 2.5.5.3(d)(5), Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR Program.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM POLICIES AS THEY RELATE TO WATER SUPPLIES

The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the County's General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies. This analysis has been completed to determine if sufficient water supplies will be available for the Specific Plan under the County's General Plan Development Monitoring System (DMS) requirements. The projected total water demand for the Specific Plan is 17,680 acre-feet per year in average years and 19,449 acre-feet per year dry years. The analysis addresses water supply requirements resulting from buildout of all pending, recorded, and approved projects listed in the County's DMS, plus the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Under the DMS analysis, there will be sufficient water supplies for the entire demand of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and all pending, approved and recorded projects in DMS. Because two independent primary water sources have been secured to meet the potable water

needs of the Specific Plan, no additional potable water would be needed from State Water Project (SWP) and the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) supplies. In fact, a water surplus of approximately 16,566 to 44,103 AFY would occur in average years and a surplus of approximately 16,552 to 88,089 AFY would occur in dry years.

The analysis also shows that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site is located immediately adjacent to existing development and the retail water service area of the Valencia Water Company. The site is also within the wholesale service area of CLWA. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site is located approximately one eighth of one mile from the Magic Mountain Theme Park, Castaic Junction, and the Valencia Commerce Center, and approximately three quarters of a mile from the Valencia Industrial Park. All of these existing development areas are served by County or other public services, and provide commercial services and job opportunities. As indicated above, more than enough water supplies are available to the Specific Plan to meet its projected demand. For additional information on this topic, please see Revised Draft Additional Analysis, Section 2.5.5.4(a)(1) entitled, DMS General Plan Consistency.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The Court in the Newhall Ranch litigation directed the County to reconsider its entire water analysis, and to adopt such mitigation measures and/or additional findings as may be necessary to comply with CEQA and the Court's decision and writ. This section of the Board of Supervisors' findings presents the water-related mitigation measures previously adopted by the County for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (entitled below "Existing EIR Specific Plan Mitigation Measures"). Also presented below are revisions to the Board's previously adopted mitigation measures, as well as new additional mitigation measures, which were adopted in response to the revised water analysis. For consistency, the numbering used for each mitigation measure is the same as the numbering used in the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR.

EXISTING EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

4.11-1 The proposed Specific Plan shall implement a water reclamation system in order to reduce the Specific Plan's demand for imported potable water. The Specific Plan shall install a distribution system to deliver non-potable reclaimed water to irrigate land uses suitable to accept reclaimed water, pursuant to Los Angeles County Department of Health Standards.

4.11-2 Landscape concept plans shall include a palette rich in drought-tolerant and native plants.

4.11-3 Major manufactured slopes shall be landscaped with materials that will eventually naturalize, requiring minimal irrigation.

4.11-4 Water conservation measures as required by the State of California shall be incorporated into all irrigation systems.

4.11-5 The area within each future subdivision within Newhall Ranch shall be annexed to the Valencia Water Company prior to issuance of building permits.

4.11-7 Prior to commencement of use, all uses of recycled water shall be reviewed and approved by the State of California Health and Welfare Agency, Department of Health Services.

4.11-8 Prior to the issuance of building permits that allow construction, the applicant of the subdivision shall finance the expansion costs of water service extension to the subdivision through the payment of connection fees to the appropriate water agency(ies).

Revised EIR Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

4.11-6 In conjunction with the submittal of applications for tentative tract maps or parcel maps which permit construction, and prior to approval of any such tentative maps, ~~Prior to recordation of any final subdivision map that allows construction,~~ and in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County General Plan Development Monitoring System (DMS), as amended, Los Angeles County shall require the applicant of the map ~~subdivision~~ to obtain written confirmation from the retail water agency ~~that a~~ identifying the source(s) of water ~~source is~~ available to ~~supply~~ serve the map ~~subdivision~~ concurrent with need. If the applicant of such map ~~the subdivision~~ cannot obtain confirmation that a water source(s) is available for buildout of the ~~subdivision~~ map, the ~~subdivision~~ map shall be phased with the timing of an available water source(s), consistent with the County's DMS requirements.

4.11-9 Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that the Upper Santa Clara Water Committee (or Santa Clarita Valley Water Purveyors), made up of the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 36, Newhall County Water District, Santa Clarita Water ~~Company~~ Division of CLWA and the Valencia Water Company, prepare an annual water report that will discuss the status of groundwater ~~levels~~ within the Alluvial and Saugus Aquifers, and State Water Project water supplies as they relate to the Santa Clarita Valley. The report will also include an annual update of the actions taken by CLWA to enhance the quality and reliability of existing and planned water supplies for the Santa Clarita Valley. In those years when the Committee or purveyors do~~es~~ not prepare such a report, the applicant at ~~his~~its expense shall cause the preparation of such a report that is acceptable to the County to address these issues. This annual report shall be provided to Los Angeles County who ~~may~~will ~~use~~ consider the report as part of ~~the~~ its local land use decision-making process. (To date, four such water reports have been prepared (1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001) and provided to both the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita.)

4.11-10 Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), in cooperation with other Santa Clarita Valley retail water providers, continue to update the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for Santa Clarita Valley once every five years (on or before December 31) to ensure that the County receives up-to-date information about the existing and planned water supplies in the Santa Clarita Valley. The County will consider the information contained in the updated UWMP in connection with the County's future local land use decision-making process. The County will also consider the information contained in the updated UWMP in connection with the County's future consideration of any Newhall Ranch tentative subdivision maps allowing construction.

~~4.11-10 In conjunction with the submittal of applications for and prior to approval of tentative tract and parcel maps which permit construction, a letter from the retail water provider will be submitted to the County identifying the source(s) of supply of water for the land uses within that tentative tract or parcel map. The source(s) of water identified shall not result in the net use of groundwater over that which is planned for the Santa Clarita water basin, which is identified as the "annual safe perennial yield" of the Alluvial Aquifer and the "annual recharge rate" of the Saugus Aquifer in the Final EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan or subsequent environmental documentation.~~ (See, Mitigation Measure 4.11-15, below.)

Additional Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

4.11-11 With implementation of the proposed Saugus ASR program, ASR wells shall be spaced so that adjacent non-project wells will not lose pumping capacity as a result of drawdown occurring during pumping of the ASR wells.

4.11-12 With implementation of the proposed Saugus ASR program, the ultimate number of ASR wells to be constructed shall be sufficient to inject the ultimate target injection volume of 4,500 acre-feet per year and withdraw the ultimate target withdraw volume of 4,100 acre-feet per year.

4.11-13 With implementation of the proposed Saugus ASR program, ASR wells shall be constructed in the following two general areas:

(a) South of the Santa Clara River and west of Interstate 5. This location includes areas within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan boundary. (This area is referred to as the "south ASR well field."); and

(b) North of the Santa Clara River and west of Castaic Creek. (This location is referred to as the "north ASR well field.")

4.11-14 The Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program injection water must meet the water quality requirements of the State Regional Water Quality Control Board,

Los Angeles Region. The water extracted for use on the Specific Plan site shall meet the Title 22 drinking water standards of the State Department of Health Services.

4.11-15 Groundwater historically and presently used for crop irrigation on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site and elsewhere in Los Angeles County shall be made available by the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, to partially meet the potable water demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The amount of groundwater pumped for this purpose shall not exceed 7,038 AFY. This is the amount of groundwater pumped historically and presently by the Newhall Land and Farming Company in Los Angeles County to support its agricultural operations. Pumping this amount will not result in a net increase in groundwater use in the Santa Clarita Valley. To monitor groundwater use, the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide the County an annual report indicating the amount of groundwater used in Los Angeles County and the specific land upon which that groundwater was historically used for irrigation. For agricultural land located off the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site in Los Angeles County, at the time agricultural groundwater is transferred from agricultural uses on that land to Specific Plan uses, The Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide a verified statement to the County's Department of Regional Planning that Alluvial aquifer water rights on that land will now be used to meet Specific Plan demand.

4.11-16 The agricultural groundwater used to meet the needs of the Specific Plan shall meet the drinking water quality standards required under Title 22 prior to use.

4.11-17 In conjunction with each project-specific subdivision map for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the County shall require the applicant of that map to cause to be prepared a supplemental or subsequent Environmental Impact Report, as appropriate, pursuant to CEQA requirements. By imposing this EIR requirement on each Newhall Ranch tentative subdivision map application allowing construction, the County will ensure that, among other things, the water needed for each proposed subdivision is confirmed as part of the County's subdivision map application process. This mitigation requirement shall be read and applied in combination with the requirements set forth in revised Mitigation Measure 4.11-6.

4.11-18 The storage capacity purchased in the Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan applicant shall be used in conjunction with the provision of water to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The applicant, or entity responsible for storing Newhall Ranch water in this groundwater bank, shall prepare an annual status report indicating the amount of water placed in storage in the groundwater bank. This report shall be made available annually and used by Los Angeles County in its decision-making processes relating to build-out of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

4.11-19 A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Water Resource Monitoring Program has been entered into between United Water Conservation District and the Upper Basin Water Purveyors, effective August 20, 2001.[2] The MOU/Water Resource Monitoring Program, when executed, will put in place a joint water resource monitoring program that will be an effective regional water management tool for both the Upper and Lower Santa Clara River areas as further information is developed, consistent with the MOU. This monitoring program will result in a database addressing water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over various representative water cycles. The parties to the MOU intend to utilize this database to further identify surface water and groundwater impacts on the Santa Clara River Valley. The applicant, or its designee, shall cooperate in good faith with the continuing efforts to implement the MOU and Water Resource Monitoring Program.

As part of the MOU process, the United Water Conservation District and the applicant have also entered into a "Settlement and Mutual Release" agreement, which is intended to continue to develop data as part of an on-going process for providing information about surface and groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley. In that agreement, the County and the applicant have agreed to the following:

"4.3 Los Angeles County and Newhall will each in good faith cooperate with the parties to the MOU and will assist them as requested in the development of the database calibrating water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over multi-year water cycles. Such cooperation will include, but not be limited to, providing the parties to the MOU with historical well data and other data concerning surface water and groundwater in the Santa Clara River and, in the case of Newhall, providing Valencia Water Company with access to wells for the collection of well data for the MOU.

4.4 Los Angeles County and Newhall further agree that the County of Los Angeles will be provided with, and consider, the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program in connection with, and prior to, all future Newhall Ranch subdivision approvals or any other future land use entitlements implementing the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. If the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program identifies significant impacts to surface water or groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley, Los Angeles County will identify those impacts and adopt feasible mitigation measures in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act."

4.11-20. The Specific Plan applicant, or its successors, shall assign its acquired Nickel Water rights to the Valencia Water Company or Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), and, in consultation with the Valencia Water Company, CLWA or their

---

2 *See*, **Appendix F** to Final Additional Analysis [Memorandum of Understanding Between the Santa Clara River Valley Upper Basin Water Purveyors and United Water Conservation District, dated August 2001].

designee(s), the applicant shall ensure that the Nickel Water is delivered to the appropriate place of use necessary to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan at the time of need, as determined by the County of Los Angeles through required SB221 and/or SB610 analyses for future subdivision map applications. Upon approval of the Specific Plan, the applicant, Valencia Water Company, CLWA or a designee, will take delivery of the Nickel Water, so that such water will be used, or stored for use, for the Specific Plan in future years.

4.11-21. The applicant, in coordination with RWQCB staff, shall select a representative location upstream and downstream of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and sample surface and groundwater quality. Sampling from these two locations would begin upon approval of the first subdivision map and be provided annually to the RWQCB and County for the purpose of monitoring water quality impacts of the Specific Plan over time. If the sampling data results in the identification of significant new or additional water quality impacts resulting from the Specific Plan, which were not previously known or identified, additional mitigation shall be required at the subdivision map level.

4.11-22 Beginning with the filing of the first subdivision map allowing construction on the Specific Plan site and with the filing of each subsequent subdivision map allowing construction, the Specific Plan applicant, or its designee, shall provide documentation to the County of Los Angeles identifying the specific portion(s) of irrigated farmland in the County of Los Angeles proposed to be retired from irrigated production to make agricultural water available to serve the subdivision. As a condition of subdivision approval, the applicant or its designee, shall provide proof to the County that the agricultural land has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the subdivision.

In summary, the Board of Supervisors finds that adequate water supplies are available for build-out of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and that the proposed Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program is feasible. In addition, the Specific Plan can be provided with water supplies without creating significant water-related impacts onsite, in the Santa Clarita Valley and downstream in Ventura County. As a result of the information contained in the Revised Draft Additional Analysis, the Final Additional Analysis, the mitigation measures identified above, and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings, the Board finds that the magnitude of all water-related impacts are considered to be less than significant. Based on these findings and the information presented, the Board further finds that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the County's General Plan DMS requirements, as they relate to water supplies.

Because the Specific Plan applicant has secured water supplies that more than meet the water demands of the Specific Plan, implementation of the Specific Plan will not contribute to a decline in regional water supplies; therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan will not result in a significant cumulative water availability impact. In addition, cumulative water supplies exceed cumulative water demand; therefore, cumulative development (including the proposed Newhall Ranch Specific Plan) would not result in unavoidable significant cumulative impacts on Santa Clarita Valley water resources. As a result, cumulative mitigation measures are not

required. However, to ensure sufficient long-term water supplies for all cumulative development (including the proposed Specific Plan), the County's General Plan Development Monitoring System requires tentative map applications to show that water supplies are adequate to meet demand. The County's DMS regulatory requirements are consistent with the SB-221 and/or SB-610 analyses required for future Newhall Ranch subdivision map applications and project-specific tiered EIRs.

2.3 REVISED AND ADDITIONAL MITIGATION MEASURES AND ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In addition to the revised and additional mitigation measures above, the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the following revised and additional mitigation measures, all of which arose from the assessment conducted in the Final Additional Analysis, and in response to public comments and staff recommendations:

REVISED MITIGATION MEASURE - FLOOD (WATER QUALITY)

4.2-8. The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall comply with all appropriate requirements of the County of Los Angeles Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP") requirements, and comply with the SWRCB-issued General Permit for Construction Activity Storm Water (SWRCB Order 99-08-DWQ), as it may be amended from time to time or replaced by other applicable stormwater permits. ~~or demonstrate equivalency to these requirements.~~

NEW MITIGATION MEASURE - WATER RECLAMATION PLANT

5.0-52(b) The applicant shall initiate a request to the new County sanitation district formed for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site to adopt an ordinance prohibiting the installation and use of self-regenerating water softeners within the new sanitation district prior to connection of the first residential unit to the sanitary sewer system.

In addition to the revised and additional mitigation measures, the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the following conditions of approval recommended by staff and/or the Regional Planning Commission, all of which arose from the assessment conducted in the Final Additional Analysis, and in response to public comments:

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL - RECOMMENDED BY STAFF

(a) Require the applicant to submit a signed statement, filed concurrently with the filing of any departmental development application, obligating the applicant to disclose to the Department of Regional Planning the existence of any endangered or threatened species that are known or suspected to exist on the subject property.

(b) Require the applicant to report to the Department of Regional Planning the results of all on-site biological surveys within thirty (30) days after completion of the survey work.

(c) Require the applicant to schedule a consultation meeting between the Department of Regional Planning, the applicant and environmental consultant(s) to discuss the results of the survey work, and to ensure public disclosure of the survey results in the required environmental documentation for the proposed project.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL - RECOMMENDED BY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

(d) Clean sediment, periodically removed from debris basins within or outside the Specific Plan, may be placed into the Santa Clara River area as approved by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by DPW.

(e) Prior to approval of the first subdivision map which permits construction, a report will be provided by the applicant which evaluates methods to recharge the Saugus Aquifer within the Specific Plan, including the identification of appropriate candidate land areas for recharge. The report shall be subject to approval by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by DPW.

(f) All purchasers of homes within any subdivision in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are to be provided with a disclosure statement in the purchase/sales documentation making the purchaser(s) aware that the parking and storage of recreational vehicles on the purchased home/lot must satisfy the standards established by the County of Los Angeles and/or as contained in the Conditions Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs), whichever is more restrictive.

SECTION 3

FINDINGS REGARDING THE FINAL ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

This section contains findings regarding those environmental effects addressed in the Final Additional Analysis. The Final Additional Analysis does not identify any potentially significant impacts beyond those identified and mitigated above, and those addressed and mitigated in the partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR. CEQA only requires the County to make findings for environmental effects that are determined to be significant. *See*, Public Resources Code §21081; CEQA Guidelines §15091. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors is not required to make findings regarding those effects for which the Final Additional Analysis does not identify additional significant impacts. Nonetheless, the Board of Supervisors makes the following findings to summarize and substantiate its conclusion that, for those environmental effects that received further analysis in the Final Additional Analysis, no additional significant impacts have been identified.

Except as specified below, the following findings are not intended to amend or supercede the Board's prior, partially certified CEQA Findings. Rather, these findings supplement particular portions of those findings as a result of the additional information presented in the Final Additional Analysis. Some of these findings may supplement prior Board findings pertaining to unavoidable significant impacts or significant impacts mitigated to below a level of significance. Because these findings are limited to the issues addressed in the Final Additional Analysis, however, the Board of Supervisors makes those findings in the context of environmental impacts that are not significant and, therefore, need not be mitigated or overridden.

3.1 TRAFFIC ON VENTURA COUNTY ARTERIALS EXITING SR-126 AND SR-23

3.1.1 POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. The issue presented called for extending the traffic impact analysis that was used in the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR to evaluate Los Angeles County traffic impacts, to the project's impacts on Ventura County arterial roadways exiting State Routes 23 and 126 until the 1% impact standard is reached. Based on the Final Additional Analysis and record, the Board of Supervisors finds that implementation of the Specific Plan and WRP will not result in any significant project or cumulative impacts to traffic on Ventura County arterials exiting SR-126 and SR-23.

3.1.2 FINDING. Because no significant project or cumulative impacts to Ventura County arterials were identified, the County is not required to adopt one or more CEQA findings with regard to those impacts.

3.1.3 FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING. Traffic generated by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan will not cause a significant impact to arterial roadways in Ventura County exiting SR-126 and SR-23 using the one percent standard used to study impacts to Los Angeles County roadways in the Final EIR. It should be noted that the original Newhall Ranch Traffic Analysis contained in the Final EIR was prepared using traffic forecast data from the Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model (SCVCTM). This traffic-forecasting model was developed jointly by the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita to facilitate the analysis of transportation needs in the Santa Clarita Valley. The model was developed as a "windowed" model in which the Santa Clarita Valley study area was extracted as a window of the overall region. As a windowed model, the SCVCTM features only the land use and highway network within the Santa Clarita Valley and has a set of "cordons" which define the edges of the modeled area. These cordons are designated points on the highway network where regional traffic from outside the window enters and exits the modeled area. Since the time the original traffic study was conducted, the Ventura County Transportation Commission has prepared a long-range Ventura Countywide Traffic Model ("VCTM"). The VCTM is based on the regional land use database produced by the Southern California Association of Governments. The database contains land use information on existing and future development patterns for the five county Southern California region. Consequently, it is now possible to more accurately determine the Specific Plan's impacts to Ventura County arterial roadways.

The analysis contained in Section 2.1 of the Draft Additional Analysis demonstrates that the Specific Plan will not have a significant project or cumulative impact on any Ventura County arterial roadways exiting SR-126 or SR-23 (*i.e.*, a one percent or more contribution was not

exceeded). Therefore, the Specific Plan will not result in significant project or cumulative impacts to any arterial roads in Ventura County and no mitigation beyond that identified in the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR is required. Staff of the Ventura County Transportation Commission reviewed the traffic analysis in the Final Additional Analysis and indicated their concurrence with the significance conclusions reached. *See*, Draft Additional Analysis, **Appendix 2.1(a)**. In assessing both project and cumulative impacts to Ventura County arterial roadways exiting SR-126 or SR-23, the Board of Supervisors also considered traffic-related comments and responses, including comments to the effect that "cumulative" impacts were not assessed. Based on the traffic-related responses to those comments, the Board of Supervisors finds that the Final Additional Analysis, including Section 2.1, the relevant responses to comments and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings analyze both project and cumulative impacts to such roadways and that such analysis adequately addresses those impacts.

3.2 BIOTA

3.2.1 SALT CREEK CORRIDOR

3.2.1.1 POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. The issue presented called for a determination of the effect on the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek wildlife corridor caused by the shifting of wildlife into the Salt Creek corridor. Based on the Final Additional Analysis and record, the Board of Supervisors finds that implementation of the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant will not result in significant impacts to the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek wildlife movement corridor.

3.2.1.2 FINDING. Because no significant impacts to the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek wildlife movement corridor were identified, the County is not required to adopt one or more CEQA findings with regard to those impacts.

3.2.1.3 FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan will not significantly affect wildlife movement in the Salt Creek corridor. Wildlife movement within the Salt Creek watershed occurs primarily along the general direction of the drainages between the Santa Susana Mountains and the Santa Clara River Valley. These routes are used because they follow the gentlest topography and more open habitat. Wildlife movement between watersheds to the east and west are easiest at the upper and lower ends of the watersheds. At the lower ends, canyons merge in the Santa Clara River Valley and are generally flat with less steep ridges. At the upper ends of the watersheds, the ridgeline of the Santa Susana Mountains provides less steep connections to the upper reaches of the canyons and adjacent watersheds.

As part of the original approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors established a one-half mile wide buffer south of the Santa Clara River and a one-eighth of a mile buffer north of the river between all development proposed as part of the Specific Plan and the Los Angeles County/Ventura County jurisdictional line. Direct impacts to habitats in the Potrero Creek watershed in Los Angeles County from the proposed Specific Plan are important to the Salt Creek watershed. Habitat loss in the Potrero Creek watershed would potentially cause a shift in some wildlife populations to undisturbed habitats in the Salt Creek watershed in both Los Angeles County and Ventura County. Habitat losses in the Potrero Creek watershed would also potentially affect the long-term movement of wildlife within this

watershed and within the Salt Creek watershed in both Ventura County and Los Angeles County. However, no direct impacts to that portion of the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County would occur in association with the Specific Plan because no development is proposed in the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek corridor, and all development proposed as part of the Specific Plan would occur no closer than one-half mile to Ventura County.

It is also important to understand that the Specific Plan will build out over a 25 to 30 year period. Consequently, the displacement of wildlife species, primarily larger mammals, would occur incrementally over an extended period of time. These larger wildlife species (*e.g.*, mountain lion, deer, bobcat, and coyote) generally have home ranges that are not confined to one watershed, and would be expected to be displaced in relatively small numbers. In contrast, the smaller wildlife species will more likely suffer from direct mortality because of land development, and would not be displaced into adjacent watersheds. This time factor allows for a very gradual shift (*i.e.*, over a period of decades) of wildlife use/movement for those animals able to move a distance of more than one-half mile from the Specific Plan area in Los Angeles County to adjacent undeveloped areas, including the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County. These very gradual (and temporary) increases in wildlife use/movement in the Salt Creek watershed in both Los Angeles County and Ventura County would be easier to absorb with wildlife movement over several years (*i.e.*, the animals would have more time to adapt to the available resources or would have time to move out of the Salt Creek watershed to adjacent watersheds). Therefore, the direct impacts of habitat loss in the Specific Plan area on wildlife movement within the Salt Creek watershed, and particularly the Ventura County portion given its distance away from proposed development, is not considered significant. Nevertheless, the Board of Supervisors has imposed a condition requiring the applicant to work with the County's biologist to enhance and increase the effectiveness of animal movement protections within the Salt Creek wildlife corridor, including the possible use of fencing. For further information supporting the Board's findings, please refer to the Draft Additional Analysis, Section 2.2, relevant responses to comments and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings.

3.2.2 FLOODPLAIN MODIFICATIONS

3.2.2.1 POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. The issue presented called for the County to address the Specific Plan's impacts on biological resources in the Santa Clara River corridor associated with channelization, increased flow velocities and bank hardening. Based on the Final Additional Analysis and record, the Board of Supervisors finds that implementation of the Specific Plan and WRP will not result in any significant impacts on biological resources in the Santa Clara River corridor associated with channelization, increase flow velocities or bank hardening.

3.2.2.2 FINDING. Because no significant impacts relating to biological resources in the Santa Clara River corridor associated with channelization, increased flow velocities or bank hardening were identified, the County is not required to adopt one or more CEQA findings with regard to those impacts.

3.2.2.3 FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING. The drainage improvements proposed in connection with the Specific Plan would maintain the key hydraulic characteristics that largely determine the overall mosaic of habitats in the river. Development of the Specific Plan would

increase runoff from upland areas due to increased impervious surfaces (*e.g.*, pavement, roads, and buildings). The project identifies an effect out to a point about four miles downstream of the Specific Plan site in Ventura County. Beyond this point, however, the Specific Plan has no impacts on surface flows. The increase in runoff ranges from 3 percent for high flows to 7 percent for the 2-year flood event. For high frequency floods (2-year, 5-year, and 10-year), the proposed bank protection would not hinder flows or reduce the floodplain area. Instead, these flows would spread across the river channel, unaffected by the bank protection because the river would have sufficient width to allow these flows to meander and spread out further than they would under pre-project conditions.

It is only during more infrequent floods (20-year, 50-year and 100-year events) where flows would spread out to the buried bank stabilization (but not further based on the analysis in Section 2.3 of the Draft Additional Analysis). This would limit the area of the floodplain during these infrequent flood events, causing inundation over a smaller area because the bank protection will prevent flooding of formerly adjacent floodplain areas. However, the reduction in floodplain area caused by bank protection does not create a significant increase in overall velocities or water depth, because the volume of flow carried in these shallow, slow-moving areas along the margins of the river is small. Moreover, variations are localized and limited in scope, especially when viewed in the entirety of the river corridor within the Specific Plan site and downstream. Therefore, the overall mosaic of habitats in the river would be maintained because the key hydraulic characteristics would not be significantly different under the Specific Plan. Based on these results, the Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed bank protection and bridges associated with the Specific Plan would not cause significant changes to key hydraulic characteristics, and therefore, would not alter the amount and pattern of aquatic, wetland and riparian habitats in the river at the Specific Plan site and downstream in Ventura County. For further information supporting the Board's findings, please refer to the Draft Additional Analysis, Section 2.3, relevant responses to comments and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings.

3.3 SEA GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

3.3.1 POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. The County was directed to take action to ensure consistency of the Specific Plan with the County General Plan policies requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23. Based on the Final Additional Analysis and record, the Board of Supervisors finds that implementation of the Specific Plan and WRP will be consistent with General Plan policies regarding the protection of natural resources as those policies relate to SEA 23.

3.3.2 FINDING. Because no potential General Plan inconsistency was identified, the County is not required to adopt one or more CEQA findings with regard to a General Plan inconsistency.

3.3.3 FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING. The Specific Plan proposes to develop within the boundaries of existing SEA 23. Section 22.56.215(A)(1) of the County's Zoning Code requires that a conditional use permit be obtained prior to commencing such activities, and Section 22.56.215(F) requires the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed development conforms to the County's SEA "design compatibility criteria." The Board of Supervisors'

findings to the effect that the proposed development in the Specific Plan is consistent with the County's SEA design compatibility criteria, as it relates to existing SEA 23, and other relevant SEA policies, are found in the Board's findings on Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5). Those findings are incorporated by this reference and made a part of these Additional CEQA Findings.

SECTION 4

SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR identified a number of potentially significant cumulative impacts that could result from implementation of the Specific Plan and fully assessed whether the impacts were unavoidably significant or could be reduced to a level below significant through mitigation. Please see the Board of Supervisors' prior CEQA Findings, pages 125 to 149, for a discussion of each of those potential cumulative impacts and mitigation measures.

The Final Additional Analysis does not identify any potentially significant cumulative impacts that were not identified and fully addressed in the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR and, if necessary, overridden by the County in its Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Specific Plan. Therefore, no additional discussion of the Specific Plan's significant cumulative impacts is needed or required.

SECTION 5

FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires a lead agency to consider alternatives for a project that may result in significant impacts. (*See*, Public Resources Code §21002; CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(a).) With regard to the Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant, the Court specifically directed the County to consider a non-river site alternative. The Board of Supervisors makes the following findings in response to that direction.

5.1 ON-SITE NON-RIVER ALTERNATIVE

This section of the findings (Section 5.1) *replaces and supercedes* the discussion of the non-river location alternative contained in the Board of Supervisors' prior CEQA Findings, Section 4(B)(3), page 176.

The non-river alternative would entail constructing the Water Reclamation Plant at a location more removed from the Santa Clara River than the proposed location. It is expected that slightly less land would be required for the WRP under this alternative (approximately 9 acres compared to 15 acres under the proposed project because the non-river site is not as confined). The WRP would be at a slightly higher elevation and, therefore, would require some pumping, resulting in higher costs for construction, operation and maintenance, and higher energy costs. With the exception of those topics described below, all other environmental impacts associated with this alternative (such as traffic, *etc.*) are considered similar to those created by the proposed project and would merely be relocated to another site as a result of this alternative.

Development of the Water Reclamation Plant under this alternative would require the conversion of approximately 9 acres of prime farmland. Because construction of the Water Reclamation Plant on this alternative site would slightly decrease impacts to agricultural resources by approximately 0.5 acre, the Non-River Alternative is slightly superior to the proposed project from an agricultural resources perspective when considering only the plant itself. However, it should be noted that if the Water Reclamation Plant is not constructed on this alternative site, the 9 acres of agricultural land present on the alternative site would still be converted to residential land uses under the Specific Plan. Similarly, if the Water Reclamation Plant is constructed at this alternative site and not the proposed project site, the 9.5 acres of agricultural land on the proposed project site would still be converted to urban land uses (*i.e.*, Business Park). Under either the proposed project or this alternative site, all the agricultural land (18.5 acres) would be converted to urban uses regardless of the alternative site selected. Consequently, this alternative is not necessarily environmentally superior to the proposed project with respect to agricultural resource impacts.

From a biological perspective, implementation of this alternative would decrease the magnitude of impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, because the alternative site contains no sensitive habitats. This alternative would result in an increase in energy consumption because it would require a greater amount of energy to pump waste up grade to the treatment plant. A consequence of this increased energy consumption would be the generation of air emissions in amounts incrementally greater than under the proposed project.

This Alternative would be located immediately adjacent to planned Low-Medium Residential land uses, which are incompatible with a Water Reclamation Plant. Under the proposed project, the Water Reclamation Plant would not be located adjacent to incompatible land uses. Rather, it would be located adjacent to planned Business Park uses. With regard to noise generation and land use compatibility, therefore, the proposed project is environmentally superior to the Non-River Alternative. This alternative also would not meet as many of the Water Reclamation Plant siting criteria as the proposed project (*see*, Section 3.0, pp. 3.0-25-3.0-26).

The Board of Supervisors finds that, on balance, the Non-River Alternative is environmentally superior with regard to impacts on sensitive biological habitats, but is not environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to impacts to land use compatibility, noise generation, energy consumption and air quality. For further information regarding the On-Site Non-River alternative and other alternatives, the Board considered Section 3.0 of the Draft Additional Analysis, including **Tables 3.0-2** and **3.0-3**.

5.2 NEW ON-SITE ALTERNATIVE (REDUCED HABITAT IMPACTS)

A new alternative considered for the first time in the Final Additional Analysis is the On-Site Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts). This new alternative would entail constructing the Water Reclamation Plant in approximately the same location as the proposed project. However, the plant would be situated and arranged in a manner that would avoid permanent impacts to sensitive and non-sensitive riparian habitats.

This alternative would require less land than would the proposed project because the site is more constrained by its location in between the river and SR-126 than the proposed site. The site is more compressed in order to avoid permanent encroachment into riparian areas. While the proposed project would result in the conversion of approximately 15 acres of land in the proposed Business Park, this alternative would result in the conversion of approximately 14.3 acres of land. However, it should be noted that regardless of the alternative selected, all the land (either the 15 acres for the proposed project or 14.3 acres for this alternative configuration) would be converted to either WRP or Business Park uses. Excess wastewater not used for on-site irrigation purposes would still be discharged to the river. With the exception of biological and agricultural resources, all other environmental impacts associated with this alternative (such as traffic, air quality, *etc.*) are considered similar to those created by the proposed WRP and would merely be relocated to this different site configuration.

With respect to biological resources, implementation of this alternative would avoid the permanent conversion of approximately 5.5 acres of sensitive and non-sensitive riparian habitats when compared to the proposed project. This alternative would be constructed completely on agricultural and other disturbed land. However, it should be noted that in order to provide access for construction of and bank protection for the plant along the River, approximately 11 acres of riparian habitat area would be temporarily impacted and later revegetated in native species under the requirements of the Specific Plan. Consequently, from the perspective of permanent biological impacts to riparian habitat, this alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

However, with respect to agricultural resource impacts, the proposed project would convert 9.5 acres of prime farmland to WRP uses. In contrast, this alternative would result in the conversion of approximately 14.1 acres of prime farmland. However, it should be noted that if the WRP is not constructed on this alternative site, the 14.1 acres of agricultural land present on the alternative site would be converted to Business Park land uses under the Specific Plan. Similarly, if the WRP is constructed at this alternative site and not the proposed project site, the 9.5 acres of agricultural land on the proposed project site would still be converted to urban land uses (*i.e.*, Business Park). Consequently, under either the proposed project or this alternative site, all the agricultural land would be converted to urban uses regardless of the alternative selected. Consequently, from the perspective of agricultural resource impacts, this alternative is not necessarily environmentally superior to the proposed project.

Based on the Final Additional Analysis and the Newhall Ranch record of proceedings, the Board of Supervisors concludes that the On-Site Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts) alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project. Impacts in one environmental category would be less (*i.e.*, biological resources). All other impacts would be roughly equivalent. It should be noted that this alternative also meets the Water Reclamation Plant siting criteria to the same extent as the proposed project. The Board considered, among other things, the siting criteria analysis presented in the Draft Additional Analysis, Section 3.3.1, pages 3.0-2 to 3.0-4 and **Table 3.0-2**.

5.3 ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS (SPINEFLOWER/PLANT IMPACTS)

In addressing potential significant impacts of the Specific Plan on various environmental topics, including sensitive biological resources, the prior, partially certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR presented an analysis of a wide range of on- and off-site alternatives to the Specific Plan. Several of these alternatives focused specifically on reducing or eliminating the potential significant impacts of the Specific Plan on sensitive biological resources found on the Specific Plan site. During the litigation on the Newhall Ranch Final EIR, the project opponents argued that the analysis of alternatives presented in the EIR was inadequate. The Court did not agree and found that the alternatives analysis was legally adequate and complete under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

In keeping with CEQA's requirement that an EIR assess a range of reasonable alternatives to a project, and given the information regarding additional spineflower and other sensitive plants located on the Specific Plan site, and the potential for significant impacts to such plants, the Revised Draft Additional Analysis contains an expanded analysis of "Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative," and provides three additional alternatives to the Specific Plan that are intended to further address potentially significant impacts to the spineflower. These alternatives are referred to as "Alternative 7 – Spineflower Translocation Alternative," "Alternative 8 – Spineflower Avoidance Alternative I" and "Alternative 9 – Spineflower Avoidance Alternative II."

The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered both the existing and additional alternatives to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. (*See*, Revised Draft Additional Analysis, Section 2.7.) For the reasons identified in that section, these additional alternatives are rejected in favor of the Newhall Ranch mitigation program for the spineflower and other sensitive plant and animal species. On balance, the Board finds that the Newhall Ranch mitigation program, including the further mitigation provided through the Newhall/CDFG Conservation Easement and Agreement (*see*, **Topical Response 10**: Spineflower Mitigation Program and Additional Mitigation through Newhall/CDFG Conservation Easement and Agreement), is considered more favorable than the additional alternatives presented.

SECTION 6

FINDINGS REGARDING MITIGATION MEASURES

During the public review process for the Draft Additional Analysis, potential mitigation measures were suggested by the County of Ventura in response to the Specific Plan's impacts on the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek wildlife corridor. As noted in the Draft Additional Analysis, and in responses to comments, CEQA only requires findings regarding mitigation measures where a project may have a significant impact on the environment.

Nonetheless, the Board of Supervisors has reviewed the Final Additional Analysis, including the mitigation measures suggested by Ventura County and, based upon that review, has rejected the various suggested mitigation measures as unnecessary and infeasible. The basis for the Board's rejection of each of the suggested mitigation measures is presented below.

Ventura County's suggested mitigation involved a proposal to, among other things, remove irrigated agriculture from the Salt Creek watershed located in Ventura County, cattle grazing and any other activities deemed to be detrimental to wildlife or non-agricultural biological communities. These requirements would remain in effect until Ventura County approved a discretionary action that included all or part of the Salt Creek watershed in Ventura County. Ventura County suggested a qualified consultant or monitoring organization be appointed by Ventura County to make recommendations to the County of Ventura regarding management of the Salt Creek watershed.

Ventura County also suggested that management of the Salt Creek watershed within Ventura County be turned over to the same open space organization that would manage the High Country portion of Newhall Ranch. Ventura County further suggested that the management of the Salt Creek watershed include funds to be provided by the developer to develop and implement a "habitat enhancement plan" to increase the "biological carrying capacity" of the watershed, and to establish a "trust fund" adequate to maintain the watershed and the habitat enhancement plan into perpetuity. Finally, Ventura County requested that "development and monitoring" of the habitat plan be under the direction and approval of Ventura County.

In response to the mitigation measures suggested by Ventura County and other suggested mitigation measures and comments on the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR, the Specific Plan was revised at the direction of both the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and the Regional Planning Commission to reduce its impacts to biological/animal movement resources. Pursuant to these revisions, the Specific Plan's development footprint was reduced by approximately 210 acres, which, in turn, reduced the amount of habitat area that would be directly impacted by the Specific Plan.

The most noteworthy revisions from a biological perspective included: (1) creation of a one-half mile-wide set back along the Los Angeles County/Ventura County line, thereby increasing the width of the Salt Creek Corridor adjacent to Ventura County; (2) removal of development adjacent to Ventura County north of SR-126 by creating a 1/8-mile-wide Open Area and reducing the number of planned units in the nearest Low Medium and Estate residential areas; (3) replacement of all Low and Low-Medium Residential housing with Estate Residential housing on average lot sizes of 2.5 acres in all areas adjacent to the High Country Special Management Area (SMA)/SEA 20; and (4) removal of the 15 Estate Residential housing units from the High Country SMA/SEA 20 (required by the Regional Planning Commission).

The setback of development from the Los Angeles County/Ventura County line and the increased width of the Salt Creek Corridor create a continuous one-half mile-wide connection between the River Corridor SMA (Santa Clara River/SEA 23) and the High Country SMA/SEA 20. While wildlife would have continued the use of the Salt Creek Corridor in both Los Angeles County and Ventura County under the originally proposed Land Use Plan, the revised Specific Plan provides a substantially wider corridor connection between the River Corridor and the High Country in Los Angeles County.

The replacement of all Low and Low-Medium Residential housing with Estate Residential housing on average lot sizes of 2.5 acres in all areas adjacent to the High Country SMA/SEA 20, and the removal of the 15 Estate Residential housing units from the High Country

SMA/SEA 20, creates a transition from higher density development proposed in Oak Valley and Potrero Valley to the High Country SMA/SEA 20. These revisions also reduce the magnitude of potential indirect impacts caused by the presence of humans and domestic animals, lighting and the potential planting of exotic, invasive plant species.

In addition to the specified revisions, additional existing (secondary) open space connections were incorporated into the design of the Specific Plan. The Long Canyon corridor and the Sawtooth Ridge and Lion Canyon corridors occur in Long Canyon Village and The Mesas, respectively.

After implementation of the Specific Plan revisions and design features discussed above, the mitigation measures suggested by Ventura County are unnecessary to protect the Salt Creek corridor in Ventura County. Development of the Ventura County portion of the corridor would likely degrade the creek's ability to function as a movement corridor; however, because the Specific Plan does not propose development in the Ventura County portion of the corridor and no other development activity has been proposed there, and because the Specific Plan incorporates a one-half mile-wide setback from the County line, which will allow for animal movement between the River and the High Country in Los Angeles County, and because many other connections similar to Salt Creek occur along the 35-mile wide interface area, no significant impact would occur due to implementation of the Specific Plan. Therefore, no mitigation is required in the Salt Creek corridor in Ventura County. Nevertheless, the Board of Supervisors has imposed a condition requiring the applicant to work with the County's biologist to enhance and increase the effectiveness of animal movement protections within the Salt Creek wildlife corridor, including the possible use of fencing.

Mitigation measures designed to enhance the Salt Creek corridor and the High Country SMA are proposed in Los Angeles County on the Specific Plan site because that is where development is proposed. Nothing about the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan proposal would change the limits of the existing, active movement corridor in Ventura County or cause it to function differently.

Even if implementation of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan were anticipated to result in significant impacts to the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek corridor (and it is not), Los Angeles County would not be required to incorporate the mitigation measures suggested by Ventura County because the suggested mitigation is not feasible. A finding that a proposed mitigation measure is not feasible can be based on *legal* infeasibility. *See*, *Concerned Citizens of South Central Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School District* (1994) 24 Cal.App.4th 826, 842; *Kenneth Mebane Ranches v. Superior Court* (1992) 10 Cal.App.4th 276, 291-292. The mitigation measures proposed by Ventura County are legally infeasible because Los Angeles County does not have the authority to impose such measures on property outside of its jurisdictional boundaries, absent agreement or consent by a project applicant.

In mitigating significant environmental effects, public agencies may exercise only those express or implied powers provided by law other than CEQA. *See*, *e.g.*, Pub.Res.Code Sections 21002, 21004; CEQA Guidelines Section 15040(b); *Concerned Citizens, supra,* at 842; and *Kenneth Mebane Ranches, supra,* at 291. CEQA, by itself, does not confer independent authority on public agencies, nor does it expand the authority granted by other laws to those

agencies. When public agencies adopt measures to mitigate significant environmental effects, agencies may exercise only those express or implied powers provided by law other than CEQA, and the actions of those agencies must be consistent with express or implied limitations on the agencies' authority found in other laws.

Because Los Angeles County has no authority which permits it to impose conditions on the Salt Creek corridor in Ventura County, the mitigation measures proposed by Ventura County are not feasible. Consequently, even if implementation of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan would result in significant impacts to the Salt Creek corridor in Ventura County (and the Board of Supervisors finds that it will not), Los Angeles County's decision not to impose the extra-jurisdictional mitigation measures suggested by Ventura County would not constitute a CEQA violation.

In conclusion, the analysis presented in the Final Additional Analysis indicates that no significant impacts would occur in Ventura County as a result of Specific Plan implementation, and there is no indication that the portion of the Salt Creek corridor in Ventura County would be significantly impacted by an increase in animal movement. Consequently, the corridor would continue to function largely as it does today. It is for these reasons that the suggested mitigation measures are not necessary. Even if the suggested mitigation measures were necessary, however, they are not legally feasible; therefore, under CEQA, Los Angeles County would not be required to incorporate the measures as part of its approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

These findings are intended to address mitigation measures suggested by various commentators during the public comment period on the Draft Additional Analysis, and which were rejected. In addition, to the extent that other mitigation measures have not been discussed in these findings, but were rejected in responses to comments on the Draft Additional Analysis and Final Additional Analysis, the Board of Supervisors hereby expressly rejects those mitigation measures as infeasible for the reasons discussed in the Final Additional Analysis (as defined above).

SECTION 7

FINDINGS REGARDING REVISED MITIGATION MONITORING PLANS

As required by Public Resources Code §21081.6, the Board of Supervisors, in adopting these findings, also adopts revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, as prepared by the environmental consultant under the County's direction. These plans are designed to ensure that, during project implementation, the County, and other responsible parties will comply with the mitigation measures adopted in these findings.

The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plans, which are incorporated by reference and attached as **Attachment A** to these findings, meet the requirements of Public Resources Code §21086 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potential environmental effects of both the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant. In addition, the Board finds that the revised Mitigation

Monitoring Plans include new and revised mitigation measures, based on the assessment presented in the Final Additional Analysis.

SECTION 8

SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

At page 189 of the Board's prior CEQA Findings, the Board of Supervisors previously made the findings required by Sections 15091 and 15092 of the State CEQA Guidelines. In connection with the Final Additional Analysis, the Board hereby makes the required findings provided in those sections of the CEQA Guidelines.

SECTION 9

SECTION 21082.1(c)(1), (2) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code §§21082.1(c)(1), (2), the Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the County, through its staff, Regional Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final Additional Analysis, as required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and that the Final Additional Analysis reflects the County's independent judgment as the lead agency for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant.

SECTION 10

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

In the Board of Supervisors' prior CEQA Findings, the Board previously found that implementation of the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant would result in certain project-specific and cumulative significant environmental impacts. The Board found that, with implementation of mitigation, many of those impacts could be reduced to a level below significant. However, the Board also found that, for some of the identified impacts, implementation of mitigation would reduce the impacts, but that the mitigation could not reduce the impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, having balanced the benefits of the project against the project's potential unavoidable significant impacts, the Board determined that the benefits of the project outweigh the potential unavoidable significant impacts and that those impacts are nevertheless "acceptable," based on certain Overriding Considerations specified at pages 190 to 196 of the Board's prior CEQA Findings.

The Final Additional Analysis does not identify any unmitigated significant environmental impacts. Therefore, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is not required for the Additional Analysis. Nevertheless, the Board of Supervisors hereby reconsiders and readopts its prior Statement of Overriding Considerations for all the applicable reasons stated on pages 190 to 196 of the Board's prior CEQA Findings. A copy of the previously adopted Statement of Overriding Considerations is attached as **Attachment B** for review by both the Board and the public.

MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
(Newhall Ranch Specific Plan)

INTRODUCTION The Mitigation Monitoring Program describes the procedures the applicant and others will use to implement the mitigation measures adopted in connection with the approval of the Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant and the methods of monitoring such actions. A Monitoring Program is necessary only for impacts which would be significant if not mitigated. The following consists of a monitoring program table noting the responsible agency for mitigation monitoring, the schedule and a list of all Specific Plan-related mitigation measures.

PURPOSE *The Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) has been prepared in conformance with Section 21081.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act. It is the intent of this program to (1) verify satisfaction of the required mitigation measures of the EIR; (2) provide a methodology to document implementation of the required mitigation; (3) provide a record of the Monitoring Program; (4) identify monitoring responsibility; (5) establish administrative procedures for the clearance of mitigation measures; (6) establish the frequency and duration of monitoring; and (7) utilize existing review processes wherever feasible.*

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES			
4.1-1. The standard building setbacks from ascending and descending man-made slopes are to be followed in accordance with Section 1806.4 of the Los Angeles County Building Code, unless superseded by specific geologic and/or soils engineering evaluations. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 44)	Applicant (Civil Engineer, Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist)	Building and Grading Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, and Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety and Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits

ACOE - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CIWMB - California Integrated Waste Management Board
CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
FCD - Flood Control Division
LACDRP - Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District
CPUC - California Public Utilities Commission
CNLM - Center for Natural Lands Management
RWQCBLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
USFWS - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-2. The existing Grading Ordinance for planting and irrigation of cut-slopes and fill slopes is to be adhered to for grading operations within the project site. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 44)	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
4.1-3. In order to safeguard against major seismic-related structural failures, all buildings within the project boundaries are to be constructed in conformance with the Los Angeles County Uniform Building Code, as applicable.	Applicant (Project Structural Engineer)	Building Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits
MITIGATION FOR GEOLOGIC HAZARDS			
4.1-4. The location and dimensions of the exploratory trenches and borings undertaken by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. and R.T. Frankian & Associates are to be noted on all grading plans relative to future building plans, unless the trenches and/or borings are removed by future grading operations. If future foundations traverse the trenches or borings, they are to be reviewed and approved by the project Geotechnical Engineer. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 45)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans; grading
4.1-5. Wherever the Pacoima Formation is exposed, it may be potentially expansive; therefore, it is to be tested by the project Soils Engineer at the grading plan stage to determine its engineering characteristics and mitigation requirements, as necessary.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-6. Should any expansive soils be encountered during grading operations, they are not to be placed nearer the finished surface than 8 feet below the bottom of the subgrade elevation. This depth is subject to revision depending upon the expansive potential measured during grading. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer) Grading Contractor	Field Investigation	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-7. If expansive materials are encountered at subgrade elevation in cut areas, the soils are to be removed to a depth of 8 feet below the "finished" or "subgrade" surface and the excavated area backfilled with nonexpansive, properly compacted soils. This depth is subject to revision depending upon the expansive potential measured during grading. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Investigation	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. During Grading
4.1-8. At the time of subdivision, which allows construction, areas subject to liquefaction are to be mitigated to the satisfaction of the project Geotechnical Engineer prior to site development. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit(s)
4.1-9. Subdrains are to be placed in areas of high ground water conditions (Potrero Canyon, in particular) or wherever extensive irrigation is planned. The systems are to be designed to the specifications of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit and Verify During Grading
4.1-10. Subdrains are to be placed in the major and minor canyon fills, behind stabilization blankets, buttress fills, and retaining walls, and as required by the Geotechnical Engineer during grading operations. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit and Verify During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-11. Canyon subdrains may be installed in "V"-ditches or in a rectangular trench excavated to expose competent material or bedrock as approved by the Geotechnical Engineer.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit and Verify During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-12. The vertical spacing of subdrains behind buttress fills, stabilization blankets, etc., are to be a maximum of 15 feet. The gradient is to be at least 2 percent to the discharge end. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit and Verify During Grading
4.1-13. Geological materials subject to hydroconsolidation (containing significant void space) are to be removed prior to the placement of fill. Specific recommendations relative to hydroconsolidation are to be provided by the project Geotechnical Engineer at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 44)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Receipt of Specific Hydro-consolidation Recommend-ations Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans and Verify During Grading
4.1-14. Proposed structures on ridgelines will have a minimum 20-foot horizontal setback from the margin of the bedrocks to prevent perched or ground water levels where relatively impermeable materials can block downward migration.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, and Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify during Grading
4.1-15. Subsurface exploration is required to delineate the depth and lateral extent of the landslides shown on the geologic map. This work shall be undertaken at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 15) Landslides must be mitigated through stabilization, removal, and/or building setbacks as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer, and to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Receipt of Exploratory Data and Mitigation Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plan and Verify During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-16. At the subdivision stage, the existence of landslides designated with "3" on **Figure 4.1-2, Existing Landslide Areas**, and within or adjacent to the development area is to be confirmed. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994,p. 15) If landslides are confirmed in these areas, they are to be mitigated through stabilization, removal, and/or building setbacks as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plan and Verify During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-17. The existence, or lack thereof, of landslides on or adjacent to the roadway alignments for the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Boulevard will be evaluated by subsurface investigations at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, p. 11) If landslides are confirmed in these areas, they are to be mitigated through stabilization, removal, and/or building setbacks as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plan and Verify During Grading
4.1-18. The potential hazards associated with debris flow scars and other possible surficial failures located in proximity to the roadway alignments for the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Boulevard will be evaluated at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, p. 11) These areas are to be mitigated as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plan and Verify During Grading
4.1-19. Remove debris from surficial failures during grading operations prior to the placement of fill. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 16)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. During Grading Operations
4.1-20. All soils and/or unconsolidated slopewash and landslide debris is to be removed prior to the placement of compacted fills. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 45)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to approval of Final Grading Plan and During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-21. Cut-slopes, which will expose landslide material, are to undergo geologic and geotechnical evaluation at the subdivision stage to determine their stability and degree of consolidation. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 15) Several options are available to mitigate potential landslide failure in the proposed cut-slopes. Landslides may be stabilized with buttress fills or shear keys designed by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer; landslide material can be entirely removed and replaced with a stability fill; or the slope can be redesigned to avoid the landslide. Landslides underlying cut pad or road areas may be removed or partially removed if the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer conclude that the landslide is stable and sufficiently consolidated to build on. Landslides located on ascending natural slopes above proposed graded areas will also require evaluation for stability. Unstable landslides on natural slopes above graded areas will either require stabilization, removal or building setbacks to mitigate potential hazards.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plan and During Grading
4.1-22. Additional geologic investigations are required prior to approval of future tentative maps which allow construction, or grading plans to determine the geologic and geotechnical feasibility of the fifteen (15) lots proposed in the High Country SMA.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Tentative Maps for the 15 Estate Residential Lots
4.1-23. Prior to construction of the road embankment located within landslide Qls II, a compacted fill shear key will be constructed at the property boundary. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, p. 6)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, and Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Construction of the Road Embankment and Verify During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-24. Landslides, which will not affect the proposed grading concept, are to be placed in Restricted Use Areas on the Final Maps. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 43)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-25. Surficial stability of cut-slopes designated with a "G" are to be fully evaluated at the subdivision stage, due to the possibility of wedge failures or surficial material in the slope. Corrective grading measures are to be presented in detail as mitigation at both the subdivision and Grading Plan stages of development. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, pp. 17, 43)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans and During Grading
4.1-26. Cut slopes designated as "P" are potentially unstable and are to be fully evaluated at the subdivision stage to ascertain whether they are stable as designed. Corrective grading measures are to be presented in detail as mitigation at both the subdivision and Grading Plan stages of development. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, pp. 17, 43)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans and During Grading
4.1-27. Cut-slopes designated with a "U" are to be further investigated at the subdivision stage to confirm underlying geologic conditions and slope stability. Corrective grading measures are to be presented in detail as mitigation at both the subdivision and Grading Plan stages of development. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, pp. 17, 43)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans and During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-28. Cut-slopes associated with the construction of the proposed extensions of Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Boulevard are to be further investigated at the subdivision stage to confirm the underlying geologic conditions and slope stability. Corrective measures are to be required if it is determined that the cut-slopes will not be stable. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, pp. 11 & 12) According to Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., unstable cut-slopes can either be redesigned or stabilized using various corrective grading techniques. Redesign options for unstable cut-slopes include reorientation, relocation and reducing the proposed slope gradient. Options for corrective grading include the construction of buttress fills, stability fills, shear keys, and complete removal of the landslide material.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans and During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-29. Orientations of the bedrock attitudes are to be evaluated by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Engineering Geologist to identify locations of required buttress fills. Buttress fill design and recommendations, if necessary, are to be presented as mitigation during the grading plan stage. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans
4.1-30. All fills, unless otherwise specifically designed, are to be compacted to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry unit weight as determined by ASTM Designation D 1557-91 Method of Soil Compaction. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. During Grading
4.1-31. No fill is to be placed until the area to receive the fill has been adequately prepared and approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-32. Fill soils are to be kept free of all debris and organic material. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-33. Rocks or hard fragments larger than 8 inches are not to be placed in the fill without approval of the Geotechnical Engineer, and in a manner specified for each occurrence. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-34. Rock fragments larger than 8 inches are not to be placed within 10 feet of finished pad grade or the subgrade of roadways or within 15 feet of a slope face. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-35. Rock fragments larger than 8 inches may be placed in windrows, below the limits given above, provided the windrows are spaced at least 5 feet vertically and 15 feet horizontally. Granular soil must be flooded around windrows to fill voids between the rock fragments. The granular soil is to be wheel rolled to assure compaction. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-36. The fill material is to be placed in layers which, when compacted, is not to exceed 8 inches per layer. Each layer is to be spread evenly and is to be thoroughly mixed during the spreading to insure uniformity of material and moisture. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-37. When moisture content of the fill material is too low to obtain adequate compaction, water is to be added and thoroughly dispersed until the soil is approximately 2 percent over optimum moisture content. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-38. When the moisture content of the fill material is too high to obtain adequate compaction, the fill material is to be aerated by blading or other satisfactory methods until the soil is approximately two percent over optimum moisture content. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-39. Where fills toe out on a natural slope or surface, a keyway, with a minimum width of 16 feet and extending at least 3 feet into firm, natural soil, is to be cut at the toe of the fill. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-40. Where the fills toe out on a natural or cut slope and the natural or cut slope is steeper than 5 horizontal to 1 vertical, a drainage bench with a width of at least 8 feet is to be established at the toe of the fill. Fills may be placed over cut slopes if the visible contact between the fill and cut is steeper than 45 degrees. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-41. When placing fills over slopes, sidewall benching is to extend into competent material, approved by the Geotechnical Engineer, with vertical benches not less than 4 feet. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I) Competent material is defined as being free of loose soil, heavy fracturing or compressive soils.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-42. When constructing fill slopes, the grading contractor is to avoid spillage of loose material down the face of the slope during the dumping and compacting operations. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-43. The outer faces of fill slopes are to be compacted by backing a sheepsfoot compactor over the top of the slope, and thoroughly covering all of the slope surface with overlapping passes of the compactor. Compaction of the slope is to be repeated after each 4 feet of fill has been placed. The required compaction must be obtained prior to placement of additional fill. As an alternate, the slope can be overbuilt and cut back to expose a compacted core. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-44. All artificial fill associated with past petroleum activities as well as other existing artificial fill, are to be evaluated by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer at the subdivision and/or Grading Plan Stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, 19 September 1994, Inc., p. 45) Unstable fills are to be mitigated through removal, stabilization, or other means as determined by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Geotechnical Engineer.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Receipt of Geotechnical Evaluation Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Approval of Final Subdivision Maps or Grading Plans, and Verify During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-45. Surface runoff from the future graded areas is not to run over any natural, cut, or fill slopes. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20)	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Include this Measure in Specifications Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-46. Runoff from future pads and structures is to be collected and channeled to the street and/or natural drainage courses via non-erosive drainage devices. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20)	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Include this Measure in Specifications Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-47. Water is not to stand or pond anywhere on the graded pads. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20)	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Include this Measure in Specifications Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading
4.1-48. Oil and water wells that might occur on site are to be abandoned in accordance with State and local regulations. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 45)	Applicant (Well abandonment Specialist)	Receipt of Confirmation of Abandonment	1. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits
4.1-49. If any leaking or undocumented oil wells are encountered during grading operations, their locations are to be surveyed and the current well conditions evaluated immediately. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 21) Measures are to be taken to document the wells, abandonment, and remediate the well sites (if necessary) in accordance with State and local regulations.)	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Well Abandonment Specialist)	Include Measure in Specifications Field Documentation	1. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas, Building and Safety 2. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas, Building and Safety 3. During Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-50. The exact status and location of the Exxon (Newhall Land & Farming) oil well #31 will be evaluated at the subdivision stage. If necessary, the well will be abandoned in accordance with State and local regulations. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, p. 12)	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Well Abandonment Specialist)	Locate Well #31 on Tract Map Documentation of Abandonment, if applicable	1. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas, Building and Safety 2. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
MITIGATION FOR SEISMIC HAZARDS			
4.1-51. Survey control will be required to precisely locate the Salt Creek and Del Valle Faults at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 33)	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Receipt of Geotechnical Documentation	1. LACDPW, Geology Section 2. LACDPW, Geology Section 3. Prior to Tract Map/Site Plan Approvals as Applicable
4.1-52. Additional subsurface trenching will be performed within the Holser Structural Zone on Newhall Ranch during the subdivision stage to evaluate its existence. Within Potrero Canyon, additional subsurface evaluation will be performed during the subdivision stage to confirm that nontectonic alluvial movement was the cause of surface ground cracking during the January 17, 1994 earthquake, and to evaluate the potential for shallow-depth faults. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. 19 September 1994, p. 42, as revised above)	Applicant (Engineering Geologist)	Receipt of Geotechnical Documentation	1. LACDPW, Geology Section 2. LACDPW, Geology Section 3. Prior to Tract Map/Site Plan Approvals as Applicable
No distinct evidence for Holocene activity on any of the faults traversing the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site was observed during Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc.'s investigation; however, based on the distinct nature of faulting, the possible association of minor seismic activity, and compatible orientation of the faulting in relation to the current stress regime of the Transverse Ranges, preliminary Building Setback Zones have been designated around the mapped fault zones (see **Figure 4.1-4)**.			
4.1-53. Precise Building Setback Zones for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site are to be defined at the subdivision stage.	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Setback Zones Identified on Tract Maps/Site Plans	1. LACDPW, Geology Section, and Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology Section, and Building and Safety 3. Prior to Tract Map and Site Plan and Final Map Approvals, as Applicable

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1-54. Due to the potential activity of the Salt Creek and Del Valle Faults, site development is to remain outside of Building Setback Zones around fault traces, and the possible fault zone connecting them (see **Figure 4.1-4**). (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 42)	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Engineering Geologist)	Setback Zones Identified on Tract Maps/Site Plans	1. LACDPW, Geology Section, and Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology Section, and Building and Safety 3. Prior to Tract Map/Site Plan/Final Map Approvals, as Applicable

The zone shown around the possible fault connecting the Del Valle and Salt Creek Faults may be deleted if future work shows that this fault segment does not exist.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOIL RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.1-55. To minimize potential hazards from shattered ridge effects, structures and storage tanks proposed on ridgelines are to have a minimum 20 foot setback from the margins of the bedrock. Designation of specific building setbacks will require evaluation at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 40) Building setback zones are to be identified on all site plans and tract maps for the site.	Applicant (Engineering Geologist)	Setback Zones Identified on Tract Maps/Site Plans	1. LACDPW, Geology Section, and Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology Section, and Building and Safety 3. Prior to Tract Map/Site Plan Approvals, as Applicable
4.1-56. The potential for ground motion and ground failure associated with a seismic event in proximity to the planned roadway alignments of Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Boulevard will be evaluated at the subdivision stage. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 13 December 1995, p. 11) Mitigation to reduce associated significant impacts will also be identified at that time.	Applicant (Engineering Geologist)	Receipt of Geotechnical Report and Mitigation	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, and Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section, and Building and Safety 3. Prior to Final Map Approval

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.2 FLOOD			
4.2-1. All on- and off-site flood control improvements necessary to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are to be constructed to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Flood Control Division.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Approval of Drainage Plans Field Verification	1. LACDPW, FCD 2. LACDPW, FCD 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permit(s)
4.2-2. All necessary permits or letters of exemption from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for Specific Plan-related development are to be obtained prior to construction of drainage improvements. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.6, Biological Resources, **Mitigation Measures 4.6-1** through **4.6-10** (restoration) and **4.6-11** through **4.6-16** (enhancement).	Applicant	Receipt of all Necessary Permit(s)	1. ACOE, USFWS, CDFG, RWQCBLAR 2. ACOE, USFWS, CDFG, RWQCBLAR 3. Prior to Grading
4.2-3. All necessary streambed agreement(s) are to be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game wherever grading activities alter the flow of streams under CDFG jurisdiction. The performance criteria to be used in conjunction with 1603 agreements and/or 404 permits are described in Section 4.6, Biological Resources, **Mitigation Measures 4.6-1** through **4.6-10** (restoration) and **4.6-11** through **4.6-16** (enhancement).	Applicant	Receipt of Streambed Agreements	1. CDFG 2. LACDPW, FCD 3. Prior to Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.2-4. Conditional Letters of Map Revision (CLOMR) relative to adjustments to the 100-year FIA flood plain are to be obtained by the applicant after the proposed drainage facilities are constructed.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Receipt of CLOMR(s)	1. Federal Insurance Administration 2. LACDPW 3. Upon Completion of Facilities
4.2-5. Prior to the approval and recordation of each subdivision map, a Hydrology Plan, Drainage Plan, and Grading Plan (including an Erosion Control Plan if required) for each subdivision must be prepared by the applicant of the subdivision map to ensure that no significant erosion, sedimentation, or flooding impacts would occur during or after site development. These plans shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Approval of Final Hydrology Plan, Final Drainage Plan, and Final Grading Plan	1. LACDPW, FCD and Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, FCD and Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Recording of Each Subdivision Map
4.2-6. Install permanent erosion control measures, such as desilting and debris basins, drainage swales, slope drains, storm drain inlet/outlet protection, and sediment traps in order to prevent sediment and debris from the upper reaches of the drainage areas which occur on the Newhall Ranch site from entering storm drainage improvements. These erosion control measures shall be installed to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, FCD 2. LACDPW, FCD 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
4.2 FLOOD (cont.)			
4.2-7. The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall satisfy all applicable requirements of the NPDES Program in effect in Los Angeles County to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. These requirements currently include preparation of an Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (USWMP) containing design features and Best Management Practices (BMPs) appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. In addition, the requirements currently include preparation of a Storm Water Management Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works shall monitor compliance with those NPDES requirements.	Applicant (Construction Superintendent)	Submittal of USWMP and SWPPP to RWQCBLAR Field Verification	1. RWQCBLAR 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Grading and During Grading Operations

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.2-8. The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall comply with all appropriate requirements of the County of Los Angeles Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP") requirements, and comply with the SWRCB-issued General Permit for Construction Activity Storm Water (SWRCB Order 99-08-DWQ), as it may be amended from time to time or replaced by other applicable stormwater permits. ~~or demonstrate equivalency to these requirements.~~	Applicant (Construction Superintendent)	Submittal of SUSMP to LACDPW Field Verification	1. LACDPW, FCD 2. LACDPW, FCD 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.3 CULTURAL/PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
The following mitigation measures are derived from the Los Angeles County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines for paleontological resources and Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines for the protection of cultural resources. Both documents require that reasonable efforts be made to reduce significant impacts on cultural resources to levels below identified thresholds of significance:			
4.3-1. Any adverse impacts to California-LAN-2133, -2235, and the northern portion of -2233 are to be mitigated by avoidance and preservation. Should preservation of these sites be infeasible, a Phase III data recovery (salvage excavation) operation is to be completed on the sites so affected, with archaeological monitoring of grading to occur during subsequent soils removals on the site. This will serve to collect and preserve the scientific information contained therein, thereby mitigating all significant impacts to the affected cultural resource.	Applicant (Archaeologist)	Qualified Archaeologist Present During Grading Activities of Sites	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and During Grading Activities, as appropriate
4.3-2. Any significant effects to California-LAN-2241 are to be mitigated through site avoidance and preservation. Should this prove infeasible, an effort is to be made to relocate, analyze and re-inter the disturbed burial at some more appropriate and environmentally secure locale within the region.	Applicant (Archaeologist)	Qualified Archaeologist Present During Grading Activities of site if not located before	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and During Grading Activities, as appropriate
4.3-3. In the unlikely event that additional artifacts are found during grading within the development area or future roadway extensions, an archaeologist will be notified to stabilize, recover and evaluate such finds.	Applicant (Archaeologist)	Include this Measure in Subdivision Map Conditions if appropriate	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Tentative Map Processing

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.3-4. As part of an inspection testing program, a Los Angeles County Natural History Museum-approved inspector is to be on site during an appropriate number of excavations into the Pico Formation, Saugus Formation, Quaternary Terrace Deposits, and Quaternary Older Alluvium. Should the excavations yield significant paleontological resources, excavation is to be stopped or redirected until the extent of the find is established and the resources are salvaged.	Applicant (Archaeologist)	LA County Natural History Museum-Approved Inspector Present During Grading Activities	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading Activities in the Pico Formation, Saugus Formation, Quaternary Terrace Deposits, and Quaternary Older Alluvium
4.4 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES			
4.4-1. Purchasers of homes located within 1,500 feet of an agricultural field or grazing area are to be informed of the location and potential effects of farming uses prior to the close of escrow.	Applicant	Include this Information in CC&Rs	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. At Home Sales
4.4-2. New homes within 1,500 feet of farming uses within Ventura County, if any, are to be informed that agricultural activities within Ventura County are protected under the County's right-to-farm ordinance, and are to be provided with copies of the County's Amended Ordinance 3730-5/7/85.	Applicant	Include this Information in CC&Rs	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. At Home Sales

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.5 ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY			
4.5-1. All final school locations are to comply with the California State Board of Education requirement that no schools be sited within 100 feet from the edge of the right-of-way of 100-110 kV lines; 150 feet from 220-230 kV lines; and 250 feet from 345 kV lines.	Applicant	Tentative Tract Map Review	1. State Board of Education 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Tract Maps
4.5-2. Only non-habitable structures shall be located within SCE easements.	Applicant	Tentative Tract Map Review	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Tract Maps
4.5-3. Prior to issuance of grading permits, all abandoned oil and natural gas-related sites must be remediated to the satisfaction of the California Department of Oil and Gas, the Los Angeles County Hazardous Materials Control Program, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles region).	Applicant/On-Site Oil and Natural Gas Producers	Confirmation that Oil- and Natural Gas-Related Sites are Satisfactorily Remediated	1. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas; LA County Hazardous Materials Control Program; SCAQMD; and RWQCBLAR 2. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas; LA County Hazardous Materials Control Program; SCAQMD; and RWQCBLAR 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.5-4. All on-going oil and natural gas operational sites adjacent to or in close proximity to residential, mixed-use, commercial, business park, schools, and local and Community Parks shall be secured by fencing and emergency access to these locations shall be provided.	Applicant/On-Site Oil and Natural Gas Producers	Field Verification	1. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety Department 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits
4.5-5. The Specific Plan is to meet the requirements of SCGC in terms of pipeline relocation, grading in the vicinity of gas mains, and development within Southern California Gas Company easements. These requirements would be explicitly defined by SCGC at the future tentative map stage.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1. SCGC 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Approval of Grading Plan

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.5 ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY (cont.)			
4.5-6. All potential buyers or tenants of property in the vicinity of Southern California Gas Company transmission lines are to be made aware of the line's presence in order to assure that no permanent construction or grading occurs over and within the vicinity of the high-pressure gas mains.	Applicant	Include this Information in CC&Rs	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. At Home Sales
4.5-7. In accordance with the provisions of the Los Angeles County Building Code, Section 308(d), all buildings and enclosed structures that would be constructed within the Specific Plan located within 25 feet of oil or gas wells shall be provided with methane gas protection systems. Buildings located between 25 feet and 200 feet of oil or gas wells shall, prior to the issuance of building permits by the County of Los Angeles, be evaluated in accordance with the current rules and regulations of the State of California Division of Oil and Gas.	Applicant (Building Contractors)	Include this Requirement in Building Specifications Field Verification	1. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas and LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
4.5-8. In accordance with the provisions of the Los Angeles County Building Code, Section 308(c), all buildings and structures located within 1,000 feet of a landfill containing decomposable material (in this case the Chiquito Canyon Landfill) shall be provided with a landfill gas migration protection and/or control system.	Applicant (Building Contractors)	Include this Requirement in Building Specifications Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
4.5-9. In accordance with the provisions of the Los Angeles County Code, Title 11, Division 4, Underground Storage of Hazardous Materials regulations, the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works shall review, prior to the issuance of building permits by the County of Los Angeles, any plans for underground hazardous materials storage facilities (e.g., gasoline) that may be constructed or installed within the Specific Plan.	Applicant (Building Contractors)	Include this Requirement in Building Specifications Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

4.6 BIOTA

Development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan will result in impacts to biological resources, some of which are considered to be significant. However, the Specific Plan generally avoids areas of highest biological value, and concentrates development in lower quality areas. The mitigation measures presented below, if successfully implemented, would reduce the degree of many of these impacts to a level that is considered not significant.

Mitigation measures are separated into three categories. The first includes an overview of those design features that are incorporated as part of the Specific Plan to reduce the biological impact potential. The second category includes specific mitigation measures incorporated as part of the Resource Management Plan. The last category includes additional mitigation measures recommended as part of this Draft EIR. The specific mitigation measures in each of these categories are defined below.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
SPECIFIC PLAN DESIGN MEASURES			
The Specific Plan was designed to partially mitigate potential impacts to sensitive biological resources through avoidance in order to maximize the conservation of important biological features of the site. Specific elements of Specific Plan design that are intended to reduce impacts to plants, animals and habitat would be implemented through adoption and approval of the Specific Plan.			
The habitat types and associated plant and wildlife species which occur on the property have become an integral part of the overall Specific Plan design, through the formulation of a conservation strategy that allows for the development of the site in a way that minimizes the effects to sensitive biological resources. In addition, this conservation strategy incorporates the design and management of important open areas in a way that conserves biological values. An important aspect of this approach was an analysis of the conservation value of habitats on the property, which used conservation principles and a GIS mapping methodology. An additional component of the conservation strategy was the consideration of the larger regional context in the conservation design of biological resources on the site. The Ranch, which extends from the ridgeline of the Santa Susana Mountains across the Santa Clara River to the uplands on the north, offers the potential for significant habitat contributions to a Santa Susana Mountains open area and a key segment of the Santa Clara River system, as well as regionally important connections between these habitat areas and across the River.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
The biological resource conservation strategy developed for the Newhall Ranch property addresses the sequencing recommended by the resource agencies: avoidance, minimization, and mitigation for unavoidable impacts to key sensitive resources. The proposed large, open areas on the Newhall Ranch property avoid impacts to many of the highly sensitive species present or potentially occurring on the site, and their habitats. Further design with respect to potential unavoidable impacts to biological resources has minimized encroachments into key areas of the property, decreasing the overall impacts. Indirect impacts to biological resources are minimized through the dedication of large blocks of habitat that decreases the edge-area ratio, and thus, buffers the habitat from noise, lighting, and encroachment by domestic pets, non-native plants, and humans. The result of these design efforts has produced a biological resource conservation strategy that has focused conservation and mitigation efforts on the Newhall Ranch property into two Special Management Areas and their connection: • the Santa Clara River Corridor (River Corridor SMA); • the large block of relatively undisturbed habitats on higher elevations into the Santa Susana Mountains (High Country SMA); and • the connection between these two areas along the Salt Creek drainage.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
In this design, the Conceptual Grading Plan (Draft EIR, **Figure 1.0-14**) has been developed to allow for preservation of significantly large areas of sensitive native habitats associated with the natural drainage areas of the site, and major landforms have been maintained. Large contiguous blocks of valuable habitat have been avoided and provided with direct linkage. The Specific Plan has focused on putting the two key habitat resource areas into consolidated blocks (connected by the Salt Creek drainage), resulting in minimal boundaries with developed areas. The assembly of these three elements will facilitate their management as a single special management area system within the Specific Plan area, as well as allowing coordination and interface with other programs outside the boundary of Newhall Ranch. The transitions between development and the special management areas will be the focus of special design treatments to protect the integrity of the conserved areas. As indicated above, the "edges" of urban development areas have been minimized to reduce the indirect impact potential of the Specific Plan, and native and compatible species will be used for landscaping in these areas.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
The open area system for Newhall Ranch includes the most important habitat areas of the Santa Clara River (River Corridor SMA) and the areas which have been least impacted by agricultural, and oil and natural gas production activities (High Country SMA). It also includes the largest, least fragmented patches of each habitat type that remain on Newhall Ranch. In addition to consolidating the habitat on the Ranch into two major interconnected blocks, the open areas include the largest remaining individual blocks of each of the important habitat types. Substantial proportions of each of the habitat types and vegetation associations that occur on the Ranch will be conserved within the open area system. The incorporation of the River, the mountains, and connection provides for conservation of substantially the entire range of terrain and vegetation types on Newhall Ranch.			
By connecting the open areas into two major blocks with a major linkage, the land use plan for the Ranch provides for a minimum edge-to-area ratio within the Specific Plan area. The least accessible portion of the property, in terms of topography and presence of roads, is the High Country SMA. In addition, there is limited existing access to the River and to the Salt Creek corridor area. The topography along the High Country and River provide the opportunity to focus management activities to effectively limit access to the habitat in these key resource areas. Additional management practices are intended to restrict future access as the Specific Plan is implemented.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
A critical component of the open area system within the Newhall Ranch property and in the region is the connection between the High Country and the River Corridor along Salt Creek. The corridor will provide continuity between the habitats and the wildlife populations within the property, as well as forming a permanent regional linkage between the Santa Clara River and the Santa Susana Mountains. Salt Creek is the most appropriate location for such a wildlife corridor connection because of several distinguishing characteristics. These include provision of a direct link between the two major open areas; less disturbance than any of the other potential connections; it is bound through most of its length by open area on the north side and, therefore, will not be surrounded by development in the future; it is the only drainage that would provide more than a discontinuous, narrow connection; it includes both upland and riparian vegetation through most of the corridor; and it is topographically isolated from areas of development on Newhall Ranch. Currently, a portion of the wildlife corridor is situated in Ventura County. Future land use decisions will be required to define the corridor's final configuration in areas that occur outside the County of Los Angeles.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN MITIGATION			
Approval of the Specific Plan and its associated RMP would involve an amendment to the Los Angeles County zoning ordinance such that the provisions of the Specific Plan and RMP are binding. Specific measures to mitigate impacts to biological resources are incorporated as part of the Resource Management Plan (RMP) that is part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. These measures are identified below:			
SANTA CLARA RIVER (RIVER CORRIDOR) SMA			
MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS			
Mitigation for impacts for the Specific Plan on riparian resources will include restoration of riparian habitat and may include enhancement activities as well. In addition, a mitigation bank may be established as discussed in this section. The general areas in which riparian mitigation activities may take place are shown on Exhibit 2.6-3, Candidate Riparian Restoration/Enhancement Areas, of the Specific Plan.			
The mitigation of Specific Plan impacts through restoration of habitat and enhancement of existing habitat quality shall conform to the requirements set forth below:			
MITIGATION THROUGH RESTORATION			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
Habitat restoration as referred to in the Specific Plan means the revegetation of native plant communities on sites that have had the habitat removed due to past activities, such as agricultural or oil and natural gas operations. Riparian resources along the Santa Clara River that are impacted by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan will require restoration of similar habitat and values. Avoidance of impacts to riparian resources shall be the primary goal during the design of the individual stages of the Specific Plan. Unavoidable impacts to riparian resources shall be minimized through Specific Plan design, and then mitigated by the implementation of a revegetation plan. The revegetation plan may be prepared as part of a California Department of Fish and Game 1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit and shall include the following:			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-1. The restoration mitigation areas located within the River Corridor SMA shall be in areas that have been disturbed by previous uses or activities. Mitigation shall be conducted only on sites where soils, hydrology, and microclimate conditions are suitable for riparian habitat. First priority will be given to those restorable areas that occur adjacent to existing patches (areas) of native habitat that support sensitive species, particularly endangered or threatened species. The goal is to increase habitat patch size and connectivity with other existing habitat patches while restoring habitat values that will benefit sensitive species.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Field Verification	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plans
4.6-2. A qualified biologist shall prepare or review revegetation plans. The biologist shall also monitor the restoration effort from its inception through the establishment phase.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Comments and Documentation of Restoration Monitoring from Qualified Biologist Field Verification	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plans and Monitor During Restoration Effort
4.6-3. Revegetation Plans may be prepared as part of a California Department of Fish and Game 1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement and/or an U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit, and shall include: • Input from both the Project proponent and resource agencies to assure that the Project objectives applicable to the River Corridor SMA and the criteria of this RMP are met. • The identification of restoration/mitigation sites to be used. This effort shall involve an analysis of the suitability of potential sites to support the desired habitat, including a description of the existing conditions at the site(s) and such base line data information deemed necessary by the permitting agency.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-4. The revegetation effort shall involve an analysis of the site conditions such as soils and hydrology so that site preparation needs can be evaluated. The revegetation plan shall include the details and procedures required to prepare the restoration site for planting (i.e., grading, soil preparation, soil stockpiling, soil amendments, etc.), including the need for a supplemental irrigation system, if any.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-5. Restoration of riparian habitats within the River Corridor SMA shall use plant species native to the Santa Clara River. Cuttings or seeds of native plants shall be gathered within the River Corridor SMA or purchased from nurseries with local supplies to provide good genetic stock for the replacement habitats. Plant species used in the restoration of riparian habitat shall be listed on the approved project plant palette (Specific Plan Table 2.6-1, Recommended Plant Species for Habitat Restoration in the River Corridor SMA) or as approved by the permitting State and Federal agencies.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review Field Verification	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan and Monitor During Restoration Effort
4.6-6. The final revegetation plans shall include notes that outline the methods and procedures for the installation of the plant materials. Plant protection measures identified by the project biologist shall be incorporated into the planting design/layout.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan
4.6-7. The revegetation plan shall include guidelines for the maintenance of the mitigation site during the establishment phase of the plantings. The maintenance program shall contain guidelines for the control of non-native plant species, the maintenance of the irrigation system, and the replacement of plant species.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan
4.6-8. The revegetation plan shall provide for monitoring to evaluate the growth of the developing habitat. Specific performance goals for the restored habitat shall be defined by qualitative and quantitative characteristics of similar habitats on the River (e.g., density, cover, species composition, structural development). The monitoring effort shall include an evaluation of not only the plant material installed, but the use of the site by wildlife. The length of the monitoring period shall be determined by the permitting state and/or federal agency.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-9. Monitoring reports for the mitigation site shall be reviewed by the permitting State and/or Federal agency.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Monitoring Reports	1. ACOE and CDFG 2. ACOE and CDFG 3. During Revegetation Activities
4.6-10. Contingency plans and appropriate remedial measures shall also be outlined in the revegetation plan.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan
MITIGATION THROUGH ENHANCEMENT			
4.6-11. Habitat enhancement as referred to in this document means the rehabilitation of areas of native habitat that have been moderately disturbed by past activities (e.g., grazing, roads, oil and natural gas operations, etc.) or have been invaded by non-native plant species such as giant cane (*Arundo donax*) and tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.).	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan
4.6-12. Removal of grazing is an important means of enhancement of habitat values. Without ongoing disturbance from cattle, many riparian areas will recover naturally. Grazing except as permitted as a long-term resource management activity will be removed from the River Corridor SMA pursuant to the Long-Term Management Plan set forth in Section 4.6 of the Specific Plan EIR.	Land Owner/SMA Manager	Mitigation Monitoring Reports	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Mitigation Monitoring Reports under CUP Condition No. 8
4.6-13. To provide guidelines for the installation of supplemental plantings of native species within enhancement areas, a revegetation plan shall be prepared prior to implementation of mitigation (see guidelines for revegetation plans above). These supplemental plantings will be composed of plant species similar to those growing in the existing habitat patch (see Specific Plan Table 2.6-1).	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-14. Not all enhancement areas will necessarily require supplemental plantings of native species. Some areas may support conditions conducive for rapid "natural" re-establishment of native species. The revegetation plan may incorporate means of enhancement to areas of compacted soils, poor soil fertility, trash or flood debris, and roads as a way of enhancing riparian habitat values.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan
4.6-15. Removal of non-native species such as giant cane (*Arundo donax*), salt cedar or tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.), tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*), castor bean (*Ricans communis*), if included in a revegetation plan to mitigate impacts, shall be subject to the following standards: • First priority shall be given to those habitat patches that support or have a high potential for supporting sensitive species, particularly endangered or threatened species. • All non-native species removals shall be conducted according to a resource agency approved exotics removal program. • Removal of non-native species in patches of native habitat shall be conducted in such a way as to minimize impacts to the existing native riparian plant species.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan
MITIGATION BANKING			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-16. Mitigation banking activities for riparian habitats will be subject to State and Federal regulations and permits. Mitigation banking for oak resources shall be conducted pursuant to the Oak Resources Replacement Program. Mitigation banking for elderberry scrub shall be subject to approval of plans by the County Forester.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	State and Federal Permits; Submittal of Permits	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG, 3. Prior to Approval of Mitigation Banking Program
		Oak Resources; Review of Oak Tree Permit	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Approval of Oak Tree Permit
		Elderberry Scrub; Review of Initial Study	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS			
RECREATION AND ACCESS			
The quality of the habitat values that are conserved in the River Corridor SMA will benefit from the control of access to riparian areas. Guidelines for the control of access to the River Corridor SMA include the following:			
4.6-16. Access to the River Corridor SMA for hiking and biking shall be limited to the River trail system (including the Regional River Trail and various Local Trails) as set forth in this Specific Plan. • The River trail system shall be designed to avoid impacts to existing native riparian habitat, especially habitat areas known to support sensitive species. Where impacts to riparian habitat are unavoidable, disturbance shall be minimized and mitigated as outlined above under **Mitigation Measures 4.6-1** through **4.6-8**.	Applicant (Design)	Review of Trails Plans, Tract Maps, and/or Site Plans (Design)	1. LA County Department of Parks and Recreation 2. LA County Department of Parks and Recreation 3. Prior to Approval of Trails Plans, Tract Maps, and/or Site Plans, as applicable.
• Access to the River Corridor SMA will be limited to day time use of the designated trail system. • Signs indicating that no pets of any kind will be allowed within the River Corridor SMA, with the exception that equestrian use is permitted on established trails, shall be posted along the River Corridor SMA. • No hunting, fishing, or motor or off-trail bike riding shall be permitted. • The trail system shall be designed and constructed to minimize impacts on native habitats.	SMA Manager (Access)	Field Verification (Access)	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Upon Complaint
TRANSITION AREAS			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-18. Where development lies adjacent to the boundary of the River Corridor SMA a transition area shall be designed to lessen the impact of the development on the conserved area. Transition areas may be comprised of Open Area, natural or revegetated manufactured slopes, other planted areas, bank areas, and trails. Exhibits 2.6-4, 2.6-5, and 2.6-6 indicate the relationship between the River Corridor SMA and the development (disturbed) areas of the Specific Plan. The SMAs and the Open Area as well as the undisturbed portions of the development areas are shown in green. As indicated on the exhibits, on the south side of the River the River Corridor SMA is separated from development by the River bluffs, except in one location. The Regional River Trail will serve as transition area on the north side of the River where development areas adjoin the River Corridor SMA (excluding Travel Village).	Applicant	Review of Trails Plans, Tract Maps, and/or Site Plans	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Approval of Trails Plans, Tract Maps, and/or Site Plans, as applicable.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
TRANSITION AREAS			
4.6-19. The following are the standards for design of transition areas: • In all locations where there is no steep grade separation between the River Corridor and development, a trail shall be provided along this edge. • Native riparian plants shall be incorporated into the landscaping of the transition areas between the River Corridor SMA and adjacent development areas where feasible for their long-term survival. Plants used in these areas shall be those listed on the approved plant palette (Specific Plan Table 2.6-2 of the Resource Management Plan [Recommended Plants for Transition Areas Adjacent to the River Corridor SMA]). • Roads and bridges that cross the River Corridor SMA shall have adequate barriers at their perimeters to discourage access to the River Corridor SMA adjacent to the structures. • Where bank stabilization is required to protect development areas, it shall be composed of ungrouted rock, or buried bank stabilization as described in Section 2.5.2.a, except at bridge crossings and other locations where public health and safety requirements necessitate concrete or other bank protection. • A minimum 100 foot wide buffer adjacent to the Santa Clara River should be required between the top river-side of bank stabilization and development within the Land Use Designations Residential Low Medium, Residential Medium, Mixed-Use and Business Park unless, through Planning Director review in consultation with the staff biologist, it is determined that a lesser buffer would adequately protect the riparian resources within the River Corridor or that a 100 foot wide buffer is infeasible for physical infrastructure planning. The buffer area may be used for public infrastructure, such as: flood control access; sewer, water and utility easements; abutments; trails and parks, subject to findings of consistency with the Specific Plan and applicable County policies.	Applicant	Review of Trails Plans, Tract Maps, and/or Site Plans	1. LACDRP and LACDPW for Bank Stabilization 2. LACDRP and LACDPW for Bank Stabilization 3. Prior to Approval of Trails Plans, Tract Maps, and/or Site Plans, as applicable

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-20. The following guidelines shall be followed during any grading activities that take place within the River Corridor SMA: • Grading perimeters shall be clearly marked and inspected by the project biologist prior to grading occurring within or immediately adjacent to the River Corridor SMA. • The project biologist shall work with the grading contractor to avoid inadvertent impacts to riparian resources.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to and During Grading Activities

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
GRADING ACTIVITIES			
LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT PLAN			
4.6-21. Upon final approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Special Management Area designation for the River Corridor SMA shall become effective. The permitted uses and development standards for the SMA are governed by the Development Regulations, Chapter 3 of the Specific Plan.	Los Angeles County	None Required	1. Los Angeles County 2. Los Angeles County 3. Upon Effective Date of Zoning Ordinance
4.6-22. Upon completion of development of all land uses, utilities, roads, flood control improvements, bridges, trails, and other improvements necessary for implementation of the Specific Plan within the River Corridor in each subdivision allowing construction within or adjacent to the River Corridor, a permanent, non-revocable *conservation and public access easement* shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles pursuant to **Mitigation Measure 4.6-23** below over the portion of the River Corridor SMA within that subdivision.	Land Owner	Offer of Dedication of Easement	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Submittal of Monitoring Report(s) Under CUP Condition No. 8
4.6-23. The River Corridor SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles prior to the transfer of the River Corridor SMA ownership, or portion thereof to the management entity described in **Mitigation Measure 4.6-26** below.	Land Owner	Offer of Dedication of Easement	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Transfer of River Corridor Ownership Under 4.6-26

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-24. The River Corridor SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* shall prohibit grazing, except as a long-term resource management activity, and agriculture within the River Corridor and shall restrict recreation use to the established trail system. Agricultural land uses and grazing for purposes other than long-term resource management activities within the River Corridor shall be extended in the event of the filing of any legal action against Los Angeles County challenging final approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and any related project approvals or certification of the Final EIR for Newhall Ranch. Agricultural land uses and grazing for purposes other than long-term resource management activities within the River Corridor shall be extended by the time period between the filing of any such legal action and the entry of a final judgment by a court with appropriate jurisdiction, after exhausting all rights of appeal, or execution of a final settlement agreement between all parties to the legal action, whichever occurs first.	Land Owner	Review of Easement Document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Acceptance of Easement by County

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-25. The River Corridor SMA conservation and public access easement shall be consistent in its provisions with any other conservation easements to State or Federal resource agencies which may have been granted as part of mitigation or mitigation banking activities.	Land Owner	Review of Conservation Easement /and Resource Permits	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Recordation of River Corridor SMA Conservation Easement
4.6-26. Prior to the recordation of the River Corridor SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* as specified in **Mitigation Measure 4.6-23** above, the land owner shall provide a plan to the County for the permanent ownership and management of the River Corridor SMA, including any necessary financing. This plan shall include the transfer of ownership of the River Corridor SMA to the Center for Natural Lands Management, or if the Center for Natural Lands Management is declared bankrupt or dissolved, ownership will transfer or revert to a *joint powers authority* consisting of Los Angeles County (4 members), the City of Santa Clarita (2 members), and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (2 members).	Land Owner	Approval of Management Plan by County	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Recordation of River Corridor SMA *Conservation Easement*
HIGH COUNTRY SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA (SMA)			
4.6-26a Two types of habitat restoration may occur in the High Country SMA: 1) riparian revegetation activities principally in Salt Creek Canyon; and 2) oak tree replacement in, or adjacent to, existing oak woodlands and savannahs. • Mitigation requirements for riparian revegetation activities within the High Country SMA are the same as those for the River Corridor SMA and are set forth in **Mitigation Measures 4.6-1** through **4.6-11** and **4.6-13** through **4.6-16** above. • Mitigation requirements for oak tree replacement are set forth in **Mitigation Measure 4.6-48** below.	Land Owner (Project Biologist)	Field Verification	1. ACOE, CDFG (Riparian) 2. ACOE, CDFG (Riparian) 3. Approval of Revegetation Plans
MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
Mitigation activities which may occur in the High Country SMA, either for impacts associated with the construction of Estate lots, trails or access roads, or for impacts identified during the subdivision process in other portions of the Specific Plan Area, include restoration of habitat and enhancement to existing habitat (see discussion below). Mitigation banking may be established as provided below. In addition, Salt Creek Canyon is a high priority area for riparian mitigation.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
MITIGATION THROUGH RESTORATION			
Two types of habitat restoration may occur in the High Country SMA: 1) riparian revegetation activities principally in Salt Creek Canyon; and 2) oak resource replacement in, or adjacent to, existing oak woodlands and savannas.			
Mitigation requirements for riparian revegetation activities within the High Country SMA are the same as those for the River Corridor SMA and are set forth above.			
Mitigation requirements for oak resource replacement are set forth in Specific Plan Section 2.6, paragraph 3b of the Oak Tree Replacement Program of the Resource Management Program.			
ENHANCEMENT OF HABITAT			
4.6-27. Removal of grazing from the High Country SMA except for those grazing activities associated with long-term resource management programs, is a principal means of enhancing habitat values in the creeks, brushland and woodland areas of the SMA. The removal of grazing in the High Country SMA is discussed below under (b) 4. Long Term Management. All enhancement activities for riparian habitat within the High Country SMA shall be governed by the same provisions as set forth for enhancement in the River Corridor SMA. Specific Plan Table 2.6-3 of the Resource Management Plan provides a list of appropriate plant species for use in enhancement areas in the High Country SMA.	Land Owner/CNLM	Enhancement Plans and Field Verification	1. LACDRP 2. CNLM 3. During Enhancement Activities
MITIGATION BANKING			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-28. Mitigation banking activities for riparian habitats will be subject to State and Federal regulations and permits. Mitigation banking for oak resources, shall be conducted pursuant to the Oak Resource Replacement Program. Mitigation banking for elderberry scrub shall be subject to approval of plans by the County Forester.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	State and Federal Permits; Submittal of Permits	1. ACOE, and CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Mitigation Banking Program
		Oak Resources; Review of Oak Tree Permit	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Approval of Oak Tree Permit
		Elderberry Scrub; Review of Initial Study	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS			
RECREATION AND ACCESS			
The recreation opportunities presented by the High Country SMA are a major benefit of the SMA. However, recreational needs must be balanced with the preservation of the habitat values, which are conserved in the SMA. Recreation and access will be governed by the following standards:			
4.6-29. Access to the High Country SMA will be limited to day time use of the designated trail system.	Manager of High Country SMA	Field Verification	1. JPA as described in 4.6-41 2. JPA 3. In Perpetuity
4.6-30. No pets of any kind will be allowed within the High Country SMA, with the exception that equestrian use is permitted on established trails.	Manager of High Country SMA	Field Verification	1. JPA 2. JPA 3. In Perpetuity
4.6-31. No hunting, fishing, or motor or trail bike riding shall be permitted.	Manager of High Country SMA	Field Verification	1. JPA 2. JPA 3. In Perpetuity
4.6-32. The trail system shall be designed and constructed to minimize impacts on native habitats.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Trails Plan	1. JPA 2. JPA 3. Prior to Approval of Trails Plan
TRANSITION/FUEL MODIFICATION AREAS			
Development areas are generally separated from the High Country SMA by steep slopes. Specific Plan Exhibit 2.6-7 of the Resource Management Program, Salt Creek Wildlife Corridor Land Use Perspective, illustrates that development adjacent to the Salt Creek Wildlife Corridor is significantly separated vertically from the corridor.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-33. Construction of buildings and other structures (such as patios, decks, etc.) shall only be permitted upon developed pads within Planning Areas OV-04, OV-10, PV-02, and PV-28 and shall not be permitted on southerly slopes facing the High Country SMA (Planning Area HC-01) or in the area between the original SEA 20 boundary and the High Country boundary. If disturbed by grading, all southerly facing slopes which adjoin the High Country SMA within those Planning Areas shall have the disturbed areas revegetated with compatible trees, shrubs and herbs from the list of plant species for south and west facing slopes as shown in Table 2.6-3, Recommended Plant Species For Use In Enhancement Areas In The High Country.	Applicant	Field Verification	1. LACDRP/LA County Forester 2. LACDRP/LA County Forester 3. Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits
Transition from the development edge to the natural area shall also be controlled by the standards of wildfire fuel modification zones as set forth in **Mitigation Measure 4.6-49**. Within fuel modification areas, trees and herbs from Table 2.6-3 of the Resource Management Plan should be planted toward the top of slopes; and trees at lesser densities and shrubs planted on lower slopes.	Project Landscape Architect	Receipt of Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan	1. Los Angeles County Forester 2. Los Angeles County Forester 3. Prior to Recordation of Subdivision Maps
GRADING ACTIVITIES			
4.6-34. Grading perimeters shall be clearly marked and inspected by the project biologist prior to impacts occurring within or adjacent to the High Country SMA.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior To and During Grading
4.6-35. The project biologist shall work with the grading contractor to avoid inadvertent impacts to biological resources outside of the grading area.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. During Grading
LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-36. Upon final approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Special Management Area designation for the High Country SMA shall become effective. The permitted uses and development standards for the SMA are governed by the Development Regulations, Chapter 3.	Los Angeles County	None Required	1. Los Angeles County 2. Los Angeles County 3. Upon Effective Date of Zoning Ordinance

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-37. The High Country SMA shall be offered for dedication in three approximately equal phases of approximately 1,400 acres each proceeding from north to south, as follows: 1) The first offer of dedication will take place with the issuance of the 2,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch; 2) The second offer of dedication will take place with the issuance of the 6,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch; and 3) The remaining offer of dedication will be completed by the 11,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch. 4) The Specific Plan applicant shall provide a quarterly report to the Departments of Public Works and Regional Planning which indicates the number of residential building permits issued in the Specific Plan area by subdivision map number.	Land Owner	Offer of Dedication	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Building and Safety 3. Upon Issuance of Building Permits
4.6-38. Prior to dedication of the High Country SMA, a *conservation and public access easement* shall be offered to the County of Los Angeles and a conservation and management easement offered to the Center for Natural Lands Management. The High Country SMA *Conservation and Public Access Easement* shall be consistent in its provisions with any other *conservation easement*s to State or Federal resource agencies which may have been granted as part of mitigation or mitigation banking activities.	Land Owner	Review of Easement Document	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Building and Safety 3. Upon Issuance of Building Permits
4.6-39. The High Country SMA conservation and public access easement shall prohibit grazing within the High Country, except for those grazing activities associated with the long-term resource management programs, and shall restrict recreation to the established trail system.	Land Owner	Review of Easement Document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Acceptance of Easement by Los Angeles County

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-40. The High Country SMA conservation and public access easement shall be consistent in its provisions with any other conservation easements to State or Federal resource agencies which may have been granted as part of mitigation or mitigation banking activities.	Land Owner	Review of Conservation Easement and Resource Permits	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Recordation of High Country SMA Conservation Easement

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-41. The High Country SMA shall be offered for dedication in fee to a *joint powers authority* consisting of Los Angeles County (4 members), the City of Santa Clarita (2 members), and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (2 members). The *joint powers authority* will have overall responsibility for recreation within and conservation of the High Country.	Land Owner	Offer of Dedication	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits
4.6-42. An appropriate type of service or assessment district shall be formed under the authority of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for the collection of up to $24 per single family detached dwelling unit per year and $15 per single family attached dwelling unit per year, excluding any units designated as Low and Very Low affordable housing units pursuant to Section 3.10, Affordable Housing Program of the Specific Plan. This revenue would be assessed to the homeowner beginning with the occupancy of each dwelling unit and distributed to the *joint powers authority* for the purposes of recreation, maintenance, construction, conservation and related activities within the *High Country Special Management Area*.	Land Owner	Approval of Assessment District Report by County	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of First Residential Occupancy Permit
OPEN AREA			
MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS			
4.6-43. Suitable portions of *Open Area* may be used for mitigation of riparian, *oak resources*, or elderberry scrub. Mitigation activities within *Open Area* shall be subject to the following requirements, as applicable. • River Corridor SMA Mitigation Requirements, including: **Mitigation Measures 4.6-1** through **4.6-11** and **4.6-13** through **4.6-16**; and • High Country SMA Mitigation Requirements, including: **Mitigation Measures 4.6-27**, **4.6-29** through **4.6-42**, and • Mitigation Banking — **Mitigation Measure 4.6-16**.	Manager of Open Area	Review of Mitigation Plans/Field Verification	1. ACOE; CDFG or Los Angeles County as applicable 2. ACOE; CDFG or Los Angeles County as applicable 3. During Mitigation
MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-44. Drainages with flows greater than 2,000 cfs will have soft bottoms. Bank protection will be of ungrouted rock, or buried bank stabilization as described in Section 2.5.2.a, except at bridge crossings and other areas where public health and safety considerations require concrete or other stabilization.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Review Drainage Plans	1. LACDPW FCD 2. LACDPW FCD 3. Prior to Approval of Final Drainage Plans

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS			
4.6-45. The precise alignments and widths of major drainages will be established through the preparation of drainage studies to be approved by the County at the time of subdivision maps which permit construction.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Review Drainage Plans	1. LACDPW FCD 2. LACDPW FCD 3. Prior to Approval of Tract Maps
4.6-46. While Open Area is generally intended to remain in a natural state, some grading may take place, especially for parks, major drainages, trails, and roadways. Trails are also planned to be within Open Area.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Review of Tentative Map	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Map Approval
4.6-47. At the time that final subdivision maps permitting construction are recorded, the *Open Area* within the map will be offered for dedication to the Center for Natural Lands Management. Community Parks within *Open Area* are intended to be public parks. Prior to the offer of dedication of *Open Area* to the Center for Natural Lands Management, all necessary *conservation and public access easements*, as well as easements for infrastructure shall be offered to the County.	Land Owner	Review of Final Map	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps
MITIGATION BANKING			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-47a Mitigation Banking will be permitted within the River Corridor SMA, the High Country SMA, and the *Open Area land use designations*, subject to the following requirements: • Mitigation banking activities for riparian habitats will be subject to State and Federal regulations, and shall be conducted pursuant to the mitigation requirements set forth in **Mitigation Measure 4.6-1** through **4.6-15** above. • Mitigation banking for oak resources shall be conducted pursuant to **4.6-48** below. • Mitigation banking for elderberry scrub shall be subject to approval of plans by the County Forester.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	State and Federal Permits; Submittal of Permits	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Mitigation Banking Program
		Oak Resources; Review of Oak Tree Permit	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Approval of Oak Tree Permit
		Elderberry Scrub; Review of Initial Study	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
OAK RESOURCES REPLACEMENT PROGRAM			
4.6-48. Standards for the restoration and enhancement of oak resources within the High Country SMA and the Open Area include the following (oak resources include oak trees of the sizes regulated under the County Oak Tree Ordinance, southern California black walnut trees, Mainland cherry trees, and Mainland cherry shrubs): • To mitigate the impacts to oak resources which may be removed as development occurs in the Specific Plan Area, replacement trees shall be planted in conformance with the oak tree ordinance in effect at that time. • Oak resource species obtained from the local gene pool shall be used in restoration or enhancement. • Prior to recordation of construction-level final subdivision maps, an oak resource replacement plan shall be prepared that provides the guidelines for the oak tree planting and/or replanting. The Plan shall be reviewed by the Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning and the County Forester and shall include the following: site selection and preparation, selection of proper species including sizes and planting densities, protection from herbivores, site maintenance, performance standards, remedial actions, and a monitoring program. • All plans and specifications shall follow County oak tree guidelines, as specified in the County Oak Tree Ordinance.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Oak Tree Permit(s)	1. LA County Forester 2. LA County Forester 3. Prior to Final Subdivision Map Recordation
WILDFIRE FUEL MODIFICATION			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
The Specific Plan Area is within the extreme and moderate fire hazard zones as identified in the County of Los Angeles General Plan. The moderate fire hazard zone extends to those areas of Newhall Ranch where native brush can be found growing in its natural state. This is most common in the hillside areas. The extreme fire hazard zone includes high brush and woodlands, and all steep slopes regardless of vegetation (refer to **Section 4.18, Fire Services and Hazards**, for a detailed description of on-site fire zones). Development of Newhall Ranch will reduce the amount of native flammable vegetation present within the Specific Plan Area. Fire fighting capabilities will be provided by two fire stations on the Specific Plan site (see Figure 1.0-3, Land Use Plan), other nearby stations, and a system of improved roads and an urban water system with fire flows as required by the County Fire Department. Existing and proposed off-site fire facilities will also serve the Specific Plan Area.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Property damage and public safety risks associated with wildfire are greatest where homes and other structures will be located adjacent to large open areas dominated by native vegetation. This condition will occur primarily in the southern portion of the Specific Plan site and where portions of the development area in the northwest section of Riverwood Village abut large natural open areas.			
Access is currently provided to the Los Angeles County Fire Department for fire prevention control of the Specific Plan Area. Access will continue to be provided as the Specific Plan is implemented.			
Fuel modification mitigation includes:			
4.6-49. To minimize the potential exposure of the development areas, Open Area, and the SMAs to fire hazards, the Specific Plan is subject to the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Protection District (LACFPD), which provides fire protection for the area. At the time of final subdivision maps permitting construction in development areas that are adjacent to Open Area and the High Country SMA, a wildfire fuel modification plan shall be prepared in accordance with the fuel modification ordinance standards in effect at that time and shall be submitted for approval to the County Fire Department.	Applicant	Review of Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan	1. LA County Forester 2. LA County Forester 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps
4.6-50. The wildfire fuel modification plan shall depict a fuel modification zone the size of which shall be consistent with the County fuel modification ordinance requirements. Within the zone, tree pruning, removal of dead plant material and weed and grass cutting shall take place as required by the fuel modification ordinance.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan	1. LA County Forester 2. LA County Forester 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-51. In order to enhance the habitat value of plant communities which require fuel modification, fire retardant plant species containing habitat value may be planted within the fuel modification zone. Typical plant species suitable for Fuel Modification Zones are indicated in Specific Plan Table 2. 6-5 of the Resource Management Plan. Fuel modification zones adjacent to SMAs and Open Areas containing habitat of high value such as oak woodland and savannas shall utilize a more restrictive plant list which shall be reviewed by the County Forester.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan	1. LA County Forester 2. LA County Forester 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-52. The wildfire fuel modification plan shall include the following construction period requirements: (a) a fire watch during welding operations; (b) spark arresters on all equipment or vehicles operating in a high fire hazard area; (c) designated smoking and non-smoking areas; and (d) water availability pursuant to the County Fire Department requirements.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan	1. LA County Forester 2. LA County Forester 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps
EIR MITIGATION MEASURES			
To further reduce impacts to biological resources that would result from Specific Plan implementation the following mitigation measures are proposed:			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-53. If**,** at the time **any** subdivision~~s~~ **map** proposing construction ~~are~~ **is** ~~processed~~**submitted**, the County determines through an Initial Study**, or otherwise,** that there may be rare, threatened or endangered**, plant or animal** species on the property ~~being~~ **to be** subdivided, then**, in addition to the prior surveys conducted on the Specific Plan site to define the presence or absence of sensitive habitat and associated species, ~~a~~current, updated** site-specific survey**s for all such animal or plant species** shall be conducted in accordance with the consultation requirements set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.6-59 **within those areas of the Specific Plan where such animal or plant species occur or are likely to occur.** **The site-specific surveys shall include the unarmored three-spine stickleback, the arroyo toad, the Southwestern pond turtle, the California red-legged frog, the southwestern willow flycatcher, the least Bell's vireo, the San Fernando Valley spineflower and any other rare, sensitive, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species occurring, or likely to occur, on the property to be subdivided. All site-specific surveys shall be conducted during appropriate seasons by qualified botanists or qualified wildlife biologists in a manner that will locate any rare, sensitive, threatened, or endangered animal or plant species that may be present. To the extent there are applicable protocols published by either the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or the California Department of Fish and Game, all such protocols shall be followed in preparing the updated site-specific surveys.**	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-53. (cont.)			
All site-specific survey work shall be documented in a separate report containing at least the following information: (a) project description, including a detailed map of the project location and study area; (b) a description of the biological setting, including references to the nomenclature used and updated vegetation mapping; (c) detailed description of survey methodologies; (d) dates of field surveys and total person-hours spent on the field surveys; (e) results of field surveys, including detailed maps and location data; (f) an assessment of potential impacts; (g) discussion of the significance of the rare, threatened or endangered animal or plant populations found in the project area, with consideration given to nearby populations and species distribution; (h) mitigation measures, including avoiding impacts altogether, minimizing or reducing impacts, rectifying or reducing impacts through habitat restoration, replacement or enhancement, or compensating for impacts by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments, consistent with CEQA (Guidelines §15370); (i) references cited and persons contacted; and (j) other pertinent information, which is designed to disclose impacts and mitigate for such impacts." ~~to define the presence or absence of such species and any necessary mitigation measures shall be determined and applied."~~			
4.6-54. Prior to development within or disturbance to occupied Unarmored threespine stickleback habitat, a formal consultation with the USFWS shall occur.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Section 7 Consultation	1. USFWS 2. USFWS 3. Prior to Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-55. Prior to development or disturbance within wetlands or other sensitive habitats, permits shall be obtained from pertinent Federal and State agencies and the Specific Plan shall conform with the specific provisions of said permits. Performance criteria shall include that described in **Mitigation Measures 4.6-1** through **4.6-16** and **4.6-42** through **4.6-47** for wetlands, and **Mitigation Measures 4.6-27**, **4.6-28**, and **4.6-42** through **4.6-48** for other sensitive habitats.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Receipt of Appropriate Permit applications	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-56. All lighting along the perimeter of natural areas shall be downcast luminaries with light patterns directed away from natural areas.	Applicant	Building Permit Plot Plan Review	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits
4.6-57. Where bridge construction is proposed and water flow would be diverted, blocking nets and seines shall be used to control and remove fish from the area of activity. All fish captured during this operation would be stored in tubs and returned unharmed back to the River after construction activities were complete.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Field Verification	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Construction
4.6-58. To limit impacts to water quality the Specific Plan shall conform with all provisions of required NPDES permits and water quality permits that would be required by the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Project Engineer	Approval of a SWMP	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit(s)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-59. Consultation shall occur with the County of Los Angeles ("County") and California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") at each of the following milestones: **1) Before Surveys. Prior to conducting sensitive plant or animal surveys at the Newhall Ranch subdivision map level, the applicant, or its designee, shall consult with the County and CDFG for purposes of establishing and/or confirming the appropriate survey methodology to be used.** **2) After Surveys. After completion of sensitive plant or animal surveys at the subdivision map level, draft survey results shall be made available to the County and CDFG within sixty (60) calendar days after completion of the field survey work.** **3) Subdivision Map Submittal**. Within thirty (30) calendar days after the applicant, or its designee, submits its application to the County for processing of a subdivision map in the Mesas Village or Riverwood Village, a copy of the submittal shall be provided to CDFG. In addition, the applicant, or its designee, shall schedule a consultation meeting with the County and CDFG for purposes of obtaining comments and input on the proposed subdivision map submittal. The consultation meeting shall take place at least thirty (30) days prior to the submittal of the proposed subdivision map to the County. **4) Development/Disturbance and Further Mitigation**. Prior to any development within, or disturbance to, habitat occupied by rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species, or to any portion of the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay, as defined below, all required permits shall be obtained from both USFWS and CDFG, as applicable. It is further anticipated that the federal and state permits will impose conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law that are beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Final EIR (March 1999), the Newhall Ranch DAA (April 2001) and the Newhall Ranch Revised DAA (2002). It is also anticipated that conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law for project-related impacts on endangered, rare or threatened species and their habitat will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns and techniques associated with project-specific grading at the subdivision map level.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Section 2081 Permit	1. USFWS and CDFG 2. USFWS and CDFG 3. Prior to Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-60. If at the time subdivisions permitting construction are processed, the County determines through an Initial Study that there may be elderberry scrub vegetation on the property being subdivided, then a site specific survey shall be conducted to define the presence or absence of such habitat and any necessary mitigation measures shall be determined and applied.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps
4.6-61. If at the time subdivisions permitting construction are processed, the County determines through and Initial Study that there may be mainland cherry trees and/or mainland cherry shrubs on the property being subdivided, then a site specific survey shall be conducted to define the presence or absence of such habitat and any necessary mitigation measures shall be determined and applied.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps
4.6-62. When a map revision or Substantial Conformance determination on any subdivision map or Conditional Use Permit would result in changes to an approved oak tree permit, then the oak tree report for that oak tree permit must be amended for the area of change, and the addendum must be approved by the County Forester prior to issuance of grading permits for the area of the map or CUP being changed.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Approval of Addendum to Oak Tree Report	1. LA County Forester 2. LA County Forester 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits
4.6-63. Riparian resources that are impacted by buildout of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall be restored with similar habitat at the rate of one acre replaced for each acre lost.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	ACOE 404 Permit	1. ACOE, CDFG 2. ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Grading
4.6-64. The operator of the golf course shall prepare a Golf Course Maintenance Plan which shall include procedures to control storm water quality and ground water quality as a result of golf course maintenance practices, including irrigation, fertilizer, pesticide and herbicide use. This Plan shall be prepared in coordination with the County biologist and approved by the County Planning Director prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.	Applicant (Golf Course Operator)	Golf Course Maintenance Plan	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Issuance of Golf Course Occupancy Permit

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Spineflower Special Study Mitigation Overlay	Applicant	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP and CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps
4.6-65. In order to facilitate the conservation of the spineflower on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site, the applicant, or its designee, shall, concurrent with Specific Plan approval, agree to the identified special study areas shown below in **Figure 2.6-8, Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay**. The applicant, or its designee, further acknowledges that, within and around the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay (**Figure 2.6-8**), changes will likely occur to Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns and techniques associated with project-specific grading at the subdivision map level. The applicant, or its designee, shall design subdivision maps that are responsive to the characteristics of the spineflower and all other endangered plant species that may be found on the Specific Plan site.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Spineflower Preserves	Applicant	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP and CDFG 3. To be completed in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesas Village, or that portion of Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower population occurs.
4.6-66. Direct impacts to known spineflower populations within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area shall be avoided or minimized through the establishment of one or more on-site preserves that are configured to ensure the continued existence of the species in perpetuity. Preserve(s) shall be delineated in consultation with the County and CDFG, and will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan development footprints for lands within and around the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay (**Figure 2.6-8**).			
Delineation of the boundaries of Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) for the entire Specific Plan area shall be completed in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesas Village, or that portion of Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower population occurs.			
A sufficient number of known spineflower populations shall be included within the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) in order to ensure the continued existence of the species in perpetuity. The conservation of known spineflower populations shall be established in consultation with the County and CDFG, and as consistent with standards governing issuance of an incidental take permit for spineflower pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081, subdivision (b).			
In addition to conservation of known populations, spineflower shall be introduced in appropriate habitat and soils in the Newhall Ranch preserve(s). The creation of introduced populations shall require seed collection and/or top soil at impacted spineflower locations and nursery propagation to increase seed and sowing of seed. The seed collection activities, and the maintenance of the bulk seed repository, shall be approved in advance by the County and CDFG.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Figure 2.6-8, Spineflower Special Study Mitigation Overlay

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-66. (cont.) Once the boundaries of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) are delineated, the project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for conducting a spineflower population census within the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) annually for 10 years. (These census surveys shall be in addition to the surveys required by **Mitigation Measure 4.6-53**, above.) The yearly spineflower population census documentation shall be submitted to the County and CDFG, and maintained by the project applicant, or its designee. If there are any persistent population declines documented in the annual population census reports, the project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for conducting an assessment of the ecological factor(s) that are likely responsible for the decline, and implement management activity or activities to address these factors where feasible. In no event, however, shall project-related activities jeopardize the continued existence of the Newhall Ranch spineflower populations. If a persistent population decline is documented, such as a trend in steady population decline that persists for a period of 5 consecutive years, or a substantial drop in population is detected over a 10-year period, spineflower may be introduced in consultation with CDFG in appropriate habitat and soils in the Newhall Ranch preserve(s), utilizing the bulk spineflower seed repository, together with other required management activity or activities. These activities shall be undertaken by a qualified botanist/biologist, subject to approval by the County and CDFG. The project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for the funding and implementation of the necessary management activity or activities, including monitoring, as approved by the County and CDFG. Annual viability reports shall be submitted to the County and CDFG for 10 years following delineation of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) to ensure long-term documentation of the spineflower population status within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s). In the event annual status reports indicate the spineflower population within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) is not stable and viable 10 years following delineation of the spineflower preserve(s), the project applicant, or its designee, shall continue to submit annual status reports to the County and CDFG for a period of no less than an additional 5 years.	Applicant	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP and CDFG 3. To be completed in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesas Village, or that portion of Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower population occurs.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Connectivity, Reserve Design and Buffers	Applicant	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP/CDFG 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps
4.6-67. Indirect impacts associated with the interface between the preserved spineflower populations and planned development within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall be avoided or minimized by establishing open space connections with Open Area, River Corridor, or High Country land use designations. In addition, buffers (i.e., setbacks from developed, landscaped or other use areas) shall be established around portions of the delineated preserve(s) not connected to Open Area, the River Corridor or the High Country land use designations. The open space connections and buffer configurations shall take into account local hydrology, soils, existing and proposed adjacent land uses, the presence of non-native invasive plant species, and seed dispersal vectors. Open space connections shall be configured such that the spineflower preserves are connected to Open Area, River Corridor, or High Country land use designations to the extent practicable. Open space connections shall be of adequate size and configuration to achieve a moderate to high likelihood of effectiveness in avoiding or minimizing indirect impacts (e.g., invasive plants, increased fire frequency, trampling, chemicals, etc.) to the spineflower preserve(s). Open space connections for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be configured in consultation with the County and CDFG. Open space connections for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be established for the entire Specific Plan area in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesa Village, or that portion of the Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-67. (cont.) For preserves and/or those portions of preserves not connected to Open Area, River Corridor, or High Country land use designations, buffers shall be established at variable distances of between 80 and 200 feet from the edge of development to achieve a moderate to high likelihood of effectiveness in avoiding or minimizing indirect impacts (e.g., invasive plants, increased fire frequency, trampling, chemicals, etc.) to the spineflower preserve(s). The buffer size/configuration shall be guided by the analysis set forth in the "*Review of Potential Edge Effects on the San Fernando Valley Spineflower*," prepared by Conservation Biology Institute, January 19, 2000, and other sources of scientific information and analysis, which are available at the time the preserve(s) and buffers are established. Buffers for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be configured in consultation with the County and CDFG for the entire Specific Plan area. Buffers for the spineflower preserve(s) shall be established in conjunction with approval of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map filed in either the Mesa Village, or that portion of the Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs. Buffer configurations may include the width of any adjacent roadway system or associated rights-of-way, because roadways and rights-of-way can afford some protection to the spineflower preserve(s) and contribute to the effectiveness of the buffers by further avoiding or minimizing the potential indirect impacts of future development. In designing buffers that include roads, the design shall take into account edge effects from the roads by assessing, among other factors, the likelihood of disturbance based upon topography, road runoff and adjacent vegetation types.	Applicant	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP/CDFG 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
The project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for revegetating open space connections and buffer areas of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) to mitigate temporary impacts due to grading that will occur within portions of those open space connections and buffer areas. The impacted areas shall be reseeded with a native seed mix to prevent erosion, reduce the potential for invasive non-native plants, and maintain functioning habitat areas within the buffer area. Revegetation seed mix shall be reviewed and approved by the County and CDFG.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Preserve Protection/Fencing 4.6-68. To protect the preserved Newhall Ranch spineflower populations, and to further reduce potential direct impacts to such populations due to unrestricted access, the project applicant, or its designee, shall erect and maintain temporary orange fencing and prohibitive signage around the Newhall Ranch preserve(s), open space connections and buffer areas, which are adjacent to areas impacted by proposed development prior to and during all phases of construction. The areas behind the temporary fencing shall not be used for the storage of any equipment, materials, construction debris or anything associated with construction activities. Following the final phase of construction of any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s), the project applicant, or its designee, shall install and maintain permanent fencing along the subdivision tract bordering the preserve(s). Permanent signage shall be installed on the fencing along the preservation boundary to indicate that the fenced area is a biological preserve, which contains protected species and habitat, that access is restricted, and that trespassing and fuel modification are prohibited within the area. The permanent fencing shall be designed to allow wildlife movement. The plans and specifications for the permanent fencing and signage shall be approved by the County and CDFG prior to the final phase of construction of any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to a Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s).	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study, subdivision, and grading permit application	1. LACDRP/CDFG 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. Prior to Grading and Occupancy

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Preserve Protection/Hydrological Alterations	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of map subdivision	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW/CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps
4.6-69. Indirect impacts resulting from changes to hydrology (i.e., increased water runoff from surrounding development) at the interface between spineflower preserve(s) and planned development within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall be avoided or mitigated to below a level of significance. Achievement of this standard will be met through the documented demonstration by the project applicant, or its designee, that the storm drain system achieves pre-development hydrological conditions for the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s). To document such a condition, the project applicant, or its designee, shall prepare a study of the pre- and post-development hydrology, in conjunction with Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to spineflower preserve(s). The study shall be used in the design and engineering of a storm drain system that achieves pre-development hydrological conditions. The study must conclude that proposed grade changes in development areas beyond the buffers will maintain pre-development hydrology conditions within the preserve(s). The study shall be approved by the Planning Director of the County, and the resulting conditions confirmed by CDFG. The storm drain system for Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to any spineflower preserves must be approved by the County prior to the initiation of any grading activities.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Road Construction Measures	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps
4.6-70. Consistent with the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay reflected in **Mitigation Measure 4.6-65**, direct ~~and indirect~~ impacts to known Newhall Ranch spineflower populations associated with proposed road construction or modifications to existing roadways shall be further assessed for proposed road construction at the Newhall Ranch subdivision map level, in conjunction with the tiered EIR required for each subdivision map. To avoid or substantially lessen direct impacts to known spineflower populations, Specific Plan roadways shall be redesigned or realigned, to the extent practicable, to achieve the spineflower preserve and connectivity/preserve design/buffer standards set forth in **Mitigation Measures 4.6-66 and 4.6-67**. The project applicant, or its designee, acknowledges that that road redesign and re-alignment is a feasible means to avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant impacts on the now known Newhall Ranch spineflower populations. Road redesign or alignments to be considered at the subdivision map level include: (a) Commerce Center Drive; (b) Magic Mountain Parkway; (c) Chiquito Canyon Road; (d) Long Canyon Road; (e) San Martinez Grande Road; (f) Potrero Valley Road; (g) Valencia Boulevard; and (h) Any other or additional roadways that have the potential to significantly impact known Newhall Ranch spineflower populations.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Engineering, Design and Grading Modifications			
4.6-71. Consistent with the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay reflected in **Mitigation Measure 4.6-65**, direct ~~and indirect~~ impacts to known Newhall Ranch spineflower populations shall be further assessed at the Newhall Ranch subdivision map level, in conjunction with the required tiered EIR process. To avoid or substantially lessen impacts to known spineflower populations at the subdivision map level, the project applicant, or its designee, may be required to adjust Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns and techniques associated with project-specific grading to achieve the spineflower preserve and connectivity/preserve design/buffer standards set forth in **Mitigation Measures 4.6-66 and 4.6-67** for all future Newhall Ranch subdivision maps that encompass identified spineflower populations.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Fire Management Plan 4.6-72. A Fire Management Plan shall be developed to avoid and minimize direct and indirect impacts to the spineflower, in accordance with the adopted Newhall Ranch Resource Management Plan (RMP), to protect and manage the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) and buffers. The Fire Management Plan shall be completed by the project applicant, or its designee, in conjunction with approval of any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to a spineflower preserve. The final Fire Management Plan shall be approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department through the processing of subdivision maps. Under the final Fire Management Plan, limited fuel modification activities within the spineflower preserves will be restricted to selective thinning with hand tools to allow the maximum preservation of Newhall Ranch spineflower populations. No other fuel modification or clearance activities shall be allowed in the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s). Controlled burning may be allowed in the future within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) and buffers, provided that it is based upon a burn plan approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department and CDFG. The project applicant, or its designee, shall also be responsible for annual maintenance of fuel modification zones, including, but not limited to, removal of undesirable non-native plants, revegetation with acceptable locally indigenous plants and clearing of trash and other debris in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Fire Department.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACFD 2. LACFD/CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Water Flow Diversion and Management 4.6-73. At the subdivision map level, the project applicant, or its designee, shall design and implement project-specific design measures to minimize changes in surface water flows to the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) for all Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to the preserve(s) and buffers, and avoid and minimize indirect impacts to the spineflower. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for each such subdivision map, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit for approval to the County plans and specifications that ensure implementation of the following design measures: (a) During construction activities, drainage ditches, piping or other approaches will be put in place to convey excess storm water and other surface water flows away from the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) and connectivity/preserve design/buffers, identified in **Mitigation Measures 4.6-66** and **4.6-67**; (b) Final grading and drainage design will be developed that does not change the current surface and subsurface hydrological conditions within the preserve(s); (c) French drains will be installed along the edge of any roadways and fill slopes that drain toward the preserve(s); (d) Roadways will be constructed with slopes that convey water flows within the roadway easements and away from the preserve(s);	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP/LACDPW 2. LACDRP/LACDPW /CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
(e) Where manufactured slopes drain toward the preserve(s), a temporary irrigation system would be installed to the satisfaction of the County in order to establish the vegetation on the slope area(s). This system shall continue only until the slope vegetation is established and self-sustaining; (f) Underground utilities will not be located within or through the preserve(s). Drainage pipes installed within the preserve(s) away from spineflower populations to convey surface or subsurface water away from the populations will be aligned to avoid the preserve(s) to the maximum extent practicable; and (g) Fencing or other structural type barriers that will be installed to reduce intrusion of people or domestic animals into the preserve(s) shall incorporate footing designs that minimize moisture collection.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Biological Monitor			
4.6-74. A knowledgeable, experienced botanist/biologist, subject to approval by the County and CDFG, shall be required to monitor the grading and fence/utility installation activities that involve earth movement adjacent to the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) to avoid the incidental take through direct impacts of conserved plant species, and to avoid disturbance of the preserve(s). The biological monitor will conduct bi-weekly inspections of the project site during such grading activities to ensure that the mitigation measures provided in the adopted Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (Biota section) are implemented and adhered to. Monthly monitoring reports, as needed, shall be submitted to the County verifying compliance with the mitigation measures specified in the adopted Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (Biota section). The biological monitor will have authority to immediately stop any such grading activity that is not in compliance with the adopted Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (Biota section), and to take reasonable steps to avoid the take of, and minimize the disturbance to, spineflower populations within the preserve(s).	Monitoring Biologist	Bi-weekly site inspections and monthly monitoring reports as needed	1. LACDRP/LACDPW 2. LACDRP/LACDPW /CDFG 3. Prior to Issuance of construction permit(s)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Construction Impact Avoidance Measures	Monitoring Biologist	Bi-weekly site inspections and monthly monitoring reports as needed	1. LACDRP/LACDPW 2. LACDRP/LACDPW /CDFG 3. Prior to issuance of occupancy permit(s)
4.6-75. The following measures shall be implemented to avoid and minimize indirect impacts to Newhall Ranch spineflower populations during all phases of project construction: (a) Water Control. Watering of the grading areas would be controlled to prevent discharge of construction water into the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) or on ground sloping toward the preserve(s). Prior to the initiation of grading operations, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit for approval to the County an irrigation plan describing watering control procedures necessary to prevent discharge of construction water into the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) and on ground sloping toward the preserve(s). (b) Storm Water Flow Redirection. Diversion ditches would be constructed to redirect storm water flows from graded areas away from the Newhall Ranch preserve(s). To the extent practicable, grading of areas adjacent to the preserve(s) would be limited to spring and summer months (May through September) when the probability of rainfall is lower. Prior to the initiation of grading operations, the project applicant, or its designee, would submit for approval to the County a storm water flow redirection plan that demonstrates the flow of storm water away from the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s). (c) Treatment of Exposed Graded Slopes. Graded slope areas would be trimmed and finished as grading proceeds. Slopes would be treated with soil stabilization measures to minimize erosion. Such measures may include seeding and planting, mulching, use of geotextiles and use of stabilization mats. Prior to the initiation of grading operations, the project applicant, or its designee, would submit for approval to the County the treatments to be applied to exposed graded slopes that would ensure minimization of erosion.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
Reassessment Requirement 4.6-76. In conjunction with submission of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map in either Mesas Village or that portion of Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs, the project applicant, or its designee, shall reassess project impacts, both direct and indirect, to the spineflower populations using subdivision mapping data, baseline data from the Newhall Ranch Final EIR and data from the updated plant surveys (see, Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.6-53). This reassessment shall take place during preparation of the required tiered EIR for each subdivision map. If the reassessment results in the identification of new or additional impacts to Newhall Ranch spineflower populations, which were not previously known or identified, the mitigation measures set forth in this program, or a Fish and Game Code section 2081 permit(s) issued by CDFG, shall be required, along with any additional mitigation required at that time.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	In conjunction with submission of the first subdivision map in either Mesas Village or that portion of Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. Prior to subdivision map approval

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.) **Newhall Ranch Monitoring and Management** 4.6-77. Direct and indirect ~~i~~impacts to the preserved Newhall Ranch spineflower populations shall require a monitoring and management plan, subject to the approval of the County. The applicant shall consult with CDFG with respect to preparation of the Newhall Ranch spineflower monitoring/management plan. This plan shall be in place when the preserve(s) and connectivity/preserve design/buffers are established (see **Mitigation Measures 4.6-66 and 4.6-67**). The criteria set forth below shall be included in the plan. **Monitoring**. The purpose of the monitoring component of the plan is to track the viability of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) and its populations, and to ensure compliance with the adopted Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (Biota section). The monitoring component of the plan shall investigate and monitor factors such as population size, growth or decline, general condition, new impacts, changes in associated vegetation species, pollinators, seed dispersal vectors and seasonal responses. Necessary management measures will be identified. The report results will be sent annually to the County, along with photo documentation of the assessed site conditions. The project applicant, or its designee, shall contract with a qualified botanist/biologist, approved by the County, with the concurrence of CDFG, to conduct quantitative monitoring over the life of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The botanist/biologist shall have a minimum of three years experience with established monitoring techniques and familiarity with southern California flora and target taxa. Field surveys of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) will be conducted each spring. Information to be obtained will include: (a) an estimate of the numbers of spineflowers in each population within the preserve(s); (b) a map of the extent of occupied habitat at each population; (c) establishment of photo monitoring points to aid in documenting long-term trends in habitat; (d) aerial photographs of the preserved areas at five-year intervals; (e) identification of significant impacts that may have occurred or problems that need attention, including invasive plant problems, weed problems and fencing or signage repair; and (f) overall compliance with the adopted mitigation measures.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Site surveys and annual reports as directed by this measure The length of the active management components set forth above shall be governed by attainment of successful management criteria	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. As necessary per the guidelines set forth in the measure

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6-77. (cont.) For a period of three years from Specific Plan re-approval, all areas of potential habitat on the Newhall Ranch site will be surveyed annually in the spring with the goal of identifying previously unrecorded spineflower populations. Because population size and distribution limits are known to vary depending on rainfall, annual surveys shall be conducted for those areas proposed for development in order to establish a database appropriate for analysis at the project-specific subdivision map level (rather than waiting to survey immediately prior to proceeding with the project-specific subdivision map process). In this way, survey results gathered over time (across years of varying rainfall) will provide information on ranges in population size and occupation. New populations, if they are found, will be mapped and assessed for inclusion in the preserve program to avoid impacts to the species. **Monitoring/Reporting.** An annual report will be submitted to the County and CDFG by December 31st of each year. The report will include a description of the monitoring methods, an analysis of the findings, effectiveness of the mitigation program, site photographs and adoptive management measures, based on the findings. Any significant adverse impacts, signage, fencing or compliance problems identified during monitoring visits will be reported to the County and CDFG for corrective action by the project applicant, or its designee. **Management**. Based on the outcome of ongoing monitoring and additional project-specific surveys addressing the status and habitat requirements of the spineflower, active management of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) will be required in perpetuity. Active management activities will be triggered by a downward population decline over 5 consecutive years, or a substantial drop in population over a 10-year period following County re-approval of the Specific Plan. Examples of management issues that may need to be addressed in the future include, but are not limited to, control of exotic competitive non-native plant species, herbivory predation, weed control, periodic controlled burns or fuel modification compliance.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Site surveys and annual reports as directed by this measure The length of the active management components set forth above shall be governed by attainment of successful management criteria	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. As necessary per the guidelines set forth in the measure

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-77. (cont.) After any population decline documented in the annual populations census following County re-approval of the Specific Plan, the project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for conducting an assessment of the ecological factor(s) that are likely responsible for the decline, and implement management activity or activities to address these factors where feasible. If a persistent population decline is documented, such as a trend in steady population decline persistent for a period of 5 consecutive years, or a substantial drop in population detected over a 10-year period, spineflower may be introduced in appropriate habitat and soils in the Newhall Ranch preserve(s), utilizing the bulk spineflower seed repository, together with other required management activity or activities. These activities shall be undertaken by a qualified botanist/biologist, subject to approval by the County with the concurrence of CDFG. The project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for the funding and implementation of the necessary management activity or activities, as approved by the County and CDFG. The length of the active management components set forth above shall be governed by attainment of successful management criteria set forth in the plan rather than by a set number of years.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Site surveys and annual reports as directed by this measure The length of the active management components set forth above shall be governed by attainment of successful management criteria	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. As necessary per the guidelines set forth in the measure

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.) **Translocation/Reintroduction Program** 4.6-78. To the extent project-related direct and indirect significant impacts on spineflower cannot be avoided or substantially lessened through establishment of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s), and other avoidance, minimization, or other compensatory mitigation measures, a translocation and reintroduction program may be implemented in consultation with CDFG to further mitigate such impacts. Direct impacts (i.e., take) to occupied spineflower areas shall be fully mitigated at a 4:1 ratio. Impacts to occupied spineflower areas caused by significant indirect effects shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio. Introduction of new spineflower areas will be achieved through a combination of direct seeding and translocation of the existing soil seed bank that would be impacted by grading. Prior to any development within, or disturbance to, spineflower populations, on-site and off-site mitigation areas shall be identified and seed and top soil shall be collected. One-third of the collected seed shall be sent to the Rancho Santa Ana Botanical Garden for storage. One third of the seed shall be sent to the USDA National Seed Storage Lab in Fort Collins, Colorado for storage. One third shall be used for direct seeding of the on-site and off-site mitigation areas. **Direct seeding**. Prior to the initiation of grading, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit to the County a program for the reintroduction of spineflower on Newhall Ranch. The reintroduction program shall include, among other information: (a) location map with scale; (b) size of each introduction polygon; (c) plans and specifications for site preparation, including selective clearing of competing vegetation; (d) site characteristics; (e) protocol for seed collection and application; and (f) monitoring and reporting. The program shall be submitted to CDFG for input and coordination. The project applicant, or its designee, shall implement the reintroduction program prior to the initiation of grading. At least **two** candidate spineflower reintroduction areas will be created within Newhall Ranch and one candidate spineflower reintroduction area will be identified offsite. Both on-site and off-site reintroduction areas will be suitable for the spineflower in both plant community and soils, and be located within the historic range of the taxon. Success criteria shall be included in the monitoring/management plan, with criteria for the germination, growth, and production of viable seeds of individual plants for a specified period.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP/CDFG 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			
4.6-78. (cont.) Although the reintroduction program is experimental at this stage, the County considers such a program to be a feasible form of mitigation at this juncture based upon available studies. Botanists/biologists familiar with the ecology and biology of the spineflower would prepare and oversee the reintroduction program. **Translocation**. Prior to the initiation of grading, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit to the County a translocation program for the spineflower. Translocation would salvage the topsoil of spineflower areas to be impacted due to grading. Salvaged spineflower soil seed bank would be translocated to the candidate spineflower reintroduction areas. The translocation program shall include, among other information: (a) location map with scale; (b) size of each translocation polygon; (c) plans and specifications for site preparation, including selective clearing of competing vegetation; (d) site characteristics; (e) protocol for topsoil collection and application; and (f) monitoring and reporting. The translocation program shall be submitted to CDFG for input and coordination. Translocation shall occur within the candidate spineflower reintroduction areas onsite and offsite. Successful criteria for each site shall be included in the monitoring/management plan/with criteria for the germination and growth to reproduction of individual plants for the first year a specified period. Although the translocation program is experimental at this stage, the County considers such a program to be a feasible form of mitigation at this juncture based upon available studies. Botanists/biologists familiar with the ecology and biology of the spineflower would prepare and oversee the translocation program.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Initial Study and subdivision	1. LACDRP/CDFG 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.6 BIOTA (cont.)			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
On-going Agricultural Activities	Applicant	Thirty (30) days advance written notice of proposed conversion to more intensive agricultural uses	1. LACDRP/CDFG 2. LACDRP/CDFG 3. As necessary
4.6-79. The project applicant, or its designee, shall engage in regular and ongoing consultation with the County and CDFG in connection with its ongoing agricultural operations in order to avoid or minimize significant direct impacts to the spineflower. In addition, the project applicant, or its designee, shall provide 30 days advance written notice to the County and CDFG of the proposed conversion of its ongoing rangeland operations on Newhall Ranch to more intensive agricultural uses. The purpose of the advance notice requirement is to allow the applicant, or its designee, to coordinate with the County and CDFG to avoid or minimize significant impacts to the spineflower prior to the applicant's proposed conversion of its ongoing rangeland operations to more intensive agricultural uses. This coordination component will be implemented by or through the County's Department of Regional Planning and/or the Regional Manager of CDFG. Implementation will consist of the County and/or CDFG conducting a site visit of the proposed conversion area(s) within the 30-day period, and making a determination of whether the proposed conversion area(s) would destroy or significantly impact spineflower population in or adjacent to those areas. If it is determined that the conversion area(s) do not destroy or significantly impact spineflower populations, then the County and/or CDFG will authorize such conversion activities in the proposed conversion area(s). However, if it is determined that the conversion area(s) may destroy or significantly impact spineflower populations, then the County and/or CDFG will issue a stop work order to the applicant, or its designee. If such an order is issued, the applicant, or its designee, shall not proceed with any conversion activities in the proposed conversion area(s). However, the applicant, or the designee, may take steps to relocate the proposed conversion activities in an alternate conversion area(s). In doing so, the applicant, or its designee, shall follow the same notice and coordination provisions identified above. This conversion shall not include ordinary pasture maintenance and renovation or dry land farming operations consistent with rangeland management.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

4.7 VISUAL QUALITIES

Key mitigation measures incorporated into the Specific Plan include, but are not limited to:

- the preservation of natural Santa Clara River vegetation and River bluffs,
- the preservation of canyons tributary to the Santa Clara River and other Open Area,
- the placement of the regional River Trail in between SR-126 and the River,
- the regulation and limitation of urban uses between SR-126 and the River which create large windows for viewing the River Corridor, the River bluffs and Santa Susana Mountains from SR-126,
- the preservation of the High Country SMA,
- the preservation of significant topographic features, such as Sawtooth Ridge and Ayers Rock,
- the installation of landscaping, and
- the preservation of significant oak tree stands (less than 4 percent of the estimated 16,000+ oak trees would be impacted).

Chapters 3 and 4 of the Specific Plan contain proposed Development Regulations and Design Guidelines, respectively. The reader is referred to those Chapters of the Specific Plan for the complete list. The Development Regulations and Design Guidelines are intended to provide a comprehensive set of regulations governing the use and development of land which is intended to achieve a development image that blends into adjoining natural landscapes and reduces the alteration of natural landforms and scenic natural features found on the Specific Plan site. The Specific Plan also includes landscape standards directing the use of drought-tolerant and native plants (including the replacement of removed oak trees) that would further highlight the surrounding natural environment. Development Regulations and Design Guidelines are proposed that address:

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.7 VISUAL QUALITIES (cont.)			
• setbacks (Development Regulations, Specific Plan Chapter 3.4, Table 3.4-1), • building heights (Development Regulations, Specific Plan Chapter 3.4, Table 3.4-1), • signage (Development Regulations, Specific Plan Chapter 3.6), • parking (Development Regulations, Specific Plan Chapter 3.7), • site planning (Design Guidelines, Specific Plan Chapter 4.3), • architecture (Design Guidelines, Specific Plan Chapter 4.4), • fencing (Design Guidelines, Specific Plan Chapter 4.5), • landscape design (Design Guidelines, Specific Plan Chapter 4.6), • lighting (Design Guidelines, Specific Plan Chapter 4.7), and • grading (Design Guidelines, Specific Plan Chapter 4.8).			
4.7-1. In conjunction with the development review process set forth in Chapter 5 of the Specific Plan, all future subdivision maps and other discretionary permits which allow construction shall incorporate the Development Guidelines (Specific Plan Chapter 3) and Design Guidelines (Specific Plan Chapter 4), and the design themes and view considerations listed in the Specific Plan.	Applicant	Plan Check	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Final Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.7 VISUAL QUALITIES (cont.)			
4.7-2. In design of residential tentative tract maps and site planning of multifamily areas and Commercial and Mixed-Use land use designations along SR-126, the following Design Guidelines shall be utilized. • Where the elevations of buildings will obstruct the views from SR-126 to the south, the location and configuration of individual buildings, driveways, parking, streets, signs and pathways shall be designed to provide view corridors of the River, bluffs and the ridge lines south of the River. Those view corridors may be perpendicular to SR-126 or oblique to it in order to provide for views of passengers within moving vehicles on SR-126. • The Community Park between SR 126 and the Santa Clara River shall be designed to promote views from SR-126 of the River, bluffs and ridge lines to the south of the River. • Residential Site Planning Guidelines set forth in Section 4.3.1 Residential and Architectural Guidelines set forth Section 4.4.1 Residential shall be employed to ensure that the views from SR-126 are aesthetically pleasing and that views of the River, bluffs and ridge lines south of the River are preserved to the extent practicable. • Mixed-Use and the Commercial Site Planning Guidelines set forth in Section 4.3.2 and Architectural Guidelines set forth Section 4.4.2 shall be incorporated to the extent practicable in the design of the Riverwood Village Mixed-Use and Commercial land use designations to ensure that the views from SR-126 are aesthetically pleasing and to preserve views of the River, bluffs and ridge lines south of the River. • Landscape improvements along SR 126 shall incorporate the Landscape Design Guidelines, set forth in Section 4.6 in order to ensure that the views from SR-126 are aesthetically pleasing and to preserve views of the River, bluffs and ridge lines south of the River.	Applicant	Plan Check	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Final Subdivision Maps or Site Plans as applicable

No further mitigation is recommended beyond that already incorporated into the Specific Plan. While the measures contained in the Specific Plan minimize the Specific Plan's visual impact, they cannot reduce the magnitude of the impact to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.8 TRAFFIC/ACCESS			
ON-SITE (EXCEPT SR-126 - SEE BELOW)			
The following mitigation is required relative to all on-site roadways and intersections except SR-126, which is discussed separately below:			
4.8-1. The applicants for future subdivision maps which permit construction shall be responsible for funding and constructing all on-site traffic improvements except as otherwise provided below. The obligation to construct improvements shall not preclude the applicants' ability to seek local, State or Federal funding for these facilities.	Applicant(s)	Bonding of and/or Receipt of Funding and/or Field Verification of Construction	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit
4.8-2. Prior to the approval of each subdivision map which permits construction, the applicant for that map shall prepare a transportation performance evaluation which shall indicate the specific improvements for all on-site roadways which are necessary to provide adequate roadway and intersection capacity as well as adequate right-of-way for the subdivision and other expected traffic. Transportation performance evaluations shall be approved by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works according to standards and policies in effect at that time. The transportation performance evaluation shall form the basis for specific conditions of approval for the subdivision.	Applicant (Traffic Engineer)	Receipt and Review of Transportation Performance Evaluation	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Approval of Subdivision Maps
4.8-3. The applicants for future subdivisions shall provide the traffic signals at the 15 locations labeled "B" through "P" in **Figure 4.8-17** as well as any additional signals warranted by future subdivision design. Signal warrants shall be prepared as part of the transportation performance evaluations noted in **Mitigation 4.8-2.**	Applicant (Traffic Engineer)	Installation of Traffic Signals or funding of or bonding of project's share	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.8-4. All development within the Specific Plan shall conform to the requirements of the Los Angeles County Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance.	Applicant (Traffic Engineer)	Subdivision Review	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Final Map Approval and/or approval of improvement plans

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.8 TRAFFIC/ACCESS (cont.)			
4.8-5. The applicants for all future subdivision maps which permit construction shall consult with the local transit provider regarding the need for, and locations of, bus pull-ins on highways within the Specific Plan area. All bus pull-in locations shall be approved by the Department of Public Works, and approved bus pull-ins shall be constructed by the applicant.	Applicant (Traffic Engineer)	Verification of Consultation with Transit Providers Review of bus pull-in locations	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Final Map Approval and/or approval of improvement plans
OFF-SITE ARTERIALS			
4.8-6. Prior to the recordation of the first subdivision map which permits construction, the applicant for that map shall prepare a transportation performance evaluation which shall determine the specific improvements needed to each off-site arterial and related costs in order to provide adequate roadway and intersection capacity for the expected Specific Plan and General Plan buildout traffic trips. The transportation performance evaluation shall be based on the Master Plan of Highways in effect at that time and shall be approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The applicant shall be required to fund its fair share of improvements to these arterials, as stated on **Table 4.8-18**. The applicants total funding obligation shall be equitably distributed over the housing units and non-residential building square footage (i.e., Business Park, Visitor-Serving, Mixed-Use, and Commercial) in the Specific Plan, and shall be a fee to be paid to the County and/or the City at each building permit. For off-site areas within the County unincorporated area, the applicant may construct improvements for credit against or in lieu of paying the fee.	Applicant(s)	Payment of Fee Determination of fair share funding obligation and fee structure for off-site improvements	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of the First Subdivision Map

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.8 TRAFFIC/ACCESS (cont.)			
FREEWAYS AND STATE HIGHWAYS (I-5 AND SR-126 IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY)			
4.8-7. Each future performance evaluation which shows that a future subdivision map will create significant impacts on SR-126 shall analyze the need for additional travel lanes on SR-126. If adequate lane capacity is not available at the time of subdivision, the applicant of the subdivision shall fund or construct the improvements necessary to serve the proposed increment of development. Construction or funding of any required facilities shall not preclude the applicant's ability to seek State, Federal or local funding for these facilities.	Applicant(s)	Receipt and Review of Transportation Performance Evaluation Applicant Funding of or bonding of Fair Share of Improvements	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Tract Map

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.8 TRAFFIC/ACCESS (cont.)			
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT			
4.8-8. Project-specific environmental analysis for future subdivision maps which allow construction shall comply with the requirements of the Congestion Management Program in effect at the time that subdivision map is filed.	Applicant	Review of future environmental analysis	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to certification of future environmental documents
SR-126 IN VENTURA COUNTY			
4.8-9. Prior to the recordation of the first subdivision map which permits construction, the applicant for that map shall prepare a transportation evaluation including all of the Specific Plan land uses which shall determine the specific improvements needed to the following intersections with SR-126 in the City of Fillmore and community of Piru in Ventura County: "A", "B", "**C**", "D" and "E" Streets, Old Telegraph, Olive, Central, Santa Clara, Mountain View, El Dorado Road, and Pole Creek (Fillmore), and Main/Torrey and Center (Piru). The related costs of those intersection improvements and the project's fair share shall be estimated based upon the expected Specific Plan traffic volumes. The transportation performance evaluation shall be based on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways in effect at that time and shall be approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The applicant's total funding obligation shall be equitably distributed over the housing units and non-residential building square footage (i.e., Business Park, Visitor Center, Mixed Use, and Commercial) in the Specific Plan, and shall be a fee to be paid to the City of Fillmore and the County of Ventura at each building permit.	Applicant (Traffic Engineer)	Receipt and Review of Transportation Performance Evaluation Payment of Fee to City of Fillmore or County of Ventura	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of the First Subdivision Map; Payment of Fee Prior to Issuance of Building Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.8 TRAFFIC/ACCESS (cont.)			
FREEWAY/HIGHWAY INTERSECTIONS AND INTERCHANGES			
4.8-10. The Specific Plan is responsible to construct or fund its fair-share of the intersections and interchange improvements indicated on Table 4.8-18. Each future transportation performance evaluation required by **Mitigation Measure 4.8-2** which identifies a significant impact at these locations due to subdivision map-generated traffic shall address the need for additional capacity at each of these locations. If adequate capacity is not available at the time of subdivision map recordation, the performance evaluation shall determine the improvements necessary to carry Specific Plan generated traffic, as well as the fair share cost to construct such improvements. If the future subdivision is conditioned to construct a phase of improvements which results in an overpayment of the fair-share cost of the improvement, then an appropriate adjustment (offset) to the fees paid to Los Angeles County and/or City of Santa Clarita pursuant to **Mitigation Measure 4.8-6** above shall be made.	Applicant	Field Verification of Construction or Receipt of Fair Share Funding or Bonding	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
4.8-11. The applicant of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall participate in an I-5 developer fee program, if adopted by the Board of Supervisors for the Santa Clarita Valley.	Applicant	Field Verification of Construction or Receipt of Fair Share Funding or Bonding	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
4.8-12. The applicant of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall participate in a transit fee program, if adopted for the entire Santa Clarita Valley by Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita.	Applicant	Field Verification of Construction or Receipt of Fair Share Funding or Bonding	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.8 TRAFFIC/ACCESS (cont.)			
4.8-13. Prior to the approval of each subdivision map which permits construction, the applicant for that map shall prepare a traffic analysis approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The analysis will assess project and cumulative development (including an existing plus cumulative development scenario under the County's Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines (TIA) and its Development Monitoring System (DMS)). In response to the traffic analysis, the applicant may construct off-site traffic improvements for credit against, or in lieu of paying, the mitigation fees described in **Mitigation Measure 4.8-6** above. If future subdivision maps are developed in phases, a traffic study for each phase of the subdivision map may be submitted to determine the improvements needed to be constructed with that phase of development.	Applicant(s) (Project Traffic Engineer)	Receipt and Review of TIA and DMS Traffic Analysis Applicant Funding of or bonding of Fair Share of Improvements	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of the Final Tract Map

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.9 NOISE			
CONSTRUCTION			
4.9-1. All construction activity occurring on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site shall adhere to the requirements of the "County of Los Angeles Construction Equipment Noise Standards," County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, §12.08.440 as identified in Table 4.9-3.	Applicant (Construction Contractor)	Include Measure in Specifications Field Verification With Noise Monitor	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. During Grading and Construction Activities
4.9-2. Limit all construction activities near occupied residences to between the hours of 6:30 A.M. and 8:00 P.M., and exclude all Sundays and legal holidays pursuant to County Department of Public Works, Construction Division standards.	Applicant (Construction Contractor)	Include Measure in Specifications Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. During Grading and Construction Activities
4.9-3. When construction operations occur adjacent to occupied residential areas, implement appropriate additional noise reduction measures that include changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, notifying adjacent residences in advance of construction work, and installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.	Applicant (Construction Contractor)	Include Measure in Specifications Field Verification and Verification that Adjacent Residents Were Notified	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. During Grading and Construction Activities

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.9-4. Locate construction staging areas on-site to maximize the distance between staging areas and occupied residential areas.	Applicant (Construction Contractor)	Include Measure in Specifications Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. During Grading and Construction Activities

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.9 NOISE (cont.)			
OPERATION			
4.9-5. Where new single family residential buildings are to be constructed within an exterior noise contour of 60 dB(A) CNEL or greater, or where any multi-family buildings are to be constructed within an exterior noise contour of 65 dB(A) CNEL or greater, an acoustic analysis shall be completed prior to approval of building permits. The acoustical analysis shall show that the building is designed so that interior noise levels resulting from outside sources will be no greater than 45 dB(A) CNEL.	Applicant	Receipt and Review of Acoustical Analysis	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits
4.9-6. For single family residential lots located within the 60 dB(A) CNEL or greater noise contour, an acoustic analysis shall be submitted prior to tentative approval of the subdivision. The acoustic analysis shall show that exterior noise in outdoor living areas (e.g., back yards, patios, etc.) will be reduced to 60 dB(A) CNEL or less.	Applicant	Receipt and Review of Acoustical Analysis	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Tentative Approval of Subdivision
4.9-7. For multi-family residential lots located within the 65 dB(A) CNEL or greater noise contour, an acoustic analysis shall be submitted prior to tentative approval of the subdivision. The acoustic analysis shall show that exterior noise in outdoor living areas (e.g., back yards, patios, etc.) will be reduced to 65 dB(A) CNEL or less.	Applicant	Receipt and Review of Acoustical Analysis	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Tentative Approval of Subdivision
4.9-8. For school sites located within the 70 dB(A) CNEL or greater noise contour, an acoustic analysis shall be submitted prior to tentative approval of the subdivision. The acoustic analysis shall show that noise at exterior play areas will be reduced to 70 dB(A) CNEL or less.	Applicant	Receipt and Review of Acoustical Analysis	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Tentative Approval of Subdivision

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.9-9. All residential air conditioning equipment installed within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site shall adhere to the requirements of the "County of Los Angeles Residential Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Noise Standards," County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, §12.08.530.	Building Contractor	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to the Issuance of Occupancy Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.9 NOISE (cont.)			
4.9-10. All stationary and point sources of noise occurring on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site shall adhere to the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, §12.08.390 as identified in Table 4.9-2, County of Los Angeles Exterior Noise Standards for Stationary and Point Noise Sources.	Future Owners/ Operators within project	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LA County Department of Building and Safety 3. During Life of Project
4.9-11. Loading, unloading, opening, closing, or other handling of boxes, crates, containers, building materials, garbage cans or similar objects between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M. in such a manner as to cause a noise disturbance is prohibited in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, §12.08.460.	Future Owners/ Operators within project	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. During Life of Project
4.9-12. Loading zones and trash receptacles in commercial and Business Park areas shall be located away from adjacent residential areas, or provide attenuation so that noise levels at residential uses do not exceed the standards identified in §12.08.460 of the Ordinance No. 11743.	Applicant	Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Approval of Final Maps or improvement/building plans and Verify Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
4.9-13. Where residential lots are located with direct lines of sight to the Magic Mountain Theme Park, an acoustic analysis shall be submitted to show that exterior noise on the residential lots generated by activities at the park do not exceed the standards identified in §12.08.390 of the Ordinance No. 11743 as identified in Table 4.9-2, County of Los Angeles Exterior Noise Standards for Stationary and Point Noise Sources.	Applicant	Receipt and Review of Acoustical Analysis	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.9-14. After the time that occupancy of uses on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site occurs, AND when noise levels at the Travel Village RV Park reach 70 dB(A) CNEL at locations where recreational vehicles are inhabited, the applicant shall construct a noise abatement barrier to reduce noise levels at the RV Park to 70 dB(A) CNEL or less.	Applicant	Receipt and Review of Acoustical Analysis Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Upon Occupancy of Uses on Newhall Ranch and if/when noise levels in Travel Village reach 70 dB(A) CNEL

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.9 NOISE (cont.)			
4.9-15. Despite the absence of a significant impact, applicants for all building permits of Residential, Mixed-Use, Commercial, and Business Park land uses (Project) shall pay to the Santa Clara Elementary School District, prior to issuance of building permits, the project's pro rata share of the cost of a sound wall to be located between SR-126 and the Little Red School House. The project's pro rata share shall be determined by multiplying the estimated cost of the sound wall by the ratio of the project's estimated contribution of average daily trips on SR-126 (ADT) at the Little Red School House (numerator) to the total projected cumulative ADT increase at that location (denominator).[1] The total projected cumulative ADT increase shall be determined by subtracting the existing trips on SR-126[2] from the projected cumulative trips as shown in Table 1 of Topical Response 5 - Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County after adding the total Newhall Ranch ADT traveling west of the City of Fillmore.	Applicants for all Building Permits	Payment to Santa Clara Elementary School District	1. LACDRP 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Upon Issuance of Building Permits

[1] Cost of Sound Wall X (Project ADT on SR-126 @ LRSH*/Total Projected Cumulative ADT Increase on SR-126 @ LRSH*) * LRSH = Little Red School House.

[2] 25,165 ADT using linear extrapolation from Table 1 of Topical Response 5 - Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.9-16. Despite the absence of a significant impact, the applicant for all building permits of Residential, Mixed-Use, Commercial and Business Park land uses (Project) shall participate on a fair-share basis in noise attenuation programs developed and implemented by the City of Moorpark to attenuate vehicular noise on SR-23 just north of Casey Road for the existing single-family homes which front SR-23. The mitigation criteria shall be to reduce noise levels to satisfy State noise compatibility standards. The project's pro rata share shall be determined by multiplying the estimated cost of attenuation by the ratio of the project's estimated contribution of average daily trips on SR-23 (ADT) north of the intersection of SR-23 and Casey Road (numerator) to the total projected cumulative ADT increase at that location (denominator).[3] The total projected cumulative ADT increase shall be determined by subtracting the existing trips on SR-23 north of Casey Road[4] from the projected cumulative trips as shown in Topical Response 5 - Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County after adding the total Newhall Ranch ADT traveling south of the City of Fillmore.	Applicants for all Building Permits	Payment to City of Moorpark	1. LACDRP 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Upon Issuance of Building Permits

[3] Cost of mitigation x (Project ADT on SR-23 north of Casey Road/Total Projected cumulative ADT Increase on SR-23 north of Casey Road).

[4] ADT using linear extrapolation from Table 1 of Topical Response 5 - Traffic Impacts to State and Local Roads in Ventura County.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.9 NOISE (cont.)			
4.9-17. Prior to the approval of any subdivision map which permits construction within the Specific Plan area, the applicant for that map shall prepare an acoustical analysis assessing project and cumulative development (including an existing plus project analysis, and an existing plus cumulative development analysis including the project). The acoustical analysis shall be based upon State noise land use compatibility criteria and shall be approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services. In order to mitigate any future impacts resulting from the project's contribution to significant cumulative noise impacts to development in existence as of the adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and caused by vehicular traffic on off-site roadways, the applicant for building permits of Residential, Mixed-Use, Commercial, Visitor Serving and Business Park land uses shall, prior to issuance of building permits, pay a fee to Los Angeles County, Ventura County, the City of Fillmore or the City of Santa Clarita. The amount of the fee shall be the project's fair-share under any jurisdiction-wide or Santa Clarita Valley-wide noise programs adopted by any of the above jurisdictions.	Applicants for all Building Permits	Payment of Fee to Los Angeles County, Ventura County, City of Fillmore or the City of Santa Clarita	1. LACDRP 2. Los Angeles Co. Department of Health Services 3. Upon Issuance of Building Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10 AIR QUALITY			
As discussed in Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan includes an on-site mobility system with alternatives to automobile use. Bus transit service within the Santa Clarita Valley currently provides linkages to the MetroLink rail station located on Soledad Canyon Road in the City of Santa Clarita, as well as to major commercial and other high activity centers within the Santa Clarita Valley. As set forth in Specific Plan, bus pull-ins will be provided throughout the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site. Transit service is expected to serve the site when the demand for service justifies the extension of service to the area. The bus transit system will serve to implement SCAQMD mitigation measures pertaining to the establishment of shuttles from the Specific Plan site to commercial core areas and to major rail transit centers. In addition, the Specific Plan incorporates a variety of design concepts, which will reduce total vehicle miles traveled and encourage alternative modes of transportation. These features include Mixed-Use areas, the location of employment centers in proximity to residential areas, and trails, which will accommodate bicycles and pedestrians, which link employment centers and commercial areas. The Specific Plan also reserves land for a future rail right-of-way and an area has been identified for a future transit station within the Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan is designed to reduce vehicle miles traveled through encouraging alternative modes of travel and allowing for residents to work, shop, and recreate in close proximity to their homes.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
The Specific Plan would be built out over an estimated 25-year period. It is unknown at this time what technological developments may take place that may affect the identification and implementation of mitigation measures; however, preliminary information is available on the direction that these developments appear to be taking. Projects planned today should be able to integrate improvements, which facilitate use of new technologies as they become commercially available. For example, several alternatives to gasoline-powered vehicles are being developed today. Fuel cells which generate little, if any, pollutant emissions are being designed and tested as means to supply energy, heat, and cooling for structures. The potential application of measures such as these to reduce emissions should be studied as they become readily available and economically viable. However, with regard to "a fuel cell program for the commercial and industrial buildings", there is no supportable evidence that such a mitigation measure is economically achievable and therefore feasible. Nor is any data available to demonstrate that such a measure would have a measurable or significant effect on reducing air emissions. In addition, Los Angeles County is not aware of any objective data demonstrating that such a measure, if implemented, would measurably reduce air emissions. SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook does not recommend this measure for non-residential land uses. For all these reasons, Los Angeles County rejects this measure as infeasible.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			
However, the following features have been incorporated as part of the Specific Plan to reduce motor vehicle trips:			
4.10-1. The Specific Plan will provide Commercial and Service uses in close proximity to residential subdivisions.	Applicant	Approval of Tentative Maps	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals
4.10-2. The Specific Plan will locate residential uses in close proximity to Commercial uses, Mixed-Uses, and Business Parks.	Applicant	Approval of Tentative Maps	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals
4.10-3. Bus pull-ins will be constructed throughout the Specific Plan site.	Applicant	Final Highway Plan Check	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals
4.10-4. Pedestrian facilities, such as sidewalks, and community regional, and local trails, will be provided throughout the Specific Plan site.	Applicant	Submittal of Tentative Maps	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals
4.10-5. Roads with adjacent trails for pedestrian and bicycle use will be provided throughout the Specific Plan site connecting the individual Villages and community.	Applicant	Submittal of Tentative Maps	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			
CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-6. The applicant of future subdivisions shall implement all rules and regulations adopted by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD which are applicable to the development of the subdivision (such as Rule 402 - Nuisance, Rule 403 - Fugitive Dust, Rule 1113 - Architectural Coatings) and which are in effect at the time of development. The purpose of Rule 403 is to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of man-made fugitive dust sources by requiring actions to prevent, reduce, or mitigate fugitive dust emissions. Rule 403 applies to any activity or man-made condition capable of generating fugitive dust such as the mass and remedial grading associated with the project as well as weed abatement and stockpiling of construction materials (i.e., rock, earth, gravel). Rule 403 requires that grading operations either (1) take actions specified in Tables 1 and 2 of the Rule for each applicable source of fugitive dust and take certain notification and record keeping actions; or (2) obtain an approved Fugitive Dust Control Plan. A complete copy of the SCAQMD's Rule 403 Implementation Handbook, which has been included in **Appendix 4.10**, provides guideline tables to demonstrate the typical mitigation program and record keeping required for grading operations (Tables 1 and 2 and sample record keeping chart). The record keeping is accomplished by on-site construction personnel, typically the construction superintendent. Each future subdivision proposed in association with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall implement the following if found applicable and feasible for that subdivision:	Applicant	Plan Check Review and apply applicable rules as part of environmental document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals
GRADING a. Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more). b. Replace groundcover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-6. (cont.) c. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders according to manufacturers' specifications, to exposed piles (i.e., gravel, sand, dirt) with 5 percent or greater silt content. d. Water active sites at least twice daily. e. Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph. f. Monitor for particulate emissions according to District-specified procedures. g. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114. **PAVED ROADS** h. Sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public paved roads (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water). i. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip. **UNPAVED ROADS** j. Apply water three times daily, or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces. k. Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 mph or less. l. Pave construction roads that have a traffic volume of more than 50 daily trips by construction equipment, 150 total daily trips for all vehicles. m. Pave all construction access roads at least 100 feet on to the site from the main road. n. Pave construction roads that have a daily traffic volume of less than 50 vehicular trips.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-7. Prior to the approval of each future subdivision proposed in association with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, each of the construction emission reduction measures indicated below (and in Tables 11-2 and 11-3 of the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, as amended) shall be implemented if found applicable and feasible for that subdivision. Tables of currently applicable measures are provided for reference in EIR **Appendix 4.10**. **ON-ROAD MOBILE SOURCE CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS:** a. Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference. b. Provide temporary traffic controls when construction activities have the potential to disrupt traffic to maintain traffic flow (e.g., signage, flag person, detours). c. Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours (e.g., between 7:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M. and between 10:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M.). d. Develop a trip reduction plan to achieve a 1.5 average vehicle ridership (AVR) for construction employees. e. Implement a shuttle service to and from retail services and food establishments during lunch hours. f. Develop a construction traffic management plan that includes the following measures to address construction traffic that has the potential to affect traffic on public streets: - Rerouting construction traffic off congested streets; - Consolidating truck deliveries; and - Providing temporary dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off of the site. g. Prohibit truck idling in excess of two minutes. **OFF-ROAD MOBILE SOURCE CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS:** h. Use methanol-fueled pile drivers. i. Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during second stage smog alerts. j. Prevent trucks from idling longer than two minutes. k. Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel-powered generators. l. Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline-powered generators. m. Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment instead of diesel. n. Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of	Applicant	Field Verification and review and include applicable and feasible rules as part of environmental document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			
OPERATION IMPACTS			
The following measures based on current technology and feasibility will be implemented to reduce the operational emissions of the Specific Plan.			
4.10-8. The applicant of future subdivisions shall implement all rules and regulations adopted by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD which are applicable to the development of the subdivision (such as Rule 402 - Nuisance, Rule 1102 - Petroleum Solvent Dry Cleaners, Rule 1111 - NOx Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired, Fan-Type Central Furnaces, Rule 1146 - Emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen from Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters) and which are in effect at the time of occupancy permit issuance.	Applicant	Field Verification and review and include applicable and feasible rules as part of environmental document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-9. Prior to the approval of each future subdivision proposed in association with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, each of the operational emission reduction measures indicated below (and in Tables 11-6 and 11-7 of the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, as amended) shall be implemented if found applicable and feasible for that subdivision. Tables of currently applicable measures are provided for reference in **Appendix 4.10**.	Applicant	Field Verification and review and include applicable and feasible rules as part of environmental document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals
ON-ROAD MOBILE SOURCE OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS:			
RESIDENTIAL USES a. Include satellite telecommunications centers in residential subdivisions. b. Establish a shuttle service from residential subdivisions to commercial core areas. c. Construct on-site or off-site bus stops (e.g., bus turnouts, passenger benches, and shelters). d. Construct off-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as overpasses and wider sidewalks. e. Include retail services within or adjacent to residential subdivisions. f. Provide shuttles to major rail transit centers or multi-modal stations. g. Contribute to regional transit systems (e.g., right-of-way, capital improvements, etc.). h. Synchronize traffic lights on streets impacted by development. i. Construct, contribute, or dedicate land for the provision of off-site bicycle trails linking the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-9. (cont.) **COMMERCIAL USES** j. Provide preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools and provide 7′2″ minimum vertical clearance in parking facilities for vanpool access. k. Implement on-site circulation plans in parking lots to reduce vehicle queuing. l. Improve traffic flow at drive-throughs by designing separate windows for different functions and by providing temporary parking for orders not immediately available for pickup. m. Provide video-conference facilities. n. Set up resident worker training programs to improve job/housing balance. o. Implement home dispatching system where employees receive routing schedule by phone instead of driving to work. p. Develop a program to minimize the use of fleet vehicles during smog alerts (for business not subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202) or XII). q. Use low-emissions fleet vehicles: - TLEV - ULEV - LEV - ZEV r. Reduce employee parking spaces for those businesses subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202). s. Implement a lunch shuttle service from a worksite(s) to food establishments. t. Implement compressed work-week schedules where weekly work hours are compressed into fewer than five days. - 9/80 - 4/40 - 3/36 u. Develop a trip reduction plan to achieve 1.5 AVR for businesses with less than 100 employees or multi-tenant worksites. v. Utilize satellite offices rather than regular worksite to reduce VMT. w. Establish a home-based telecommuting program. x. Provide on-site child care and after-school facilities or contribute to off-site development within walking distance.	Applicant	Field Verification and review and include applicable and feasible rules as part of environmental document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-9. (cont.) y. Require retail facilities or special event centers to offer travel incentives such as discounts on purchases for transit riders. z. Provide on-site employee services such as cafeterias, banks, etc. aa. Establish a shuttle service from residential core areas to the worksite. ab. Construct on-site or off-site bus stops (e.g., bus turnouts, passenger benches, and shelters). ac. Implement a pricing structure for single-occupancy employee parking and/or provide discounts to ridesharers. ad. Include residential units within a commercial project. ae. Utilize parking in excess of code requirements as on-site park-n-ride lots or contribute to construction of off-site lots. af. Any two of the following: - Construct off-site bicycle facility improvements, such as bicycle trails linking the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes, or on-site improvements, such as bicycle paths. - Include bicycle parking facilities, such as bicycle lockers and racks. - Include showers for bicycling employees' use. ag. Any two of the following: - Construct off-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as overpasses, wider sidewalks. - Construct on-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as building access which is physically separated from street and parking lot traffic and walk paths. - Include showers for pedestrian employees' use. ah. Provide shuttles to major rail transit stations and multi-modal centers. ai. Contribute to regional transit systems (e.g., right-of-way, capital improvements, etc.). aj. Charge visitors to park. ak. Synchronize traffic lights on streets impacted by development. al. Reschedule truck deliveries and pickups to off-peak hours. am. Set up paid parking systems where drivers pay at walkup kiosk and exit via a stamped ticket to reduce emissions from queuing vehicles. an. Require on-site truck loading zones. ao. Implement or contribute to public outreach programs. ap. Require employers not subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202) to provide commuter information area.	Applicant	Field Verification and review and include applicable and feasible rules as part of environmental document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-9. (cont.) **BUSINESS PARK USES** aq. Provide preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools and provide 7′2″ minimum vertical clearance in parking facilities for vanpool access. ar. Implement on-site circulation plans in parking lots to reduce vehicle queuing. as. Set up resident worker training programs to improve job/housing balance. at. Implement home dispatching system where employees receive routing schedule by phone instead of driving to work. au. Develop a program to minimize the use of fleet vehicles during smog alerts (for business not subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202) or XII). av. Use low-emissions fleet vehicles: - TLEV - ULEV - LEV - ZEV aw. Require employers not subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202) to provide commuter information area. ax. Reduce employee parking spaces for those businesses subject to Regulation XV (now Rule 2202). ay. Implement compressed work-week schedules where weekly work hours are compressed into fewer than five days. - 9/80 - 4/40 - 3/36 az. Offer first right of refusal, low interest loans, or other incentives to employees who purchase or rent local residences. ba. Develop a trip reduction plan to achieve 1.5 AVR for businesses with less than 100 employees or multi-tenant worksites. bb. Provide on-site child care and after-school facilities or contribute to off-site development within walking distance. bc. Provide on-site employee services such as cafeterias, banks, etc. bd. Establish a shuttle service from residential core areas to the worksite. be. Construct on-site or off-site bus stops (e.g., bus turnouts, passenger benches, and shelters)	Applicant	Field Verification and review and include applicable and feasible rules as part of environmental document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-9. (cont.) bf. Implement a pricing structure for single-occupancy employee parking and/or provide discounts to ridesharers. bg. Utilize parking in excess of code requirements as on-site park-n-ride lots or contribute to construction of off-site lots. bh. Any two of the following: - Construct off-site bicycle facility improvements, such as bicycle trails linking the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes, or on-site improvements, such as bicycle paths. - Include bicycle parking facilities, such as bicycle lockers and racks. - Include showers for bicycling employees' use. bi. Any two of the following: - Construct off-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as overpasses, wider sidewalks. - Construct on-site pedestrian facility improvements, such as building access which is physically separated from street and parking lot traffic and walk paths. - Include showers for pedestrian employees' use. bj. Provide shuttles to major rail transit stations and multi-modal centers. bk. Contribute to regional transit systems (e.g., right-of-way, capital improvements, etc.). bl. Synchronize traffic lights on streets impacted by development. bm. Reschedule truck deliveries and pickups to off-peak hours. bn. Implement a lunch shuttle service from a worksite(s) to food establishments. bo. Require on-site truck loading zones. bp. Install aerodynamic add-on devices to heavy-duty trucks. bq. Implement or contribute to public outreach programs.	Applicant	Field Verification and review and include applicable and feasible rules as part of environmental document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals
STATIONARY SOURCE OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS			
RESIDENTIAL USES br. Use solar or low emission water heaters. bs. Use central water heating systems. bt. Use built-in energy-efficient appliances. bu. Provide shade trees to reduce building heating/cooling needs. bv. Use energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners. bw. Use double-paned windows. bx. Use energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-9. (cont.) **COMMERCIAL USES** by. Use lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting. bz. Use fuel cells in residential subdivisions to produce heat and electricity. ca. Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and include passive solar design (e.g., daylighting). cb. Use light-colored roofing materials to reflect heat. cc. Increase walls and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements. cd. Use solar or low emission water heaters. ce. Use central water heating systems. cf. Provide shade trees to reduce building heating/cooling needs. cg. Use energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners. ch. Use double-paned windows. ci. Use energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights. cj. Use lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting. ck. Use light-colored roofing materials to reflect heat. cl. Increase walls and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements. cm. Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and include passive solar design (e.g., daylighting). **BUSINESS PARK USES** cn. Provide shade trees to reduce building heating/cooling needs. co. Use energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioning. cp. Use double-paned windows. cq. Use energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights. cr. Use lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting. cs. Use light-colored roofing materials to reflect heat. ct. Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and include passive solar design (e.g., daylighting). cu. Increase walls and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements. cv. Improved storage and handling or source materials. cw. Materials substitution (e.g., use water-based paints, life-cycle analysis). cx. Modify manufacturing processes (e.g., reduce process stages, closed-loop systems, materials recycling). cy. Resource recovery systems that redirect chemicals to new production processes.	Applicant	Field Verification and review and include applicable and feasible rules as part of environmental document	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Tentative Subdivision Map Approvals

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			
4.10-10. All non-residential development of 25,000 gross square feet or more shall comply with the County's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance (Ordinance No. 93-0028M) in effect at the time of subdivision. The sizes and configurations of the Specific Plan's non-residential uses are not known at this time and the Ordinance specifies different requirements based on the size of the project under review. All current provisions of the ordinance are summarized in **Appendix 4.10**.	Applicant	Include Requirement in Future environmental documents and/or check at Building Permit	1. LACDPW 2. LACDRP 3. Tentative Map Approval or Building Permit, as applicable
4.10-11. Subdivisions and buildings shall comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations which are current at the time of development.	Applicant	Include Requirement in Future environmental documents and/or check at Building Permit	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Tentative Map Approval or Building Permit, as applicable
4.10-12. Lighting for public streets, parking areas, and recreation areas shall utilize energy efficient light and mechanical, computerized or photo cell switching devices to reduce unnecessary energy usage.	Applicant	Include Requirement in Future environmental documents and/or check at Building Permit	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Tentative Map Approval or Building Permit, as applicable
4.10-13. Any on-site subterranean parking structures shall provide adequate ventilation systems to disperse pollutants and preclude the potential for a pollutant concentration to occur.	Applicant	Include Requirement in Future environmental documents and/or check at Building Permit	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Tentative Map Approval or Building Permit, as applicable

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.10-14. The sellers of new residential units shall be required to distribute brochures and other relevant information published by the SCAQMD or similar organization to new homeowners regarding the importance of reducing vehicle miles traveled and related air quality impacts, as well as on local opportunities for public transit and ridesharing.	Applicant	LACDRP Review of information package and distribution records	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit (Package) and Occupancy Permits (Records)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES			
4.11-1. The proposed Specific Plan shall implement a water reclamation system in order to reduce the Specific Plan's demand for imported potable water. The Specific Plan shall install a distribution system to deliver non-potable reclaimed water to irrigate land uses suitable to accept reclaimed water, pursuant to Los Angeles County Department of Health Standards.	Applicant	Subdivision Map Improvement Plan Check	1. LACDRP 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit(s)
4.11-2. Landscape concept plans shall include a palette rich in drought-tolerant and native plants.	Applicant	Preliminary Landscape Plan Review	1. LACDPW 2. LA County Fire Department or Parks and Recreation 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Map
4.11-3. Major manufactured slopes shall be landscaped with materials that will eventually naturalize, requiring minimal irrigation.	Applicant	Preliminary Landscape Plan Review	1. LACDPW 2. LA County Fire Department or Parks and Recreation 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Map
4.11-4. Water conservation measures as required by the State of California shall be incorporated into all irrigation systems.	Applicant	Architectural Plans	1. California Department of Conservation 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit(s)
4.11-5. The area within each future subdivision within Newhall Ranch shall be annexed to the Valencia Water Company prior to issuance of building permits.	Applicant	CPUC Annexation Approval	1. CPUC 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit(s)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.11-6. In conjunction with the submittal of applications for tentative tract maps or parcel maps which permit construction, and prior to approval of any such tentative maps, ~~Prior to recordation of any final subdivision map that allows construction,~~ and in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County General Plan Development Monitoring System (DMS), as amended, Los Angeles County shall require the applicant of the map ~~subdivision~~ to obtain written confirmation from the retail water agency ~~that a~~ identifying the source(s) of water ~~source is~~ available to ~~supply~~ serve the map ~~subdivision~~ concurrent with need. If the applicant of such map ~~the subdivision~~ cannot obtain confirmation that a water source(s) is available for buildout of the ~~subdivision~~ map, the ~~subdivision~~ map shall be phased with the timing of an available water source(s), consistent with the County's DMS requirements.	Applicant	Written Confirmation of Water Availability	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps
4.11-7. Prior to commencement of use, all uses of recycled water shall be reviewed and approved by the State of California Health and Welfare Agency, Department of Health Services.	Applicant	Plan Check	1. County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading or Occupancy Permit(s) as applicable
4.11-8. Prior to the issuance of building permits that allow construction, the applicant of the subdivision shall finance the expansion costs of water service extension to the subdivision through the payment of connection fees to the appropriate water agency(ies).	Applicant	Payment of Connection Fees	1. CLWA/VWC 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.11-9. Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that the Upper Santa Clara Water Committee (or Santa Clarita Valley Water Purveyors), made up of the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 36, Newhall County Water District, Santa Clarita Water ~~Company~~ Division of CLWA and the Valencia Water Company, prepare an annual water report that will discuss the status of groundwater ~~levels~~ within the Alluvial and Saugus Aquifers, and State Water Project water supplies as they relate to the Santa Clarita Valley. The report will also include an annual update of the actions taken by CLWA to enhance the quality and reliability of existing and planned water supplies for the Santa Clarita Valley. In those years when the Committee or purveyors do~~es~~ not prepare such a report, the applicant at ~~his~~its expense shall cause the preparation of such a report that is acceptable to the County to address these issues. This annual report shall be provided to Los Angeles County who ~~may~~will ~~use~~ consider the report as part of ~~the~~ its local land use decision-making process. (To date, four such water reports have been prepared (1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001) and provided to both the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita.)	Applicant	Receipt of Annual Report	1. Board of Supervisors 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.11-10. Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), in cooperation with other Santa Clarita Valley retail water providers, continue to update the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for Santa Clarita Valley once every five years (on or before December 31) to ensure that the County receives up-to-date information about the existing and planned water supplies in the Santa Clarita Valley. The County will consider the information contained in the updated UWMP in connection with the County's future local land use decision-making process. The County will also consider the information contained in the updated UWMP in connection with the County's future consideration of any Newhall Ranch tentative subdivision maps allowing construction. (see, **Mitigation Measure 4.11-15**, below.)	Applicant	Receipt of written identification of water service from retailer	1. Board of Supervisors 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps
4.11-11. With implementation of the proposed Saugus ASR program, ASR wells shall be spaced so that adjacent non-project wells will not lose pumping capacity as a result of drawdown occurring during pumping of the ASR wells.	Applicant	Receipt of written report addressing proposed and existing well locations, and effects on adjacent wells	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Saugus ASR Program

Deleted:
2. LACD
3. Concu
applicatio
which per

Deleted:
submittal
prior to ap
and parcel
constructi
water pro
the County
of supply
within tha
map. The
identified
use of gro
planned f
basin, whi
annual saf
Alluvial A
recharge r
the Final E
Specific Pl
environme

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.11-12. With implementation of the proposed Saugus ASR program, the ultimate number of ASR wells to be constructed shall be sufficient to inject the ultimate target injection volume of 4,500 acre-feet per year and withdraw the ultimate target withdraw volume of 4,100 acre-feet per year.	Applicant	Receipt of written report from ASR program engineer	1. LACDRPW 2. LACDRPW 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.
4.11-13. With implementation of the proposed Saugus ASR program, ASR wells shall be constructed in the following two general areas: (a) South of the Santa Clara River and west of Interstate 5. This location includes areas within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan boundary. (This area is referred to as the "south ASR well field".); and (b) North of the Santa Clara River and west of Castaic Creek. (This location is referred to as the "north ASR well field.")	Applicant	Receipt of written report from ASR program engineer indicating well locations	1. LACDRPW 2. LACDRPW 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.
4.11-14. The Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program injection water must meet the water quality requirements of the State Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. The water extracted for use on the Specific Plan site shall meet the Title 22 drinking water standards of the State Department of Health Services.	Applicant	Receipt of written report on water quality from ASR program engineer	1. LACDRPW 2. LACDRPW 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.11-15. Groundwater historically and presently used for crop irrigation on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site and elsewhere in Los Angeles County shall be made available by the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, to partially meet the potable water demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The amount of groundwater pumped for this purpose shall not exceed 7,038 AFY. This is the amount of groundwater pumped historically and presently by the Newhall Land and Farming Company in Los Angeles County to support its agricultural operations. Pumping this amount will not result in a net increase in groundwater use in the Santa Clarita Valley. To monitor groundwater use, the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide the County an annual report indicating the amount of groundwater used in Los Angeles County **and the specific land upon which that groundwater was historically used for irrigation. For agricultural land located off the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site in Los Angeles County, at the time agricultural groundwater is transferred from agricultural uses on that land to Specific Plan uses, The Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide a verified statement to the County's Department of Regional Planning that Alluvial aquifer water rights on that land will now be used to meet Specific Plan demand.**	Applicant	Receipt of written identification of water service provider or applicant	1. Board of Supervisors 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps
4.11-16. The agricultural groundwater used to meet the needs of the Specific Plan shall meet the drinking water quality standards required under Title 22 prior to use.	Applicant	Receipt of written report on water quality from ASR program engineer	1. LACDPW 2. LACDRP 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.11-17. In conjunction with each project-specific subdivision map for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the County shall require the applicant of that map to cause to be prepared a supplemental or subsequent Environmental Impact Report, as appropriate, pursuant to CEQA requirements. By imposing this EIR requirement on each Newhall Ranch tentative subdivision map application allowing construction, the County will ensure that, among other things, the water needed for each proposed subdivision is confirmed as part of the County's subdivision map application process. This mitigation requirement shall be read and applied in combination with the requirements set forth in revised **Mitigation Measure 4.11-6**, above.	Applicant	Preparation of supplemental or subsequent EIR	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Concurrent with Approval of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.
4.11-18. The storage capacity purchased in the Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan applicant shall be used in conjunction with the provision of water to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The applicant, or entity responsible for storing Newhall Ranch water in this groundwater bank, shall prepare an annual status report indicating the amount of water placed in storage in the groundwater bank. This report shall be made available annually and used by Los Angeles County in its decision-making processes relating to build-out of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.	Applicant	Receipt of written report from applicant or entity storing Newhall Ranch water	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES (cont.)	Applicant	Review of Initial Study and subdivision maps	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.
4.11-19. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Water Resource Monitoring Program has been entered into between United Water Conservation District and the Upper Basin Water Purveyors, effective August 20, 2001.[5] The MOU/Water Resource Monitoring Program, when executed, will put in place a joint water resource monitoring program that will be an effective regional water management tool for both the Upper and Lower Santa Clara River areas as further information is developed, consistent with the MOU. This monitoring program will result in a database addressing water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over various representative water cycles. The parties to the MOU intend to utilize this database to further identify surface water and groundwater impacts on the Santa Clara River Valley. The applicant, or its designee, shall cooperate in good faith with the continuing efforts to implement the MOU and Water Resource Monitoring Program. As part of the MOU process, the United Water Conservation District and the applicant have also entered into a "Settlement and Mutual Release" agreement, which is intended to continue to develop data as part of an on-going process for providing information about surface and groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley. In that agreement, the County and the applicant have agreed to the following: "4.3 Los Angeles County and Newhall will each in good faith cooperate with the parties to the MOU and will assist them as requested in the development of the database calibrating water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over multi-year water cycles. Such cooperation will include, but not be limited to, providing the parties to the MOU with historical well data and other data concerning surface water and groundwater in the Santa Clara River and, in the case of Newhall, providing Valencia Water Company with access to wells for the collection of well data for the MOU.			

[5] *See*, **Appendix F** to Final Additional Analysis [Memorandum of Understanding Between the Santa Clara River Valley Upper Basin Water Purveyors and

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.11-19. (cont.) 4.4 Los Angeles County and Newhall further agree that the County of Los Angeles will be provided with, and consider, the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program in connection with, and prior to, all future Newhall Ranch subdivision approvals or any other future land use entitlements implementing the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. If the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program identifies significant impacts to surface water or groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley, Los Angeles County will identify those impacts and adopt feasible mitigation measures in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act."	Applicant	Review of Initial Study and subdivision maps	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.

United Water Conservation District, dated August 2001].

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.11 WATER RESOURCES (cont.)			
4.11-20. The Specific Plan applicant, or its successors, shall assign its acquired Nickel Water rights to the Valencia Water Company **or Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), and, in consultation with** the Valencia Water Company**, CLWA or their designee(s), the applicant** shall ensure that the Nickel Water is delivered to the appropriate place of use necessary to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan at the time of need, as determined by the County of Los Angeles through required SB221 and/or SB610 analyses for future subdivision map applications. **Upon approval of the Specific Plan, the applicant, Valencia Water Company, CLWA or a designee, will take delivery of the Nickel Water, so that such water will be used, or stored for use, for the Specific Plan in future years.**	Applicant	Verify during review of Initial Study and subdivision maps	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.
4.11-21. The applicant, in coordination with RWQCB staff, shall select a representative location upstream and downstream of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and sample surface and groundwater quality. Sampling from these two locations would begin upon approval of the first subdivision map and be provided annually to the RWQCB and County for the purpose of monitoring water quality impacts of the Specific Plan over time. If the sampling data results in the identification of significant new or additional water quality impacts resulting from the Specific Plan, which were not previously known or identified, additional mitigation shall be required at the subdivision map level.	Applicant	Water quality sampling in coordination with RWQCB staff	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP/RWQCB 3. Concurrent with Approval of the first Subdivision Map which permits construction, and annually thereafter.
4.11-22. Beginning with the filing of the first subdivision map allowing construction on the Specific Plan site and with the filing of each subsequent subdivision map allowing construction, the Specific Plan applicant, or its designee, shall provide documentation to the County of Los Angeles identifying the specific portion(s) of irrigated farmland in the County of Los Angeles proposed to be retired from irrigated production to make agricultural water available to serve the subdivision. As a condition of subdivision approval, the applicant or its designee, shall provide proof to the County that the agricultural land has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the subdivision.	Applicant	Receipt of written report from applicant	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.12 WASTEWATER DISPOSAL			
4.12-1. The Specific Plan shall reserve a site of sufficient size to accommodate a water reclamation plant to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.	Applicant	Specific Plan Review	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Final Approval of Specific Plan
4.12-2. A 5.8 to 6.9 mgd water reclamation plant shall be constructed on the Specific Plan site, pursuant to County, State and Federal design standards, to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.	WRP Applicant	Review of WRP Construction Plans	1. CSDLAC 2. CSDLAC 3. Prior to Demand for First Phase or WRP Capacity
4.12-3. The Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan shall be implemented pursuant to County, State and Federal design standards.	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Review of Tentative Map	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Approval of Tentative Maps
4.12-4. Prior to recordation of each subdivision permitting construction, the applicant of each subdivision shall obtain a letter from the new County sanitation district stating that treatment capacity will be adequate for that subdivision.	Applicant	Review Final Subdivision Map	1. CSDLAC 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Each Final Subdivision Map
4.12-5. All facilities of the sanitary sewer system will be designed and constructed for maintenance by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and/or the new County sanitation district or similar entity in accordance with their manuals, criteria, and requirements.	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Review Final Subdivision Plans	1. CSDLAC, LACDPW 2. CSDLAC, LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Each Final Subdivision Map

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.12-6. Pursuant to Los Angeles County Code, Title 20, Division 2, all industrial waste pretreatment facilities shall, prior to the issuance of building permits, be reviewed by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Industrial Waste Planning and Control Section and/or the new County sanitation district, to determine if they would be subject to an Industrial Wastewater Disposal Permit.	Applicants for Such Industrial Facilities	Plan Check Review	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits
4.12-7. Each subdivision permitting construction shall be required to be annexed into the Los Angeles County Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District.	LACDPW	Review of Final Sewer Plans	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. After County Acceptance of Sewer Improvements

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.13 NATURAL GAS			
4.13-1. All development within the Specific Plan area shall comply with the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24 of the California Administrative Code), as applicable.	Applicant/Future Owners and Operators within project	Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permit(s)
4.13-2. A letter from Southern California Gas Company (SCGC)or other gas provider is to be obtained prior to recordation of all future subdivisions stating that service can be provided to the subdivision under recordation.	Applicant	Receipt of Letter from Gas Provider	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps
4.13-3. The Specific Plan is to meet the requirements of SCGC in terms of pipeline relocation, grading in the vicinity of gas mains, and development within SCGC easements. These requirements would be explicitly defined by SCGC at the future tentative map stage.	Applicant (Construction Contractor)	Receipt and implementation of Such Requirements from SCGC	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Grading and Construction Operations
4.13-4. All potential buyers or tenants of property in the vicinity of SCGC transmission lines are to be made aware of the line's presence in order to assure that no permanent construction or grading occurs over and within the vicinity of the high-pressure gas mains.	Applicant	Include in Sale/Lease Disclosure Documents	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.14 ELECTRICITY			
4.14-1. All development within the Specific Plan area shall comply with the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24 of the California Administrative Code), as applicable.	Applicant	Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permit(s)
4.14-2. Southern California Edison (SCE)or other energy provider is to be notified of the nature and extent of future development on the Specific Plan site prior to recordation of all future subdivisions.	Applicant	Receipt of Notification to Energy Provider	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Recordation of All Subdivisions
4.14-3. All future tract maps are to comply with SCE or other energy provider guidelines for grading, construction, and development within SCE easements.	Applicant (Construction Contractor)	Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Final Tract Map Approvals and Verify Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
4.14-4. Electrical infrastructure removals and relocations are to be coordinated between the Specific Plan engineer and SCE or other energy provider as each tract is designed and constructed.	Applicant (Specific Plan Engineer)	Receipt of Verification of Such Consultations	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Final Tract Map Approval and During Construction
4.14-5. All future tract maps are to be reviewed by Los Angeles County to ensure adequate accessibility to SCE or other energy provider facilities as a condition of their approvals.	Applicant	Plan Check	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Final Tract Map Approval

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.14-6. Upon transfer of the High Country Special Management Area to another entity for long-term maintenance, continued and adequate access to all SCE facilities in the High Country Special Management Area is to be ensured within the transfer agreement.	Applicant	Review of Transfer Agreement	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Upon Transfer of High Country SMA

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.15 SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL			
4.15-1. Each future subdivision which allows construction within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan shall meet the requirements of all applicable solid waste diversion, storage, and disposal regulations that are in effect at the time of subdivision review. Current applicable regulations include recycling areas that are: • compatible with nearby structures; • secured and protected against adverse environmental conditions; • clearly marked, and adequate in capacity, number and distribution; • in conformance with local building code requirements for garbage collection access and clearance; • designed, placed and maintained to protect adjacent developments and transportation corridors from adverse impacts, such as noise, odors, vectors, or glare; • in compliance with Federal, State, or local laws relating to fire, building, access, transportation, circulation, or safety; and • convenient for persons who deposit, collect, and load the materials.	Applicant	Include in Future Subdivision Design and/or environmental documents for Tentative Maps	1. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 2. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 3. Prior to Tentative Map Approval
4.15-2. Future multi-family, commercial, and industrial projects within the Specific Plan shall provide accessible and convenient areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials. These areas are to be clearly marked and adequate in capacity, number, and distribution to serve the development.	Applicant	Include in Future Subdivision Design and/or environmental documents for Tentative Maps	1. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 2. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 3. Prior to Tentative Map Approval
4.15-3. The first purchaser of each residential unit within the Specific Plan shall be given educational or instructional materials which will describe what constitutes recyclable and hazardous materials, how to separate recyclable and hazardous materials, how to avoid the use of hazardous materials, and what procedures exist to collect such materials.	Applicant	Review of Information Package and Distribution Records	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit (Package) and Occupancy Permits (Records)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.15-4. The applicant of all subdivision maps which allow construction within the Specific Plan shall comply with all applicable future State and Los Angeles County regulations and procedures for the use, collection and disposal of solid and hazardous wastes.	Applicant	Include in Future Subdivision Design and/or environmental documents for Tentative Maps	1. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 2. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 3. Prior to Tentative Map Approval

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.16 EDUCATION			
4.16-1. The Specific Plan developer shall reserve five elementary schools sites, one junior high school site and one high school site, of 7 to 10, 20 to 25, and 40 to 45 acres in size, respectively, depending upon adjacency to local public parks and joint use agreements.	Applicant	Tentative Tract Map Subdivision Review	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Final Approval of Tentative Tract Maps
4.16-2. The developer of future subdivisions which allow construction will comply with the terms and conditions of the School Facilities Funding Agreement between The Newhall Land and Farming Company and the Newhall School District.	Applicant	Verification of Compliance from School District	1. Newhall School District 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Residential Building Permits
4.16-3. The developer of future subdivisions which allow construction will comply with the terms and conditions of the School Facilities Funding Agreement between The Newhall Land and Farming Company and the William S. Hart Union High School District.	Applicant	Verification of Compliance from School District	1. WSHUHSD 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Residential Building Permits
4.16-4. The developer of future subdivisions which allow construction will comply with the terms and conditions of the School Facilities Funding Agreement between The Newhall Land & Farming Company and the Castaic Union School District.	Applicant	Verification of Compliance from School District	1. Castaic Union School District 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Residential Building Permits
4.16-5. In the event that School District boundaries on the Specific Plan site remain unchanged, prior to recordation of all subdivision maps which allow construction, the developer of future subdivisions which allow construction is to pay to the Castaic Union School District the statutory school fee for commercial/industrial square footage pursuant to Government Code Sections 65995 and 65996, unless a separate agreement to the contrary is reached with the District.	Applicant	Payment of Fees	1. Castaic Union School District 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.17 POLICE SERVICES			
4.17-1. As subdivision maps are submitted to the County for approval in the future, the applicant shall incorporate County Sheriff's Department design requirements (such as those pertaining to site access, site security lighting, etc.) which will reduce demands for Sheriff's service to the subdivisions and which will help ensure adequate public safety features within the tract designs.	Applicant	Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Sheriff's Department 2. LA County Sheriff's Department 3. Prior to Final Map Approvals and Verify Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.18 FIRE SERVICES AND HAZARDS			
4.18-1. At the time of final subdivision maps permitting construction in development areas that are adjacent to Open Area and the High Country SMA, a Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan shall be prepared and submitted for approval by the County Fire Department. The Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan shall include the following construction period requirements: (a) a fire watch during welding operations; (b) spark arresters on all equipment or vehicles operating in a high fire hazard area; (c) designated smoking and non-smoking areas; and (d) water availability pursuant to County Fire Department requirements. The wildfire fuel modification plan shall depict a fuel modification zone in conformance with the Fuel Modification Ordinance in effect at the time of subdivision. Within the zone, tree pruning, removal of dead plant material and weed and grass cutting shall take place as required by the County Forester. Fire resistant plant species containing habitat value may be planted in the fuel modification zone.	Applicant	Receipt and Review of Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan	1. LA County Fire Department 2. LA County Fire Department 3. Prior to Approval of Final Maps
4.18-2. Each subdivision and site plan for the proposed Specific Plan shall provide sufficient capacity for fire flows of 1,250 gallons per minute (gpm) at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) residual pressure for a two hour duration for single family residential units, and 5,000 gpm at 20 psi residual pressure for a five-hour duration for multi-family residential units and commercial/retail uses, or whatever fire flow requirement is in effect at the time of subdivision and site plan approval.	Applicant	Field Verification of Required Fire Flows	1. LA County Fire Department 2. LA County Fire Department 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
4.18-3. Each subdivision map and site plan for the proposed Specific Plan shall comply with all applicable building and fire codes and hazard reduction programs for Fire Zones 3 and 4 that are in effect at the time of subdivision map and site plan approval.	Applicant	Field Verification	1. LA County Fire Department 2. LA County Fire Department 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.18 FIRE SERVICES AND HAZARDS (cont.)			
4.18-4. The developer will provide funding for three fire stations to the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County (the "Fire District") in lieu of developer fees. The developer will dedicate two fire station sites for the two fire stations located in Newhall Ranch. The Fire District will dedicate the site for the fire station to be located at the Del Valle Training Facility. Each fire station site will have a building pad consisting of a net buildable area of one acre. If the cost of constructing the three fire stations, providing and dedicating the two fire station sites, and providing 3-engines, 1 paramedic squad and 63 percent of a truck company exceeds the developer's developer fee obligation for the Newhall Ranch development as determined by the Fire District, the Fire District will fund the costs in excess of the fee obligation. Two of the three fire stations to be funded by the developer will not exceed 6,000 square feet; the third fire station to be funded by the developer will not exceed 8,500 square feet. The Fire District, will fund the cost of any space/square footage of improvement in excess of these amounts as well as the cost of the necessary fire apparatus for any such excess square footage of improvements. The cost of three fire engines, a proportionate share of a truck and one squad to be provided by the developer will be determined based upon the apparatus cost at the time the apparatus is placed in service.	Applicant	Execute "Fire Protection Plan" Agreement Monitor Adequacy of Fire Prevention Services	1. LA County Fire Department 2. LA County Fire Department 3. Prior to Approval of First Final Subdivision Map Subdivision Map Review Process

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
The Fire District and the developer will mutually agree to the requirements of first-phase protection requirements based upon projected response/travel coverage. Such mutual agreement regarding first-phase fire protection requirements ("fire protection plan") and the criteria for timing the development of each of the three fire stations will be defined in a Memorandum of Understanding between the developer and the Fire District. Delivery of fire service for Newhall Ranch will be either from existing fire stations or one of the three fire stations to be provided by the developer pursuant to this section. Prior to the commencement of the operation of any of the three fire stations, fire service may be delivered to Newhall Ranch from existing fire stations or from temporary fire stations to be provided by the developer at mutually agreed-upon locations, to be replaced by the permanent stations which will be located within the Newhall Ranch development. The developer and the Fire District will annually review the fire protection plan to evaluate development and market conditions and modify the Memorandum of Understanding accordingly.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.19 LIBRARIES			
4.19-1. The developer will provide funding for a maximum of two libraries (including the site(s), construction, furniture, fixtures, equipment and materials) to the County Librarian. The developer will dedicate a maximum of two library sites for a maximum of two libraries located in Newhall Ranch in lieu of the land component of the County's library facilities mitigation fee, in accordance with the provisions of Section 22.72.090 of Section 2 of Ordinance No. 98-0068. The actual net buildable library site area required and provided by the developer will be determined by the actual size of the library building(s), the Specific Plan parking requirements, the County Building Code, and other applicable rules. The total library building square footage to be funded by the developer will not exceed 0.35 net square feet per person. The developer's funding of construction of the library(s) and furnishings, fixtures, equipment and materials for the library(s) will be determined based on the cost factors in the library facilities mitigation fee in effect at the time of commencement of construction of the library(s).	Applicant	Review of Memorandum of Understanding and Library Construction Plan	1. LA County Library 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of First Residential Building Permit

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
Prior to County's issuance of the first residential building permit of Newhall Ranch to the developer, the County Librarian and the developer will mutually agree upon the library construction requirements (location, size, funding and time of construction) based upon the projected development schedule and the population of Newhall Ranch based on the applicable number of average persons per household included in the library facilities mitigation fee in effect at the time. Such mutual agreement regarding the library construction requirements ("Library Construction Plan") and the criteria for timing the completion of the library(s) will be defined in a Memorandum of Understanding between the developer and the County Librarian. Such Memorandum of Understanding shall include an agreement by the developer to dedicate sufficient land and pay the agreed amount of fees on a schedule to allow completion of the library(s) as described below. The developer's funding for library facilities shall not exceed the developer's fee obligation at the time of construction under the developer fee schedule.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.19 LIBRARIES (cont.)			
If two libraries are to be constructed, the first library will be completed and operational by the time of County's issuance of the 8,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch, and the second library will be completed and operational by the time of County's issuance of the 15,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch. If the County Librarian decides that only one library will be constructed, the library will be completed and operational by the time of County's issuance of the 10,000th residential building permit of Newhall Ranch.			
No payment of any sort with respect to library facilities will be required under Section 2.5.3.d. of the Specific Plan in order for the developer to obtain building permits for nonresidential buildings.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
4.20 PARKS, RECREATION AND TRAILS			
4.20-1. Development of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan will provide the following acreages of parks and Open Area: • Ten public Neighborhood Parks totaling 55 acres; • Open Areas totaling 1,106 acres of which 186 acres are Community Parks, • High Country Special Management Area of 4,214 acres, • River Corridor Special Management Area of 819 acres, • a 15-acre Lake, • an 18-hole Golf Course, and • a trail system consisting of: - Regional River Trail, - Community Trails, and - Unimproved Trails.	Applicant	Subdivision Review for Compliance with Specific Plan	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Processing of Tentative Subdivision Maps
4.20-2. Prior to the construction of the proposed trail system, the project applicant shall finalize the alignment of trails with the County Department of Parks and Recreation.	Applicant	Verification of Consultation of Department of Parks and Recreation	1. LACDRP 2. LA County Department of Parks and Recreation 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit for Trails
4.20-3. Trail construction shall be in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation trail system standards.	Applicant	Trails Plan Review Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Parks and Recreation 2. LA County Department of Parks and Recreation 3. Prior to Approval of Trail Plans and Verify Upon Construction Completion
4.21 POPULATION, HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT			
4.21-1. The Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan shall be amended by Los Angeles County to accommodate the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.	Applicant	General Plan Amendment	1. Board of Supervisors 2. LACDRP 3. Final Specific Plan Approval

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL			
(a) Require the applicant to submit a signed statement, filed concurrently with the filing of any departmental development application, obligating the applicant to disclose to the Department of Regional Planning the existence of any endangered or threatened species that are known or suspected to exist on the subject property.	Applicant	Verify during review of Initial Study and subdivision maps	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.
(b) Require the applicant to report to the Department of Regional Planning the results of all on-site biological surveys within thirty (30) days after completion of the survey work.	Applicant	Report containing results of all on-site biological surveys within thirty (30) days after completion of the survey work.	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. As necessary
(c) Require the applicant to schedule a consultation meeting between the Department of Regional Planning, the applicant and environmental consultant(s) to discuss the results of the survey work, and to ensure public disclosure of the survey results in the required environmental documentation for the proposed project.	Applicant and Environmental Consultant(s)	Meeting after field surveys	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. As necessary
(d) Clean sediment, periodically removed from debris basins within or outside the Specific Plan, may be placed into the Santa Clara River area as approved by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by DPW.	Applicant	Verify need annually, document to LACDPW	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. As necessary after installation of buried bank stabilization

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
(e) Prior to approval of the first subdivision map which permits construction, a report will be provided by the applicant which evaluates methods to recharge the Saugus Aquifer within the Specific Plan, including the identification of appropriate candidate land areas for recharge. The report shall be subject to approval by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by DPW.	Applicant	Report to LADPW	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to approval of the first subdivision map which permits construction

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (cont)			
(f) All purchasers of homes within any subdivision in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are to be provided with a disclosure statement in the purchase/sales documentation making the purchaser(s) aware that the parking and storage of recreational vehicles on the purchased home/lot must satisfy the standards established by the County of Los Angeles and/or as contained in the Conditions Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs), whichever is more restrictive.	Applicant, or seller of home/lot if not the Applicant	Provision of Disclosure Statement	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. At the time a home/lot is sold

MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN
(Water Reclamation Plant)

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOILS RESOURCES			
5.0-1. Prior to construction of the water reclamation plant, prepare a detailed geotechnical report that will outline the geotechnical performance requirements for placing and compacting the fill at the water reclamation plant site and along on-site sewer line alignments to ensure that none of the wastewater conveyance or treatment facilities would be subject to hazards caused by expansive soils. Construction of wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities shall comply with the requirements identified in the report.	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Building and Verify During WRP Construction
5.0-2. Should any expansive soils be encountered during grading operations, they shall not be placed nearer the finished surface than 8 feet below the bottom of the subgrade elevation. If expansive materials are encountered at subgrade elevation in cut areas, the soils shall be removed to a depth of 8 feet below the subgrade surface and the excavated area backfilled with nonexpansive, properly compacted soils. These depths are subject to revision depending upon the expansive potential measured during grading.	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-3. Prior to grading of the WRP site and the associated sewer lines, a detailed geotechnical performance report is to be prepared and approved by the WRP Operator, which will assess liquefaction potential along sewer line alignments, and which will identify design measures for potential liquefaction hazards. WRP collection and treatment facilities construction is to comply with the measures identified in the performance report.	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Approval of Detailed Geotechnical Performance Report Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Grading and Verify During WRP Construction

ACOE - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CIWMB - California Integrated Waste Management Board
CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
FCD - Flood Control Division
LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District
LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
RWQCBLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
USFWS - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOILS RESOURCES (cont.)			
5.0-4. All water reclamation plant structures and facilities are to be constructed according to Uniform Building Code standards for the appropriate Seismic Risk Zone (Zone 4).	WRP Operator (Structural Engineer)	Plan Check Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Initial Operation
5.0-5. If the height of the fill exceeds the shear strength of such saturated soils, settlement and ground failure could occur, resulting in damage to structures and/or injury to people. Potentially consolidatible materials are to be properly removed and the fill material is to be properly compacted and protected against the erosive effects of storm and River flows.	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-6. All fills, unless otherwise specifically designed, are to be compacted to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry unit weight as determined by ASTM Designation D 1557-91 Method of Soil Compaction. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-7. No fill is to be placed until the area to receive the fill has been adequately prepared and approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-8. Fill soils are to be kept free of all debris and organic material. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.1 GEOTECHNICAL AND SOILS RESOURCES (cont.)			
5.0-9. Rocks or hard fragments larger than 8 inches are not to be placed in the fill without approval of the Geotechnical Engineer, and in a manner specified for each occurrence. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-10. Rock fragments larger than 8 inches are not to be placed within 10 feet of finished pad grade or the subgrade of roadways or within 15 feet of a slope face. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-11. When moisture content of the fill material is too low to obtain adequate compaction, water is to be added and thoroughly dispersed until the soil is approximately 2 percent over optimum moisture content. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-12. When the moisture content of the fill material is too high to obtain adequate compaction, the fill material is to be aerated by blading or other satisfactory methods until the soil is approximately two percent over optimum moisture content. (R.T. Frankian & Associates, 19 September 1994, Appendix I)	WRP Operator (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-13. Surface runoff from the future graded areas is not to run over any natural, cut, or fill slopes. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, 19 September 1994, Inc., p. 20)	WRP Operator (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.2 FLOOD			
5.0-14. Runoff from future pads and structures is to be collected and channeled to the street and/or natural drainage courses via non-erosive drainage devices. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20)	WRP Operator (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-15. Water is not to stand or pond anywhere on the graded pads. (Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc., 19 September 1994, p. 20)	WRP Operator (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading Operations
5.0-16. Prepare and implement a County-approved erosion control plan to be implemented during the construction of the WRP.	WRP Operator (Civil Engineer)	Approval of Erosion Control Plan Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Grading and Verify During Grading Operations
5.0-17. All on- and off-site flood control improvements necessary to alleviate flood hazards and provide proper drainage controls are to be constructed to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, FCD.	WRP Operator (Civil Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, FCD 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits
5.0-18. All necessary permits or letters of exemption from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for WRP-related development are to be obtained.	WRP Applicant	Receipt of Permits	1. ACOE, CDFG, and RWQCBLAR 2. WRP Applicant 3. Prior to Grading
5.0-19. Conditional Letters of Map Revision (CLOMR) relative to adjustments to the 100-year FIA flood plain are to be obtained by the applicant after the proposed drainage facilities are constructed.	WRP Operator (Civil Engineer)	Receipt of CLOMR	1. LACDPW, FCD 2. WRP Operator 3. Upon Completion of Facilities

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.0-20. Prior to grading, a Final Hydrology Plan, a Final Drainage Plan, and a Final Grading Plan (including an Erosion Control Plan, as required) are to be prepared by the applicant and approved by the Department of Public Works, where applicable, to ensure that no significant erosion, sedimentation, or flooding impacts would occur during or after site development.	WRP Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Approval of Final Hydrology Plan, Final Drainage Plan, Final Grading Plan	1. LACDPW 2. FCD 3. Prior to Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.3 CULTURAL/PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
5.0-21. No significant impact to cultural or paleontological resources are anticipated from construction of the WRP. However, should such resources be found during site grading, a professional archaeologist or paleontologist will be retained to evaluate the significance of the finding and to identify appropriate methods of preserving or cataloguing any significant resources.	WRP Operator (Archaeologist and/or Paleontologist)	Include Measure in WRP Specifications Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. WRP Operator 3. Verify During Grading Operations
5.4 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES			
No mitigation measures are available that could reduce the impact of conversion of prime agricultural land to an urban use to less than significant.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.5 ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY			
5.0-22. Design and operate the WRP in accordance with an NPDES Permit that must be obtained from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region.	WRP Operator	Approval of WRP Design and Operation Plans by RWQCBLAR Field Verification	1. RWQCBLAR 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Construction Permits and Verify During WRP Operation
5.0-23. Prepare and implement worker safety programs in accordance with Cal-OSHA requirements.	WRP Operator	Review of Worker Safety Program Field Verification	1. Cal-OSHA 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During WRP Operation
5.0-24. Prepare and implement preventive and contingency plans for controlling accidental discharges of wastewater or chemicals used and stored at the WRP, and for minimizing the effects of such events. Such plans shall be integrated into the CSDLAC's overall preventive (fail-safe) and contingency (emergency response) plans and programs.	WRP Operator	Approval of Plans Field Verification	1. Los Angeles Co. Fire Department 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During WRP Operation
5.0-25. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared and implemented, in accordance with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Industrial Stormwater Permit.	WRP Operator	Review of SWPPP Field Verification	1. RWQCBLAR 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During WRP Operation

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.5 ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY (cont.)			
5.0-26. Any industrial wastewater that may be produced from manufacturing, commercial processing operations, acute care medical facilities and laboratories, etc., that would be allowed in the Commercial, Mixed-Use or Business Park land use designations as regulated by the Specific Plan, shall comply with the Wastewater Ordinance of the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (April 1, 1972, as amended November 1, 1989). A permit from the CSDLAC would be required for any such facility to allow discharge into the Newhall Ranch sewer system.	Business Owners in Commercial, Mixed Use, or Business Park Land Use Designations	Review of Building Plans	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit
5.0-27. Prepare and implement an "Integrated Emergency Response Plan" (IERP). The IERP provides procedures for personnel medical emergencies, evacuation procedures and mitigation and abatement procedures for hazardous chemicals. The plan must conform to multiple regulatory requirements, including Title 8 §3220, Emergency Action Plan, §3221, Fire Prevention Plan, §5192 Emergency Response to Hazardous Substances Releases, and Title 22, §66265.50-66265.56, Contingency Plan and Emergency Procedures.	WRP Operator	Review of IERP Field Verification	1. Los Angeles Co. Fire Department 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During WRP Operation
5.0-28. Biosolids treatment and disposal methods shall meet California Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3, which contains Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) and Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration (STLC) limits.	WRP Operator	Review of Construction Plans Laboratory Testing	1. RWQCBLAR 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During WRP Operation
5.0-29. Obtain permits to construct and operate all new sources of air toxic emissions, at each stage of WRP development, and whenever any new sources are added or replaced, pursuant to SCAQMD Regulation XIV.	WRP Operator	Review of SCAQMD Permits	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Construction Permits and During WRP Operation

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.6 BIOTA			
5.0-30. Comply with permit requirements established by the California Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, relative to removal and replacement of riparian habitat.	WRP Applicant	Obtain Required Permits Field Verification	1. CDFG, ACOE 2. WRP Operator 3. During Monitoring Period Specified in Permits
5.0-31. Obtain and implement an NPDES construction permit to avoid significant erosion or sedimentation impacts.	WRP Operator	Receipt of NPDES Permit(s) Field Verification	1. RWQCBLAR 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During Grading and Construction
5.0-32. Comply with permit requirements of Federal, State and regional agencies with jurisdiction over discharge of reclaimed water to the Santa Clara River relative to potential impacts on the River's biological values.	WRP Operator	Field Verification Laboratory Testing	1. RWQCBLAR 2. WRP Operator 3. During WRP Operation

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.7 VISUAL QUALITIES			
5.0-33. To soften views of the reclamation plant from SR-126, provide vegetation, walls, fencing, and/or other appropriate techniques and combinations of techniques. Walls and fencing shall comply with the Specific Plan Design Guidelines.	WRP Operator	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Operation
5.0-34. Landscaping themes shall be consistent with the themes developed for adjacent Business Park development to provide visual continuity and minimize contrast between the WRP facilities and their surroundings.	WRP Operator	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Operation
5.0-35. Place, orient and shield light fixtures to illuminate only those areas where it is needed and to prevent stray light from spilling off site.	WRP Operator	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Operation

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.8 TRAFFIC/ACCESS			
5.0-36. If SR-126 is still a two-lane highway at the time of WRP construction, a construction traffic management plan shall be prepared and implemented. This plan shall address site access, staging and storage areas, hours of construction, work crew parking, warning and traffic control signs and devices, flag men, temporary detouring, etc., as appropriate, to avoid a significant impact on SR-126.	WRP Operator (Construction Superintendent)	Approval of Construction Traffic Management Plan Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During Grading and Construction Activities
5.0-37. An encroachment permit shall be obtained from Caltrans, for access to the plant site from SR-126.	WRP Applicant	Receipt of Encroachment Permit(s)	1. Caltrans 2. WRP Applicant 3. Prior to Grading
5.9 NOISE			
5.0-38. All construction activity occurring on the water reclamation plant site shall adhere to the requirements of the "County of Los Angeles Construction Equipment Noise Standards", County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743.	WRP Operator	Field Verification Using Noise Monitor	1. LA County Dept. of Health Services 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading and Construction
5.0-39. Limit all construction activities occurring near occupied residences to between the hours of 6:30 A.M. and 8:00 P.M., and exclude all Sundays and legal public holidays, pursuant to County Construction Section standards.	WRP Operator	Field Verification	1. LA County Dept. of Health Services 2. WRP Operator 3. During Grading and Construction
5.0-40. All operational activity occurring on the water reclamation plant site shall adhere to the requirements of the "County of Los Angeles Exterior Noise Standards for Stationary and Point Noise Sources," pursuant to §12.08.390 of County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743.	WRP Operator	Periodic Field Verification Using Noise Monitor	1. LA County Dept. of Health Services 2. WRP Operator 3. During WRP Operation

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase

5.10 AIR QUALITY

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

The proposed WRP would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403, which prohibits emissions of fugitive dust from any active operation, open storage pile, or disturbed surface areas from remaining in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. The builder of the plant would be required to implement dust control measures for each fugitive dust source type, to prevent visible roadway dust from being deposited more than 50 feet from any property access road, and to remove all visible roadway dust deposited upon public paved roadways as a result of active operations at the conclusion of each work day. The following mitigation measure is recommended to implement this rule:

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			
5.0-41. Prepare and implement a fugitive dust emission control plan which conforms to the requirements of SCAQMD Rule 403. The plan shall include the following specific measures and be submitted to the SCAQMD for review and approval: a. Apply approved non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturer specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for four days or more). b. Replace ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible c. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply approved soil binders to exposed piles (i.e., gravel, sand, dirt) according to manufacturer's specifications. d. Water active grading sites at least twice daily. e. Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts exceed 25 mph). f. Provide temporary wind fencing with 50 percent or less porosity along the perimeter of sites that have been cleared or are being graded. g. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the top of the trailer), in accordance with Sections 23114 of the California Vehicle Code. h. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip. i. Sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent roads, (recommend water sweepers using reclaimed water if readily available). j. Apply water three times daily or chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specifications to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces k. Enforce maximum traffic speed limits of 15 mph on all unpaved roads. l. Where appropriate, pave all construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from the main road.	WRP Operator	Approval of Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan Field Verification	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Grading and During Construction

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			
The proposed WRP would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 1113 which prohibits persons from supplying, selling, applying, or soliciting the application of architectural coatings which do not meet specific emissions thresholds. The following mitigation measures address this rule:			
5.0-42. Building materials, architectural coatings, and cleaning solvents used in developing the WRP shall comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations.	WRP Operator	Provide List of Materials, Coating, Solvents That Comply with SCAQMD Rules and Regulations Field Verification	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Permit to Construct and Verify During Construction
5.0-43. The application of architectural coatings shall occur via hand application or spray equipment that emits volatile organic compound emissions at rates which are comparable to High Volume, Low Pressure (HVLP) spray equipment (i.e., equipment which is operated at an air pressure between 0.1 and 10 pounds per square inch).	WRP Operator	Field Verification	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. During Construction

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			
5.0-44. Building construction shall utilize low-polluting construction materials and coatings (i.e., bricks, stones, pre-coated or naturally colored materials, water-based paints or similar types of coating materials containing relatively low levels of volatile organic compounds) to the greatest extent feasible.	WRP Operator	Provide List of Construction Materials and Coatings with VOC Ratings Field Verification	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Permit to Construct and Verify During Construction

Emission reductions resulting from the imposition of the mitigation measures listed above have been quantified wherever possible pursuant to the methodology in the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The following discussion provides a quantification of emission reductions associated with the grading of the WRP site. A quantification of emission reductions due to the remaining construction measures have not been completed since the information necessary to conduct such an analysis, per SCAQMD methodologies, is not available at this time. However, substantial emission reductions would also result from these non-quantified construction mitigation measures.

Grading activities associated with the WRP are predicted to generate approximately 1,744.0 pounds of PM_{10} per day. The application of non-toxic soil stabilizers, the replacement of ground cover, and the wetting down of graded areas, as identified above in Mitigation Measure 5.0-41 would each reduce these emission by approximately 30 percent, 15 percent, and 34 percent, respectively. The combined percentage reduction for these measures is calculated by progressively applying the percentage reduction attributable to an individual mitigation measure to the net emissions resulting from the application of the preceding mitigation measure. When this occurs, the reduction that these three measures would provide is 60.7 percent, which equates to 1,058.6 pounds of dust per day. Net emissions of approximately 685.4 pounds per day would continue to exceed the SCAQMD's recommended threshold of 150.0 pounds per day.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.10 AIR QUALITY (cont.)			
OPERATION IMPACTS			
5.0-45. Comply with SCAQMD Regulation IX, Subpart O, which establishes specific air quality performance standards for wastewater treatment plants.	WRP Operator	Periodic Field Verification	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. During WRP Operation
5.0-46. Provide odor control equipment, covers, seals, etc., at all locations where odorous gases could be released into the atmosphere; implement managerial controls, including routine monitoring of control equipment and regular field surveys of surrounding areas; and conduct a complaint response program that achieves resolution to odor complaints within thirty minutes of receiving a complaint.	WRP Operator WRP Operator	Plan Check Approval of Complaint Response Program Field Verification	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. During WRP Design and Operation
5.0-47. Obtain permits to construct and operate all new sources of criteria air pollutants, at each stage of WRP development, and whenever any new sources are added or replaced, pursuant to SCAQMD Regulation XIII.	WRP Operator	Receipt of SCAQMD Permits	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits and Whenever New Sources are Added or Replaced
5.0-48. Obtain permits to construct and operate all new sources of air toxic emissions at each stage of WRP development, and whenever any new sources are added or replaced, pursuant to SCAQMD Regulation XIV.	WRP Operator	Receipt of SCAQMD Permits	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Permit to Construct and Whenever New Sources are Added or Replaced

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.0-49. Comply with the provisions of Title V of the Federal Clean Air Act, relative to maximum, facility-side toxic air emissions.	WRP Operator	Field Verification	1. SCAQMD 2. WRP Operator 3. During WRP Operation

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.11 WATER RESOURCES			
5.0-50. The site of the proposed water reclamation plant shall be annexed to the Valencia Water Company prior to issuance of building permits for the WRP.	WRP Operator	Annexation	1. CPUC 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Water Reclamation Plant Construction
5.0-51. Prior to construction of the proposed water reclamation plant, the WRP operator shall demonstrate water availability for both construction and operation demands.	WRP Operator	Receipt of VWC Will-Serve Letter	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Grading

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.12 WASTEWATER DISPOSAL			
5.0-52. A new County sanitation district shall be formed to administer operation of the Newhall Ranch water reclamation plant. The district shall encompass the entire Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site.	WRP Operator	Approval of District Formation	1. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of WRP Grading Permit
5.0-52(b) The applicant shall initiate a request to the new County sanitation district formed for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site to adopt an ordinance prohibiting the installation and use of self-regenerating water softeners within the new sanitation district prior to connection of the first residential unit to the sanitary sewer system.	Specific Plan Applicant	Upon Filing of Construction Permit(s) for Water Reclamation Plant	1. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors 2. Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of WRP Grading Permit
5.0-53. The Newhall Ranch water reclamation plant shall be designed and operated to satisfy the requirements of Title 22 of the California Administrative Code, which regulates reuse of reclaimed water.	WRP Operator	Plan Check Field Verification	1. RWQCBLAR 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Construction Permits and Verify During WRP Operation
5.0-54. The Newhall Ranch water reclamation plant shall be designed and operated to satisfy the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region discharge limits for reclaimed water discharged to the Santa Clara River and for the irrigation of landscaped areas.	WRP Operator	Plan Check Field Verification	1. RWQCBLAR 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Construction Permits and Verify During WRP Operation

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.0-55. The Newhall Ranch water reclamation plant shall obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region for reclaimed water discharged to the Santa Clara River and for the irrigation of landscaped areas.	WRP Operator	Receipt of NPDES Permit(s)	1. RWQCBLAR 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Issuance of Construction Permits
5.0-56. All facilities of the sanitary sewer system will be designed and constructed for maintenance by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and/or the new County sanitation district or similar entity in accordance with their manuals, criteria, and requirements.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Review of Final Sewer Plans Field Verification	1. LACDPW and WRP Operator 2. LACDPW and WRP Operator 3. Prior to Acceptance for Maintenance

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.13 NATURAL GAS			
5.0-57. WRP design shall comply with the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24 of the California Administrative Code).	WRP Operator	Plan Check	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Water Reclamation Plant Construction
5.14 ELECTRICITY			
5.0-58. Plant design shall comply with the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24 of the California Administrative Code).	WRP Operator	Plan Check	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Water Reclamation Plant Construction
5.15 SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL			
5.0-59. The operators of the water reclamation plant shall ensure that all solid waste diversion, storage, and disposal requirements that are in effect at the time the WRP is constructed, including AB 939 and all others, will be implemented so that the waste generated by the WRP will not impede the County's waste reduction and diversion requirements during construction and operation.	WRP Operator	Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. During WRP Construction and Operation
5.16 EDUCATION			
No impact on schools would result from construction or operation of the WRP; therefore, no mitigation measures are required or recommended.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.17 POLICE SERVICES			
5.0-60. If construction of the WRP occurs while SR-126 is still a two-lane highway, a construction traffic management plan shall be prepared and implemented. This plan shall address site access, staging and storage areas, hours of construction, work crew parking, warning and traffic control signs and devices, flag men, temporary detouring, etc., as appropriate.	WRP Applicant (Construction Superintendent)	Approval of Construction Traffic Management Plan Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During Grading and Construction Activities
5.0-61. Consult with the CHP and the Sheriff's Department to incorporate measures into the risk management and prevention plan to optimize their abilities to provide assistance in the event of a hazardous materials incident at the operating WRP site.	WRP Operator	Incorporate CHP and Sheriff's Department Comments in RMPP	1. Cal-EPA 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Water Reclamation Plant Operation
5.0-62. Prepare and implement worker safety programs in accordance with Cal-OSHA requirements.	WRP Operator	Review of Worker Safety Program Field Verification	1. Cal-OSHA 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During WRP Operation
5.0-63. Prepare and implement an "Integrated Emergency Response Plan" (IERP). The IERP provides procedures for personnel medical emergencies, evacuation procedures and mitigation and abatement procedures for hazardous chemicals. The plan must conform to multiple regulatory requirements, including Title 8 §3220, Emergency Action Plan, §3221, Fire Prevention Plan, §5192 Emergency Response to Hazardous Substances Releases, and Title 22, §66265.50-66265.56, Contingency Plan and Emergency Procedures.	WRP Operator	Review of IERP Field Verification	1. Los Angeles Co. Fire Department 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During WRP Operation

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.18 FIRE SERVICES AND HAZARDS			
5.0-64. If construction of the WRP occurs while SR-126 is still a two-lane highway, a construction traffic management plan shall be prepared and implemented. This plan shall address site access, staging and storage areas, hours of construction, work crew parking, warning and traffic control signs and devices, flag men, temporary detouring, etc., as appropriate.	WRP Applicant (Construction Superintendent)	Approval of Construction Traffic Management Plan Field Verification	1. WRP Operator 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During Grading and Construction Activities
5.0-65. Consult with the Fire Department and its Hazardous Materials Unit to incorporate measures into the risk management and prevention plan, to optimize its abilities to respond to a hazardous materials incident at the operating WRP site.	WRP Site Designer/ Engineer	Incorporate Fire Department Comments in RMPP	1. Cal-EPA 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Water Reclamation Plant Operation
5.0-66. Prepare and implement worker safety programs in accordance with Cal-OSHA requirements.	WRP Operator	Review of Worker Safety Program Field Verification	1. Cal-OSHA 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During WRP Operation
5.0-67. Prepare and implement an "Integrated Emergency Response Plan" (IERP). The IERP provides procedures for personnel medical emergencies, evacuation procedures and mitigation and abatement procedures for hazardous chemicals. The plan must conform to multiple regulatory requirements, including Title 8 §3220, Emergency Action Plan, §3221, Fire Prevention Plan, §5192 Emergency Response to Hazardous Substances Releases, and Title 22, §66265.50-66265.56, Contingency Plan and Emergency Procedures.	WRP Operator	Review of IERP Field Verification	1. Los Angeles Co. Fire Department 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to and During WRP Operation

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase
5.19 LIBRARIES			
No adverse library impacts have been identified; therefore no mitigation measures are required.			
5.20 PARKS, RECREATION AND TRAILS			
5.0-68. A fence shall be constructed along the southern perimeter of the WRP site to prevent access to the WRP from the Regional River Trail.	WRP Operator	Field Verification	1. Los Angeles Co. Department of Regional Planning 2. WRP Operator 3. Prior to Water Reclamation Plant Operation
5.21 POPULATION, HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT			
No significant population, housing, or employment impacts have been identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.			

SECTION 9

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Final EIR identified and discussed the significant environmental effects, which will occur as a result of both the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant. With implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan regarding the project, all of these environmental effects can be mitigated to levels of insignificance except for unavoidable significant project and cumulative impacts on agricultural resources (conversion of prime agricultural land), biological resources, visual resources, air quality and solid waste disposal. The Final EIR also identified and discussed significant effects, which will occur as a result of the Water Reclamation Plant. With implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan regarding the Water Reclamation Plant, these effects can be mitigated to levels of insignificance except for unavoidable significant project impacts on agricultural resources (conversion of prime agricultural land) visual resources, air quality and solid waste disposal, and except for unavoidable significant cumulative impacts on agricultural resources (conversion of prime agricultural land), biological resources, visual resources, air quality and solid waste disposal.

Having reduced the environmental effects by approving the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and the Water Reclamation Plant and adopting the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and having balanced the benefits of the project against the project's potential unavoidable significant impacts, the Board of Supervisors hereby determines that the benefits of the project outweigh the potential unavoidable significant impacts and that the unavoidable significant impacts are nevertheless "acceptable," based on one or more of the following overriding considerations:

1. The project has been designed to preserve over nine square miles of land (6,138 acres, or 51 percent of the site) containing the most significant natural environmental resources, including:

    (a) The High Country, which is a major portion of the County's Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") 20; SEA 20 contains six and one-half square miles (4,214 acres), and the project has modified the SEA boundaries to include more total area and land with more valuable natural resources than were originally designated in the SEA by the General Plan;

    (b) The Santa Clara River property, which is portion of the County's SEA 23, and which contains approximately 819 acres, has been planned to

minimize the necessity of removing sensitive habitat for flood control purposes and provides valuable habitat for federal and state endangered and sensitive wildlife species; and

(c) The Open Area, consisting of 1,106 acres, preserves significant oak woodlands and savannas, ridgelines, and major landforms.

2. Preservation of the High Country in conjunction with lands already acquired or planned for public acquisition, including the Santa Clarita Woodlands Park, will result in a distance of over ten miles of preserved and protected Santa Susana Mountains for conservation and recreational purposes, stretching from the I-5 freeway to the Los Angeles County/Ventura County border.

3. Provisions for the accelerated dedication of the High Country have been added to the revised Specific Plan.

   Access to the High Country would generally be provided within 24 months of approval of the Specific Plan by early construction of a trail in the High Country and by the granting of an easement to a joint powers authority for public access and maintenance of that trail.

   The Joint Powers Authority would include Los Angeles County, the City of Santa Clarita and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

   An open space financing district would also be established under the authority of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, which would provide annual revenues to the Joint Powers Authority for recreation, conservation and related activities in the High Country.

   Additionally, the Center for Natural Lands Management would be endowed ($2,000,000 in 1997 dollars) by the applicant for the perpetual conservation management of the resources in the High Country, as well as the River Corridor and Open Area.

   Offers of early dedication in fee title of the High Country - at no cost to the Joint Powers Authority- would take place in three equal phases of approximately 1,400 acres each at the 2,000th, 6,000th and 11,000th residential building permit.

The River Corridor and Open Area (excluding parks which would be dedicated to Los Angeles) would be offered to be dedicated to the Center for Natural Lands Management in phases in accordance the Specific Plan. Los Angeles County would also be granted an access and conservation easement prior to the offset dedication of the River Corridor and Open Area.

4. Ultimate removal of commercial grazing from the High Country and from the River Corridor at adoption of the Specific Plan, will enhance the natural resources within those areas.

5. A River Corridor has been designed to retain the River's significant riparian vegetation and habitat, and, at the same time, provide flood protection in accordance with Los Angeles County standards.

6. Prominent physical features, such as Sawtooth Ridge, river bluffs and Ayers Rock, have been preserved within the Open Area as landmarks for the community.

7. Preservation of the High Country will also create a 1/2 mile-wide set back of development along the Los Angeles County/Ventura County line, thereby increasing the width of the Salt Creek movement corridor adjacent to Ventura County.

   The 1/2 mile-wide set back of development from the County line results in a wide corridor linking the River Corridor and the High Country SMAs in Los Angeles County.

8. The revised Specific Plan also calls for a 1/8th mile-wide set back of development adjacent to Ventura County north of SR-126 to provide a transition between project development on Newhall Ranch and rural/agricultural land uses in Ventura County.

9. The revised Specific Plan calls for an affordable housing component developed between the applicant and the County's Community Development Commission and Department of Regional Planning, and it requires that 2,200 dwelling units be made available as "very low," "low" or "moderate" income housing. This component includes an aggressive marketing program and compliance monitoring by the County's Community Development Commission staff. The affordable housing component for Newhall Ranch is above and beyond the requirements of the County's *General Plan* and *Area Plan*.

10. The City of Santa Clarita's proposals regarding the use of "buried bank stabilization" techniques and contour grading as well as

ridgeline protection have been incorporated into the revised Specific Plan. Such provisions are above and beyond the requirements of the County's *General Plan* and *Area Plan*.

The applicant is also voluntarily committing to comply with the City's proposal to participate in a Valley-wide freeway mitigation funding program should such a program be adopted by both Los Angeles County and the City of Santa Clarita - even though such a program was not determined to be a necessary mitigation requirement of either the Final EIR or revised Specific Plan.

11. Provisions have been made for improved parks, libraries and fire stations in accordance with the revised Specific Plan - all of which are above and beyond the mitigation required by CEQA or the Final EIR, or the exactions required of other development.

12. The project's single ownership, size and density make possible the planning and financing of a comprehensive resource management plan.

13. The Asistencia, the most important historical site in the Santa Clarita Valley, will be preserved and deeded to the Archaeological Conservancy for permanent ownership and management at no expense to the County, state or taxpayers.

14. The community has been designed to provide a comprehensive array of land uses for a balanced community of homes, employment, shopping, commercial and public services, cultural facilities, education and recreation. The size and single ownership of the Newhall Ranch site provide opportunities to develop a comprehensive master-plan community in which land uses are properly sited, and infrastructure and public services are planned in advance and coordinated with regional infrastructure and public services.

15. The Newhall Ranch design includes "livable community" concepts, including the following:

a) The community is divided into five separate villages to provide a small town feel and sense of community among residents;

b) The Land Use designations include a Mixed-Use category for the creative combination of commercial, public, recreational and residential uses;

c) Shared parking programs are planned in such a way as to reduce the need for large expansive parking lots and encourage Mixed-Use development;

d) Over 50 miles of pedestrian and bicycle trails will be constructed, linking the villages and the community to the regional trail system;

e) Recreation is not only included for the overall community, but is located within individual neighborhoods;

f) Home occupations are permitted, allowing residents to telecommute or operate businesses from their residences, which reduce the need for commuting to central business districts;

g) Approximately 59 percent of all homes will be constructed within walking distance (one-quarter mile) of village or commercial centers;

h) A park-and-ride facility is planned; and

i) Bus pull-ins are provided.

16. The project's trail system will link the community of Val Verde to the project, thereby allowing that community access to and use of the project's extensive trail system.

    The applicant has also entered into an agreement with the Val Verde Civic Association which has been incorporated into the revised Specific Plan. The agreement imposes various requirements upon the applicant which are above and beyond the mitigation requirements of either the Final EIR or the revised Specific Plan.

17. A public lake within the Potrero Valley Village will provide regional recreational use and visual enjoyment, as well as community recreation.

18. A golf course within the Potrero Valley Village will provide regional recreational benefits.

19. The Business Park, Commercial, and Mixed-Use Land Uses designations will provide approximately 19,226 permanent jobs, which will allow employment opportunities for the community and the region and help the County achieve its economic goals.

20. Construction of a new Water Reclamation Plant will generate reclaimed water; the construction of a reclaimed water system and use of reclaimed water on-site will reduce the demand for potable water supplies.

21. The location and construction of three new fire stations will provide faster and better regional fire protection to Val Verde and other communities in the immediate area, in addition to fire services for the project.

22. The project will generate an estimated fiscal surplus between $251 to $301 million to the County during construction and $17 to $20 million annually thereafter (the range of fiscal surplus depends upon the final outcome of Proposition 218 in court decisions and elections).

23. The project will generate an estimated fiscal surplus to the adjacent City of Santa Clarita of $27.9 million during construction and $1.8 million annually thereafter.

24. An estimated $140 million from fuel and other tax revenues would be generated for the construction and maintenance of regional and state transportation facilities during construction and $11 million thereafter.

25. Location of the project and design of the community will result in an estimated reduction in vehicle miles traveled as compared to more conventional subdivision design.

26. The project design (Villages, clustering, Mixed-Use, variety of transportation modes, on-site employment, and proximity to regional employment) will result in the reduction of air emissions in comparison to a planned community without the project's design features.

27. The applicant has voluntarily entered into school mitigation agreements with the Newhall School District, the Castaic Union School District, and the William S. Hart Union High School District. These agreements call for payments that are far in excess of the current development fees required by state law. Based on a review of the agreements, the Board of Supervisors has noted that they represent the most generous school mitigation packages ever seen from an applicant in Los Angeles County.

28. The project provides a broad spectrum of housing which will help to meet the long-term housing needs of Los Angeles County, a major goal of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and will satisfy a wide array of economic and social needs, lifestyles. Project housing includes:

a) Rental apartments;

b) Condominiums;

c) Townhomes;

d) Attached and clustered single-family homes;

e) Detached single-family homes;

f) Larger executive and estate homes; and

g) Second Units on larger lots to allow for extended families and more affordable housing opportunities.

29. The project implements portions of the County Master Plan of Highways by the construction of Commerce Center Drive between SR-126 and Magic Mountain Parkway and Pico Canyon Road within the project.

30. The project is estimated to generate significant Congestion Management Plan credits thereby benefiting the County's efforts to continue to qualify for state and federal transportation funds.

For all these reasons, on balance, the Board of Supervisors finds that there are specific economic, legal, social, technological, planning and other considerations associated with the project that serve to override and outweigh the project's unavoidable significant environmental effects and, thus, the adverse effects are considered acceptable.

FINDINGS
OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
AND ORDER
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 94-087-(5)

1. The Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles ("the Commission") makes these additional findings as to Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 94-087-(5).

2. **Background.** On March 23, 1999, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("the County") certified the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP") (SCH No. 95011015), and approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP. The project approvals included: (i) General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendments No. 94-087-(5), which amended the Land Use Policy Maps and other General Plan Policy Maps of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan; (ii) Adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan; (iii) Zone Change Case No. 94-087-(5); (iv) Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 94-087-(5), which allowed development within SEA 20 and SEA 23, portions of which overlie the Specific Plan site; and (v) Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 24500-(5), which allowed division of the subject property into 30 large lots for the purpose of sale, lease or financing only. In conjunction with the project approvals, the Board of Supervisors adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations, dated February 1999; approved the Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Specific Plan and WRP, attached as Exhibit A to the CEQA Findings; and adopted findings, orders and conditions of approval for CUP No. 94-087-(5) and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 24500-(5).

3. **Summary of the Newhall Ranch Litigation.** After project approval, various parties challenged the County's certification of the Newhall Ranch Final EIR and approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP in a consolidated action in Kern County Superior Court entitled, *United Water Conservation District v. County of Los Angeles, et al.*, Case No. 239324 RDR ("the Newhall Ranch litigation").

The Court upheld approval of the Specific Plan and WRP and the Final EIR certification with respect to many of the issues raised in the Newhall Ranch litigation. However, the Court ordered the County to void its certification of the Final EIR with respect to the specific issues listed below and to conduct an additional analysis under CEQA in order to:

(a) Extend the traffic impact analysis that was used in the EIR to evaluate Los Angeles County traffic impacts, to the project's impacts on Ventura County arterial roadways exiting State Routes 23 and 126 until the 1% impact standard is reached;

(b) Determine the effect on the Ventura County portion of the Salt Creek wildlife corridor caused by the shifting of wildlife into the Salt Creek corridor;

(c) Address the Specific Plan's impacts on biological resources in the Santa Clara River corridor associated with channelization and bank hardening;

(d) Demonstrate that adequate water sources will be available for build-out of the Specific Plan, which may be achieved by securing other water sources consistent with CEQA and/or by developing a factual basis providing substantial evidence from which the County can adequately assess environmental impacts of the ASR alternative and its ability to meet water needs; and

(e) Address the alternative of siting the Newhall Ranch WRP off-river, including an analysis of the biological impacts of that siting.

The Court also ordered the County to set aside the project approvals, but only as those approvals relate to SEA 23 and the County's Development Monitoring System ("DMS") as it applies to water supplies, and to take action to:

(a) Ensure consistency of the Specific Plan with the County General Plan policies requiring protection of natural resources in SEAs as those standards apply to SEA 23; and

(b) Ensure consistency of the Specific Plan with the County's General Plan DMS policies as they relate to water supplies.

Consequently, the Court set aside approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and WRP, and Final EIR certification, but only with respect to the issues identified above.

4. **Resolution of the Board of Supervisors.** After the Court's decision, the Board of Supervisors approved a resolution identifying the action to be taken by the County in order to respond to the Court's decision and writ in the Newhall Ranch litigation. The Resolution instructed County staff to prepare an additional environmental analysis under CEQA ("Additional Analysis"). The Additional Analysis was to address each of the specific issues described in the Court's decision and writ.

5. **Draft Additional Analysis.** In response to the Board's Resolution, County staff caused to be prepared the Draft Additional Analysis to the Final EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and

WRP, which addresses the specific issues identified in the Court's decision and writ. On November 13, 2000, County staff distributed the Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of the Additional Analysis to various public agencies and other interested groups, and received responses to the NOP. On April 19, 2001, County staff caused to be prepared and circulated the Notice of Availability of the Draft Additional Analysis. The public review and comment period on the Draft Additional Analysis was to occur for a 60-day period, commencing on April 20, 2001 to June 19, 2001 (15 days longer than required by CEQA). The Commission held three public hearings on Newhall Ranch and the Draft Additional Analysis on June 20, 2001, July 16, 2001 and August 27, 2001. During the second public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period on the Draft Additional Analysis through August 27, 2001 (for a total public review period of 130 days).

6. **Project Approvals/Findings.** Based on the analysis set forth above, the Board of Supervisors set aside its approval of CUP No. 94-087-(5), but only as it relates to SEA 23. Therefore, the Board's prior approval of this CUP as it relates to SEA 20 remains adopted and valid in all respects. In compliance with the Court's decision and writ, this Commission reconsiders CUP No. 94-087-(5) as it relates to SEA 23, and approves CUP No. 94-087-(5) in accordance with the following findings relating to SEA 23.

7. **SEA 20.** The following findings, order and conditions constitute the Commission's approval of CUP No. 94-087-(5) and necessarily include all prior findings and conditions relating to SEA 20 and the Specific Plan's compatibility with the biotic resources present within SEA 20. As stated in paragraph 6 above, this CUP already has been approved and adopted by the Board of Supervisors as it relates to SEA 20, and it remains valid in that respect. Therefore, in making these findings, the Commission is not readopting this CUP as it relates to SEA 20. Rather, the Commission is acknowledging and reiterating the Board's adopted SEA 20 findings .

8. **Project Description.** The permittee proposes the development of a large-scale mixed use project, commonly referred to as Newhall Ranch, on portions of the subject property located in the northwestern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The proposed project would include a broad range of residential, mixed-use and non-residential land uses within five villages. As revised by the Board of Supervisors, the project allows for up to 21,615 dwelling units, 423

second units, 630 acres of mixed-use development, 67 acres of commercial uses, 256 acres of business park land uses, 36 acres of visitor-serving uses, 1,106 acres of open space, including 186 acres of community parks and 920 acres in other open spaces, 5,032 acres in special management areas, 55 acres in 10 neighborhood parks, a 15 acre lake, a public trail system, an 18-hole golf course, two fire stations, a public library, an electrical station, reservation of five elementary school sites, one junior high school site and one high school site, a 6.9 million gallon per day water reclamation plant and other associated community facilities. The project is projected to be constructed over a 25 to 30 year period.

9. The subject property is an 11,963-acre irregularly shaped site located in the northwestern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County in the Santa Clara River Valley. The property is within the County's Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area. Specifically, the property is one-half mile west of the Golden State Freeway (I-5) and largely southwest of the junction of I-5 and State Route 126 ("SR-126"), located between the Magic Mountain Theme Park on the east and the Los Angeles County/Ventura County boundary line on the west. The City of Santa Clarita is located east of the subject property. SR-126 and the Santa Clara River transect the property from east to west, with a majority of the property south of SR-126 and the Santa Clara River.

10. The permittee previously proposed adjustments in the current boundaries of Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") 20 (Santa Susana Mountains) and those adjustments were previously approved by the Board of Supervisors and remain valid in all respects. The permittee now proposed adjustments in the current boundaries of SEA 23 (Santa Clara River). Portions of SEA 20 and 23 are located within the subject property.

11. The proposed SEA boundary adjustments are intended, in part, to more accurately reflect the location of the sensitive biological resources currently located within the SEA boundaries. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan also proposes to establish a Specific Plan designation of "Special Management Area" ("SMA") over the adjusted SEA's. The SMA is to implement the special provisions contained in the "Resource Management Plan" section of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Although the adjusted area is referred to as an SMA in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the SEA designation would remain in effect.

12. Section 22.56.215 of Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance) requires that a conditional use permit be obtained for a proposed subdivision of land or proposed development within a Significant Ecological Area to ensure compliance with specific design compatibility criteria. This conditional use permit is being granted for that purpose.

13. The pre-existing zoning on the entire subject property is A-2-2 (Heavy Agriculture - 2 acre minimum lot size), A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture - 5 acre minimum lot size) and M-1-5 (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing). The Commission has recommended that the Board of Supervisors approve a change of zone on the property to "Specific Plan", as it relates to SEA 23 and DMS water supply requirements.

14. The subject property is within the Santa Clara River basin and contains ten drainage areas, all of which drain into the Santa Clara River. The Santa Clara River transects the northern portion of the subject property from east to west. Salt Creek, Potrero Canyon, Chiquito Creek, Long Canyon, San Martinez Grande, and other unnamed drainage courses also either originate on, or flow through, the site.

15. As previously indicated, two Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) overlie portions of the Specific Plan site, SEA 20 and SEA 23. SEA 20 is primarily noted for its diverse oak woodland habitat and its facilitation of species movement between the San Gabriel and Santa Monica Mountains via the Simi Hills. The Santa Clara River SEA (SEA 23) is noted for its wetlands and habitat for the unarmored threespine stickleback (UTS) fish. Approximately 5,237 acres (43.8 percent) of the property are currently within these significant ecological areas. With regard to SEA 23, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan proposes development within the boundaries of the existing SEA, including Low-Medium and Medium Density residential housing, and Mixed Use and Business Park uses (including bank stabilization, bridges, utility crossings and the Newhall Ranch WRP).

16. **Background Regarding Significant Ecological Areas.** The "Significant Ecological Area" designation is one of several land use classifications set forth in the Land Use Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan. The SEA classification generally identifies lands having important biological resources. The classification includes habitats of rare and endangered

species, sites with critical fish and wildlife values, relatively undisturbed areas of typical natural habitat and regionally scarce biotic resources. The intent of the General Plan is to preserve and enhance SEAs, to the extent possible, for the benefit of present and future County residents.

17. The purpose underlying the SEA land use classification is to preserve SEA resources in an ecologically viable state. Several General Plan policies reflect that intent. For example, Policy 15, in the "Environmental Protection" section entitled, "General Goals and Policies," requires protection of "areas that have significant natural resources and scenic values, including significant ecological areas."

18. Other factors governing implementation of the General Plan's SEA goals and objectives include the County's ability to accurately identify areas of SEA resource value, the availability of financial and other resources necessary to support preservation, restoration and enhancement efforts, and the competing priorities between resource preservation and other critical public needs. Because the original SEA selection process was based on limited field verification of SEA resources, the General Plan acknowledges that future additions or deletions to identified SEAs may be appropriate, based on more detailed and updated biological surveys. The County's Zoning Ordinance further acknowledges that it is not the purpose of the SEA designation to preclude development within SEAs, but rather to ensure, to the extent possible, that such development maintains and, where possible, enhances the SEA biotic resources while allowing limited controlled development within SEAs.

19. **SEA Development Process/General Plan.** Recognizing the resource values at stake and the constraints imposed by competing priorities and objectives, the General Plan seeks to provide a process for reconciling specific conflicts between proposed land uses and the preservation of identified SEAs. The General Plan does not, however, suggest that this can be accomplished by applying a single set of regulatory standards to all SEAs. Instead, the General Plan recognizes that measures necessary to preserve and enhance SEAs will vary depending upon the nature of the resource values present and the degree of threat implied by potential incompatible development. Within this context, the General Plan sets forth SEA compatible land uses and identifies SEA design compatibility criteria to guide specific land use decisions.

20. As stated above, the General Plan identifies certain uses which are compatible with SEAs by definition, and certain uses that may be compatible. However, the General Plan notes that it "has not attempted to identify, in other than the most general terms, appropriate use types and intensities within significant ecological areas." Therefore, in order to determine whether a development proposal, in fact, is compatible with a particular SEA, the General Plan requires that the proposal be reviewed for compliance with certain "design compatibility criteria." The design criteria are as follows:

(a) That the requested development is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas;

(b) That the requested development is designed to maintain waterbodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state;

(c) That the requested development is designed so that wildlife movement corridors (migratory paths) are left in an undisturbed and natural state;

(d) That the requested development retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resource areas from said requested development;

(e) That where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas from development; and

(f) That roads and utilities serving the proposed development are located and designed so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas or migratory paths.

21. **SEA Development Process/Zoning Ordinance.** The General Plan requirement that development proposed within an SEA comply with the foregoing "design compatibility criteria" is implemented through provisions of the Los Angeles County Code. Pursuant to Section 22.56.215(A)(1) of the County Code, an applicant must obtain a conditional use permit "prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, approval of a minor land division or subdivision, or the commencement of any construction or enlargement of any building or structure on a lot or parcel which is in or partly in an area designated in the County General Plan and related maps as a significant ecological area."

22. The Board of Supervisors has previously reviewed the burden of proof submitted by the permittee for this conditional use permit. As it relates to SEA 20, the Board previously determined that the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the

General Plan, since it is in substantial compliance with the general conditions for development in Significant Ecological Areas and that the permittee has satisfied the burden of proof contained in Section 22.56.215 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Board's determination in this regard remains adopted and valid as applied to SEA 20.

23. **Specific Plan Development Within Existing SEA 20.** The Board of Supervisors previously determined that the proposed development within existing SEA 20 is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas. This determination was based upon the Board's following findings, which were previously adopted and remain valid as applied to SEA 20:

(a) The proposed SEA boundary adjustment results in an area which is approximately 267 acres larger than the original SEA on the site. The original SEA within the Specific Plan area was approximately 3,947 acres in size, while the adjusted SMA area would be approximately 4,214 acres. The boundary adjustment would provide a beneficial impact by creating an SMA that contains larger amounts of higher quality habitats than does the original SEA.

(b) The adjustment in boundaries increases the net acreage of sensitive habitats by 214.4 acres, which includes an additional 185.5 acres of Coastal sage scrub habitat and 28.9 acres of Live oak woodland. The Habitat Value Ranking analysis described in Section 4.6 of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the project provides a second measure of the impact of the boundary modification. This analysis indicates that the amount of land in the lower value habitats (1 and 2) would be increased by 58 acres, while the land in the higher value habitats (3 and 4) would be increased by 209 acres.

(c) The boundary change would not substantially increase the contact between Specific Plan land uses and the SMA and wildlife corridor, and nearly all of the interface is separated by steep slopes which reduces potential access and impacts created by people and pets. The general effect of the boundary change would be to add approximately 267 acres at the northeast edge. The Specific Plan land uses would be separated by high, steep slopes from the canyon which forms the wildlife corridor and thus a sufficient buffer is provided between the corridor and the Specific Plan uses. This edge of development is shown on Exhibit 2.6-7 of the Resources Management Plan (Chapter 2.6 of the Specific Plan). The separating slopes would prevent direct access by residents to the wildlife corridor, and would greatly reduce access by pets. In addition, Specific Plan land uses have been modified so that Estate Residential and Open Area land use categories now adjoin nearly the entire northern boundary of the SMA, buffering it from more urban uses within the Specific Plan.

(d) Upon approval of the Specific Plan, the provisions of the Resources Management Plan ("RMP") become effective. The RMP requires that a conservation agreement be established over the SMA, and that a detailed program be developed for its long-term management and ownership. As a result of these actions, the SMA would be preserved in perpetuity and would be managed and maintained.

(e) The land uses shown on the Land Use Plan and Specific Plan within the High Country SMA consist of unimproved hiking/equestrian trails. In addition, the Permitted uses Matrix of the Specific Plan permits a range of low intensity land uses which could be proposed in the future. See Chapter 3, Table 3.4-2, Permitted Uses Matrix.

(f) With the exception of the unimproved hiking/equestrian trail, it is not currently known which of the uses described immediately above may be proposed in the future or whether any will be proposed. However, the Permitted Uses Matrix provides that each of the uses permitted in the High Country be reviewed under the County General Plan SEA criteria and Section 22.56.215 of the Los Angeles County Zoning Code, which implements the County General Plan provisions regarding SEAs. This Section requires a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") for any use which is the subject of a building permit, grading permit, or a minor land division or subdivision within a SEA. Under Section 22.56.215, a review to determine the need for such a CUP would have to be undertaken for all the permitted uses with the possible exception of the unimproved hiking and equestrian trails and existing uses. Under Section 22.56.215, a CUP would also be required for the uses shown on the Land Use Plan because such uses would require, or would be part of a development which requires, a subdivision, a grading permit or building permits. At the Specific Plan level it would be speculative to evaluate the compatibility of future unknown details of potential permitted land uses; however, the Specific Plan does impose sufficient controls so as to ensure future review and compatibility determinations for these uses under the County General Plan SEA criteria and under Section 22.56.215.

(g) The description of SEA 20 in the General Plan states that medium intensity recreational uses, which include overnight camping and daytime equestrian use, are compatible with the SEA. The Specific Plan limits public recreational access in the SMA to day use by hikers and equestrians. Trail bikes and motorized dirt bikes would be prohibited. Therefore, the intensity of recreational uses would not exceed that described in the General Plan. The proposed management and maintenance of the SMA would also help to prevent deterioration of SEA resources which might result from public recreational use.

(h) The High Country SMA is to be dedicated to a joint powers authority consisting of the County, the City of Santa Clarita, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and will be managed by the Center for Natural Lands Management, a non-profit conservancy, which will also own and manage the River Corridor SMA. Recreation and conservation activities will be funded

through an open space financing district and an endowment by the permittee, and therefore, will be at no cost to the general public.

24. The Board of Supervisors previously determined that the proposed development within existing SEA 20 is designed to maintain water bodies, water courses, and their tributaries in a natural state. This determination was based upon the Board's following finding, which was previously adopted and remains valid as applied to SEA 20:

(a) All drainage courses within the High Country SMA would be retained in a natural state. However, culverts may be provided where needed to protect the access roads or trails. In addition, inlet devices are proposed in certain locations in the SMA, as shown on Specific Plan Exhibit 2.5-1, Conceptual Backbone Drainage Plan. The inlets would be required in order to develop property outside of the SMA. As that development would require a subdivision, among other permits, the associated inlets would be reviewed under the County General Plan SEA criteria and Section 22.56.215 of the Zoning Ordinance, as discussed above. Furthermore, all impacts to drainage courses in the High Country SMA would be fully mitigated under the Resource Management Plan which requires restoration and/or enhancement as mitigation of impacts to riparian vegetation.

25. The Board of Supervisors previously determined that the proposed development within existing SEA 20 is designed so that wildlife movement corridors within that area are left in a natural and undisturbed state. This determination was based upon the Board's following finding, which was previously adopted and remains valid as applied to SEA 20:

(a) Retention of the High Country SMA in a largely natural and undisturbed state would preserve the major wildlife movement corridors and migratory paths which currently exist in the SMA. Access for wildlife between the SMA and the Santa Clara River would continue to be available through the Salt Canyon wildlife corridor, which is the most significant wildlife corridor on the property. The value of this corridor is high due to its relative remoteness, the quality of habitats present, and the fact that it is an integral part of the High Country SMAs approximate 4,214 acres. The connection of the High Country SMA to the River through the Salt Creek corridor would provide a regional open area system and would remain in a natural and undisturbed state. The Salt Creek wildlife corridor drainage joins the Santa Clara River offsite in Ventura County. The permittee, which is the owner of the property in Ventura County, has indicated no plans for development of this property.

26. The Board of Supervisors previously determined that the proposed development within existing SEA 20 retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical

resource areas based upon the Board's following finding, which was previously approved and remains valid as applied to SEA 20:

(a) Virtually all of the High Country SMA is being retained in a natural state. Vegetative cover within the SMA will be naturally enhanced by the withdrawal of grazing, with the exception of grazing for management purposes as provided for in the Resource Management Plan. The High Country SMA is identified as a primary location for oak resource planting to mitigate impacts which might occur within the development areas of the Specific Plan. As indicated in the Biotic Section of the Final Environmental Impact Report, as many as 633 oak trees may be impacted by development, and these would be replaced on at least a 2:1 ratio, as governed by the County Oak Tree Ordinance. The RMP further requires restoration and/or enhancement to mitigate any riparian vegetation or oak resources which are disturbed during development of uses within the High Country SMA. The vertical elevation of the adjacent development and the transition from higher intensity land uses to very low intensity uses adjacent to the SMA also provide buffers to the SMA resources. Additionally, steep slopes will provide buffers between the SMA and residential uses in the northwest area of the SMA. The Specific Plan, Section 2.6.2.b.(3)(b), Transition/Fuel Modification Areas, of the Specific Plan institutes protections of the interface between the High Country and adjacent residential development.

27. The Board of Supervisors previously determined that where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas within SEA 20 from development, based upon the Board's following finding, which was approved and remains valid as applied to SEA 20:

(a) In virtually all areas where the High Country SMA adjoins residential areas to be developed under the Specific Plan, the interface between development and natural area is composed of steep slopes which will minimize or eliminate access to the SMA by people and pets. The interface would be controlled by the standards of the Wildfire Fuel Modification Zones, which would include a plant palette which would be compatible with the adjoining natural vegetation of the SMA and Section 2.6.2.b.(3)(b), Transition/Fuel Modification Areas, as discussed above. Specific Plan Exhibit 2.6-7, Salt Creek Wildlife Corridor Perspective, shows the vertical separation between the Salt Creek wildlife corridor and nearby homes. Walls or view fences are typically provided at the rear or sides of residential land uses, and these would separate residents from the SMA although the steep slopes between the lots and SEA make fences and walls unnecessary for buffering purposes. Habitat areas are further protected by the provisions of Section 2.6.2.b.(3)(b) which restrict construction of buildings and other structures to developed pads within Planning Areas OV-04, OV-10, PV-02, and PV-28 and prohibits construction on southerly slopes facing the High Country SMA and in the area between the original SEA 20 boundary and the High Country boundary. Recreational access to the SMA

would occur primarily through the Visitor Serving land use designation which is shown on the Land Use Plan in a location immediately adjacent to the SMA. It is intended that this area be the control point for residents and visitors to access hiking and equestrian trails in the High Country. The Resource management Plan (Section 2.6 of the Specific Plan) requires graded areas adjacent to and within SEAs to be clearly marked thereby buffering and avoiding important habitat areas from impacts from development. Furthermore, Chapter 4 (Design Guideline) of the Specific Plan requires shielded lighting fixtures to minimize glare and "direct rays" impacts upon adjacent areas, resulting in additional protection of the habitat areas.

28. The Board of Supervisors previously determined that roads and utilities serving the proposed development are located and designed so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas, or migratory paths within Sea 20. This determination was based upon the Board's following finding, which was approved and remains valid as applied to SEA 20:

(a) At the Specific Plan level it is not possible to accurately assess the impacts that future road and/or utility construction would have because the Specific Plan does not propose any such projects within the High Country SMA. However, under Section 22.56.215 of the Zoning Ordinance, an SEA conditional use permit would be required for any such construction or subdivision, and this would require an evaluation of the project's conformity with the General Plan Design Compatibility Criteria for SEAs. Environmental review would also be required and would define the anticipated impacts and necessary mitigation.

29. **SEA 23 Boundary Adjustments.** The Commission finds that the proposed adjustments to the existing boundaries of SEA 23 are consistent with General Plan policies requiring the protection of natural resources within SEAs. As discussed in the Final Additional Analysis, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan was designed to avoid sensitive resources within SEA 23 to the greatest extent possible. As a result, only 28 acres (or 22.5 acres if the Commission recommendations are adopted) of the sensitive habitat proposed to be removed from SEA 23 would be deleted due to the Specific Plan. The majority of the other sensitive habitat proposed to be removed would be transferred to SEA 20 or the Specific Plan's Open Area designation, both of which provide resource protection, which is at least comparable to that provided by SEA 23. With regard to the 28 acres removed from the SEA and not otherwise protected, the Commisssion finds that removal of that acreage from SEA 23 is consistent with the General Plan's SEA policies for the reasons identified below.

30. Within the Land Use Element, the General Plan states: "It is the intent of the General Plan policy to preserve the County's significant ecological resources and habitat areas in viable and natural conditions." See, Los Angeles County General Plan, p. LU-A12. The removal of 28 acres of sensitive habitat will not affect the County's ability to preserve SEA 23 in a viable and natural condition. After removal of the 28 acres, SEA 23 will still contain approximately 660 acres of sensitive habitat and other riparian habitat. Moreover, the 28 acres proposed for removal consists of small patches of fragmented and disconnected habitat distributed throughout the Specific Plan area, rather than a contiguous patch of 28 acres that would provide higher habitat value. (*See, e.g.*, FAA, Figure 2.4-4.) Consequently, the removal of the 28 acres does not pose a legitimate threat to the continued viability of SEA 23.

31. The Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.4, assesses the Specific Plan's consistency with the General Plan SEA policies in greater detail than in the previously certified Final EIR, and demonstrates that a considerably smaller amount of SEA sensitive habitat will be impacted by implementation of the Specific Plan than was anticipated during the Board of Supervisors' original consideration of the previously certified Final EIR. At that time, the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR concluded that, of the 471 net acres removed from SEA 23 under the Specific Plan, 103 net acres contained sensitive habitat types. Based on additional study and analysis, a more precise understanding of the Specific Plan's impacts to sensitive habitat within the existing boundaries of SEA 23 was developed.

Based on that analysis, it is now established that most of the 103 acres of sensitive habitat to be removed from SEA 23 will not be impacted by Specific Plan development. In fact, the Final Additional Analysis ("FAA") shows that only 28 acres of sensitive habitat (*i.e.*, 2 percent of the existing SEA) will not continue to be protected(*see*, FAA, p. 2.4-12). The balance of the sensitive habitat, approximately 75 acres, would be protected, either within SEA 20 (the High Country SEA) or within the Open Area designation. (*See*, FAA, pp. 2.4-43 to 2.4-44.)

Approximately 70 acres of the land being removed from the existing SEA 23 would be transferred into the Specific Plan's Open Area (OA) land use designation. The County finds that the OA designation provides at least as much, and in some cases more, resource protection than the County's SEA designation. For example, the OA and SEA designations both allow

agricultural uses, grazing, recreational uses, greenhouses, trails, golf courses, oil and natural gas operations, and sand and gravel extraction activities, subject, in some instances, to a conditional use permit. However, certain uses (*e.g.*, residential uses, commercial uses, animal hospitals and campgrounds) are conditionally permitted in SEAs, but are not permitted within the OA designation under any circumstances. Consequently, the Commission finds that the SEA land proposed to be transferred to the OA designation will receive a degree of protection, which is at least comparable to that provided by the SEA designation.

32. In addition, the Commission has recommended that the Board approve the environmentally superior site alternative for the Water Reclamation Plant and a condition of this permit requires the implementation of that alternative. That alternative, the "On-Site Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts)," would reduce the WRP's impacts to riparian habitat within SEA 23 by approximately 5.5 acres. (*See*, FAA, Section 3.5.4.) Although the revised Specific Plan would still result in the removal of 28 acres of sensitive habitat from SEA 23, the 5.5 acres associated with the previously approved WRP site would not be subject to development activity. Finally, the Draft Additional Analysis shows that the entire 28 acres to be removed from SEA 23 and not otherwise protected in SEA 20 or in an Open Space designation consists of scattered, fragmented and isolated habitat patches. (*See*, FAA, Figure 2.4-5, Habitats Removed From Original SEA 23 and Habitats Proposed To Be Added to SEA 23.) Such isolated habitat patches are considered to have a lower biological value than large areas of contiguous habitat. The Commission finds that the 28 acres to be removed from SEA and not subject to further protection from development are not suitable for such protection within an SEA due to their low biological value and minimal potential for continuous viability as sensitive habitat.

The sensitive habitat to be moved from SEA 23 to the Open Area designation was chosen for removal because it is not the type of habitat intended for protection within SEA 23 (*i.e.*, riparian habitat necessary for the unarmored threespine stickleback fish), and because much of it would receive adequate protection under the Open Area designation. The Santa Clara River SEA was designated predominantly because of the presence of habitat for the unarmored threespine stickleback. (*See*, Los Angeles County General Plan Background Report, p. OS-A30 to OS-A31.) Therefore, SEA habitat that does not contribute to the stickleback's survival may be removed from the SEA designation. With regard to the 70 acres of habitat to be transferred to

Open Area, much of it exists on bluffs above the river and the remainder is generally fragmented and isolated. The County has determined that the habitat to be transferred to Open Area does not contribute significantly to the survival of the stickleback and, therefore, may be removed from SEA 23 as part of the boundary adjustments following the detailed study of the SEA area.

33. In addition to overall habitat values, SEA 23 would remain in a viable and natural condition with respect to other ecological functions as well. The SEA would continue to function as a wildlife movement corridor and as habitat for the UTS because the Specific Plan retains both the riparian vegetation in the Santa Clara River and the natural flow of the water without the need for periodic vegetation clearing. In addition, the Specific Plan would result in an increase in the amount of river bottom available to the UTS. The Specific Plan also establishes transitions, or "buffer" areas, to separate SEA 23 from the proposed urban land uses. The tributaries to the Santa Clara River within SEA 23 (Castaic, San Martinez, and Chiquito Canyon Creeks) would also be maintained and preserved in a largely natural state with soft bottoms.

34. Finally, the Specific Plan is consistent with General Plan policies regarding the balancing of SEA policies against other competing public needs. In its discussion of SEA policies, the General Plan states: "Major factors influencing the realization of Plan [SEA] objectives . . . include . . . the competing priorities between resource preservation and other critical public needs." See, Los Angeles County General Plan, p. LU-A12. Adjustment of the SEA 23 boundary, including removal for development of 28 acres of sensitive habitat, will serve other critical public needs. For example, the Specific Plan will provide a broad spectrum of housing, including affordable housing, which will help meet the County's long term housing needs. The size and single ownership of the Newhall Ranch site provide opportunities to develop a comprehensive master-plan community in which land uses, infrastructure and public services are properly planned and sited. The Specific Plan's Business Park, Commercial and Mixed-Use Land Use designations will provide approximately 19,000 permanent jobs, which will help the County achieve its economic goals. The Specific Plan's bridge crossings implement portions of the County's Master Plan of Highways and are considered essential to the development of a local and regional transportation system. In addition, the Specific Plan's Resource Management Plan

includes an extensive mitigation and habitat management program for the River Corridor. The Resource Management Plan is considered a significant benefit to the River Corridor area.

35. Specific Plan Development Within Existing SEA 23. The Specific Plan proposes to develop within the boundaries of existing SEA 23. As discussed above, Section 22.56.215(A)(1) of the County Code requires that a conditional use permit be obtained prior to commencing such activities and Section 22.56.215(F) requires the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed development conforms to the SEA "design compatibility criteria." The Final Additional Analysis, including responses to comments, contains the factual analysis addressing whether the proposed development in the Specific Plan is consistent with the County's SEA "design compatibility criteria" as it relates to existing SEA 23. The Commission's findings with regard to the SEA design compatibility criteria are presented below.

36. **Design Compatibility Criterion No. 1.** *The proposed development is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas.* The Commission has determined that the development proposed in the Specific Plan is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present in existing SEA 23, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas. This determination is based upon the following findings.

(a) At the inception of the planning process for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, detailed site investigation studies were performed for purposes of analyzing development constraints and opportunities. The development constraints included identification of the existing boundaries of SEA 23 within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. (*See*, Specific Plan, Ch. 2, Ex. 2.2-1, Ex. 2.2-2 and Ex. 2.2-3.) The constraints analysis also identified sensitive vegetation/habitat zones within the existing boundaries of SEA 23. (*See*, Specific Plan, Ch. 2, Ex. 2.2-1.) Based on the constraints analysis, and other relevant information, the Specific Plan identified important objectives to be implemented in conjunction with the Specific Plan. Those objectives included, among other things: (i) preserving the Santa Clara River corridor and adjacent wetlands containing significant natural resources for their resource value; and (ii) identifying and protecting significant resources within SEA 23. (*See*, Specific Plan, Ch. 2, pp. 2-1, 2-4.) During the planning process, it was also acknowledged that adjustments to SEA boundaries were possible with detailed study of the existing SEA areas. *See*, Specific Plan, Ch. 2, p. 2-9.

(b) In addition, the following objectives were developed in order to balance the environmental and flood control issues presented by the Santa Clara River, as required by the General Plan. The objectives were used to assess the existing boundaries of SEA 23, and to determine the general boundaries of the proposed SEA 23, which would be set aside as the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 under the Specific Plan. These objectives are noted below:

(i) The flood corridor must allow for the passage of Los Angeles County Capital Flood flows without the permanent removal of natural River vegetation (except at bridge crossings);

(ii) The banks of the River will generally be established outside of the "waters of the United States" as defined by Federal laws and regulations, and as determined by the delineation completed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) in August 1993;

(iii) Where the ACOE delineation width is insufficient to contain the Capital Flood flow, the flood corridor will be widened by an amount sufficient to carry the Capital Flood flow without the necessity of permanently removing vegetation or significantly increasing velocity;

(iv) Where development is proposed within the existing Los Angeles County 50-Year Capital Flood Plain, the land where development is to occur will be elevated in accordance with Los Angeles County policies to remove it from the flood plain; and

(v) Bank stabilization will occur only where necessary to protect against erosion.

(c) The Final Additional Analysis also demonstrates that 14 acres of sensitive habitat currently outside existing SEA 23 boundaries, most of which is contiguous acreage, would be added to existing SEA 23 with implementation of the Specific Plan. (*See*, DAA, pp. 2.4-22 to 2.4-23 and Figure 2.4-5.) This area consists of native vegetation located adjacent to the river channel. Consequently, with the protection of most of the sensitive habitat under separate designations, the reduction of WRP impacts and the addition of currently unprotected sensitive habitat, the Specific Plan would result in a net loss of approximately 8.5 acres of scattered and isolated sensitive habitat within SEA 23. Of that amount, approximately 0.4 acres would be impacted in connection with construction of the proposed bridges, which contribute to the buildout of the County's Master Plan of Highways, an activity determined to be essential to the maintenance of public health, safety and welfare. In addition, approximately 50 acres of existing farm field not presently available to the UTS would be converted into river bottom in order to carry the County's 50-year Capital Storm event. This would directly increase the amount of habitat available to the UTS, which is considered a benefit to that protected species.

(d) In considering the Specific Plan's sensitive habitat impacts, it is important to understand that 100 percent of the sensitive habitats impacted by development (the entire 22.5 acres) would be replaced through mitigation. As part of this mitigation effort, at least 22.5 acres of land adjacent to the river channel would be enhanced through revegetation. (*See*, FAA, p. 2.4-22.)

(e) Finally, as shown in Section 2.3 of the Final Additional Analysis addressing potential impacts due to channelization and bank hardening, no significant increases in velocity, erosion or sedimentation would occur to adversely impact biological resources in the River corridor as a result of the Specific Plan; therefore, the biotic resources present within the existing boundaries of SEA 23 would not be significantly impacted.

(f) In summary, the Commission finds that the Specific Plan is highly compatible with the biotic resources present within the existing boundaries of SEA 23 for the following reasons: (i) the Specific Plan proposes to set aside appropriate and sufficient undisturbed sensitive habitat areas within the existing boundaries of SEA 23; (ii) the Specific Plan proposes to retain the River corridor in a largely natural state; (iii) only a relatively small amount of sensitive habitat (*i.e.*, approximately 22 acres, or less than 2 percent of the existing SEA 23) is to be removed due to development; (iv) the impacted area would be fully mitigated; (v) the River corridor would still be sufficiently wide (and in certain locations widened) to accommodate the County's Capital Flood and still retain the sensitive riparian vegetation; (vi) winter storm runoff would still continue to open its own channels through the River vegetation, flowing in a natural, non-invasive manner and preserve the meandering characteristics of the streambed; (vii) the tributary canyons and bluffs on the south side of the River would still be preserved and provide an additional 543 acres (including 451 acres of undisturbed land), which would be dedicated to Open Area adjacent to the River; and (viii) due to Specific Plan implementation, approximately 156 acres of additional sensitive habitat areas within and adjacent to the SEA 23/River Corridor SMA would be permanently preserved.

37. **Design Compatibility Criterion No. 2.** *The requested development is designed to maintain waterbodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state.* The Commission's determination in this regard is based on the following findings.

(a) As discussed above, implementation of the Specific Plan would maintain the Santa Clara River in a largely natural state. Furthermore, in a 50-Year Capital Storm, total storm flows subsequent to development would be decreased by approximately 12 percent, and total debris volume would be reduced by approximately 30 percent from their pre-development levels. Because development of the Specific Plan does not increase site runoff during a Capital storm, it would not result in upstream or downstream flooding of the River. During smaller two-year storms (rather than the 50-Year Capital Flood design event), the depth of flow in the Santa Clara River at the County line would

change from approximately 2.34 feet under pre-development conditions to approximately 2.5 feet under post-development conditions, which represents an increase of 1.6 inches in depth. No significant increases in velocity, erosion or sedimentation would occur in the River. Consequently, existing biotic resources would not be significantly impacted by implementation of the Specific Plan. The velocity of flow would increase no more than 4 percent at the County line due to development of the Specific Plan and, in all cases, the post-development velocity for the two year storm would be approximately 5.2 feet per second. This would not result in a substantial increase in erosiveness; therefore, existing biotic resources would not be significantly impacted.

(b) The 6.9 million gallons per day (mgd) Newhall Ranch WRP would be developed to serve the Specific Plan land uses. A recycled water distribution system would be designed to use tertiary treated wastewater from the WRP to irrigate land uses within the Specific Plan that can accept non-potable water. The Wastewater Section of the Final EIR anticipates that there would be approximately 286 to 1,025 acre-feet of the recycled water which may not be needed during the winter months and which could be discharged to the River. This results in an approximately 6 percent increase in the annual flow volume in the River at the County line. The discharge would be 319 acre-feet per month in the highest months of December and January. This translates to a flow rate of approximately 5.2 cubic feet per second (cfs). During a year of average rainfall, the WRP discharge of 5.2 cfs would increase the River flow of 56 cfs by about 9.3 percent. Although it is possible that the 5.2 cfs discharge could increase the River flow of 17 cfs by about 30 percent in a drought year, it is highly unlikely since irrigation requirements for landscaping in a drought year would increase and the actual discharge would be significantly reduced, if not eliminated. The average annual and peak WRP discharges of recycled water do not significantly increase the River flow, either annually or monthly.

(c) Potential indirect impacts to SEA 23 due to sedimentation and debris transport during construction and subsequent to development would be controlled by the installation of desilting and debris basins, drainage swales, slope drains, storm drain inlet/outlet protection, and sediment traps, all of which would be designed as part of the final drainage plans prepared for each subdivision map. The Specific Plan, Section 2.5 (Public Services and Facilities Plan), provides conceptual drainage and flood control improvements, which include National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") water quality basins; requires that all tributaries with flows greater than 2,000 cfs would require open drainage systems; and requires that all additional NPDES requirements be met.

(d) The confluence of the Santa Clara River tributaries (Castaic, San Martinez, and Chiquito Canyon Creeks) with the River are all within the SEA 23, and are preserved in a largely natural state pursuant to the Specific Plan, Section 2.5 (Public Services and Facilities Plan) and Section 2.6 (Resources Management Plan).

(e) In summary, the Commission finds that the Specific Plan has been designed to maintain waterbodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state. As indicated above, no significant increases in velocity, erosion, or sedimentation would occur in the River because of the Specific Plan. During most storm events, the velocity and depth of the River would remain unchanged from current conditions, since the course of the River is able to meander without being constrained by bridge abutments or bank protection. It is only in the infrequent, 50 to 100 year event where small increases in depth or velocity will occur at certain locations along the River. However, as explained in the Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.3, these increases do not significantly affect the water flow in the River.

38. **Design Compatibility Criterion No. 3.** *The requested development is designed so that wildlife movement corridors are left in an undisturbed and natural state.* The Commission's determination in this regard is based on the following findings.

(a) Under the Specific Plan, SEA 23 would continue to function as a wildlife movement corridor because the Plan retains both the riparian vegetation in the River and the natural flow of the water without the need for periodic vegetation clearing. The Specific Plan also establishes transition areas to separate SEA 23 from the urban uses identified in the Land Use Plan, as discussed below. The three bridges over the River would be sufficiently high to allow the continued use of the River by animals for movement east to west along and within the River route; and lighting controls are required to ensure that SEA 23 would continue to function as a wildlife movement corridor. The Specific Plan, Section 2.5 (Public Services and Facilities Plan) and Section 2.6 (Resources Management Plan), provide objectives and conceptual plans for preserving the River and Salt Canyon in a natural and undisturbed state. The Final EIR also addresses impacts and imposes mitigation measures for any impacts that would occur.

(b) The tributaries (Castaic, San Martinez, and Chiquito Canyon Creeks) to the Santa Clara River within SEA 23 are all maintained and are preserved in a largely natural state with soft bottoms pursuant to the Specific Plan, Section 2.5 (Public Services and Facilities Plan) and Section 2.6 (Resources Management Plan). Furthermore, the remainder of these tributaries outside SEA 23, but within the Specific Plan, are designated Open Area and are preserved in a largely natural state.

(c) The Salt Canyon area of the Specific Plan serves as a wildlife movement corridor. Based on the assessment in the Final Additional Analysis, the limited development proposed within SEA 23 would not have any impact upon this wildlife movement area.

(d) As indicated in the Final Additional Analysis, Caltrans has completed the widening of SR-126 from Fillmore in Ventura County to the I-5 freeway in Los Angeles County. As part of that widening project, major north/south

animal movement undercrossings were installed under SR-126 at three locations. In addition, three additional larger undercrossings exist along SR-126 within the Specific Plan area at locations where bridges and culverts were constructed over secondary tributary stream courses. Because the Ventura County undercrossings were designed to facilitate north/south wildlife movement, and because the three undercrossings within the Specific Plan site are of sufficient size to accommodate north/south wildlife movement, County staff is of the opinion that north/south connectivity across the Santa Clara River will not be significantly impacted.

39. **Design Compatibility Criterion No. 4.** *The requested development retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resources from said requested development.* The Commission's determination in this regard is based on the following findings.

(a) Species that utilize the Santa Clara River corridor are typically found in the riverbed itself or within the riparian habitats found adjacent to the river course. As discussed under the first compatibility criterion above, after combining the land preserved in the revised SEA (819 acres) with the preserved Open Area immediately adjacent to the revised SEA (451 acres), a total of 1,270 acres of undisturbed land would be preserved as part of the Specific Plan, including 509 acres of sensitive habitat. The existing SEA 23 consists of 353 acres of sensitive habitats. Due to Specific Plan implementation, 156 acres of additional sensitive habitats within and adjacent to the River corridor would be permanently preserved when compared with the amount of sensitive habitat within the existing SEA 23. This additional amount of land would provide sufficient habitat and open areas to buffer the critical biotic resources from the 22.5 acres of development proposed on sensitive habitats within SEA 23 (assuming Board adoption of the Commission recommendations).

(b) In addition to the amount of land that will be permanently preserved for use by sensitive species, the Specific Plan requires a setback between the River and proposed land uses. This area will be planted with native species to buffer sensitive species from potential impact. The Specific Plan also provides transition areas between the riparian resources found in SEA 23 and proposed urban development.

(c) The adequacy of the width of the proposed buffer area along the Santa Clara River was previously evaluated by the Board of Supervisors when the Specific Plan was originally approved in March 1999. Prior to final approval, the Board required that the Specific Plan design be revised to incorporate an additional 100-foot buffer between development and riparian resources to protect riparian habitat and sensitive species within SEA 23 boundaries. This finding was arrived at after evaluating the potential impacts of proposed land uses along the entire length of the River, coupled with the existing habitat protection and enhancement provisions contained in the Specific Plan Resource Management Plan and Design Guidelines.

Exhibits depicting the Newhall Ranch River corridor riparian habitat buffers along the entire course of the Santa Clara River within the Specific Plan boundaries were presented to the Commission in a Staff Report, dated August 27, 2001. The exhibits show the width of the buffer between the riparian resources and adjacent development along the entire length of the River as originally approved by the Board. (Note that the exhibits do not reflect changes to the Potrero Bridge or the WRP site, which increase the acreage of riparian habitat and buffer area.)

As shown on the exhibits, the width of the riparian habitat corridor varies from a minimum of 300 feet to 2,205 feet (0.4 miles) at its widest point. The total buffer area (478 acres) varies in width from a minimum of 135 feet to more than 800 feet, and is three-quarters the size of the riparian habitat area itself. The average buffer width is approximately 400 feet. As shown on the exhibits, the buffer widths are greatest where the existing riparian habitat corridor is the narrowest; in some cases two to three times greater.

The buffer area is comprised of several different components: (a) the Salt Creek wildlife corridor connection and the High Country half mile wide buffer at the west end of the Specific Plan on the south side of the river; (b) native upland habitats in the Open Area along the south side of the river; (c) disturbed areas within the River corridor that will be restored or enhanced as riparian habitat; (d) buried bank stabilization that will be revegetated with native riparian and upland plant species; and (e) landscaped open space areas such as community parks, the Regional River Trail and community trails.

The Specific Plan, Chapter 2.6, Resource Management Plan, provides standards by which biological resources will be managed during construction and thereafter for the life of the community. It contains: (i) provisions for restoration and enhancement of disturbed areas such as agricultural fields; (ii) restrictions on pedestrian and vehicular access to the river corridor; (iii) design standards for transition areas between development and the river; (iv) conveyance of conservation easements; and (v) preparation of a financial plan for the long term management of the riparian resources by the Center for Natural Lands Management. In addition, the Specific Plan, Chapter 4, Design Guidelines, contains provisions restricting the manner in which developed areas relate to the River corridor, including site planning, fencing, landscape design, grading and lighting. These measures satisfy the General Plan SEA design compatibility criteria as means to protect sensitive habitat and species, including the unarmored three-spine stickleback (UTS) and least Bell's vireo.

(d) In summary, the Specific Plan retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and open space to buffer critical resources found in SEA 23 from the development proposed in the Specific Plan. Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in the direct preservation of 1,270 acres of land along the Santa Clara River corridor within the boundaries of the Plan area. The Specific Plan also incorporates an extensive buffer area to protect critical resources within SEA 23.

40. **Design Compatibility Criterion No. 5.** *Where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas from development.* The Commission's determination in this regard is based on the following findings.

(a) As discussed above, the Specific Plan incorporates vegetative cover and open space to buffer critical resources from proposed uses. In addition to these features, the Specific Plan buffers habitat from proposed uses through development regulations and design guidelines.

(b) As indicated in Chapter 4 of the Specific Plan, future residential subdivisions and commercial development constructed within the Specific Plan area must include fences or walls that will preclude access to sensitive resources within SEA 23. As each subdivision map is submitted to the County, it will be reviewed to determine whether proposed uses substantially comply with the standards, regulations and guidelines of the Specific Plan, including those pertaining to fencing and walls to ensure that they buffer important SEA 23 habitat areas from development.

41. **Design Compatibility Criterion No. 6.** *Roads and utilities serving the requested development are located and designed so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas or migratory paths*. The Commission's determination in this regard is based on the following findings.

(a) The Specific Plan proposes the construction of three bridges and utility lines across the Santa Clara River, within the existing SEA 23. Utilities serving the proposed Specific Plan, where feasible, would be incorporated with the bridges. Two utility crossings, as shown on Figure 2.4-6 of the Draft Additional Analysis, would contain wastewater lines, and possibly water lines, natural gas piping, telecommunications and television cable and electrical power lines. Both crossings would be buried beneath the River and its banks. The construction disturbance zone is estimated at 85 feet wide but will vary dependent upon the design of the facility and construction methods employed. Specific information would be provided to permitting authorities at the time of project design. The construction zone would be revegetated with native species upon completion of construction activities consistent with the Specific Plan and federal and state permit requirements. As a result, potential impacts would be minimized and movement paths of animals would be unimpeded.

(b) The Specific Plan proposes three elevated highway bridge crossings over the Santa Clara River. The number and general location of the bridge crossings were established in order to minimize impacts on SEA 23 and other sensitive resources, and to minimize major access points to SR-126. Each bridge crossing is an extension of an existing road, creating a functional regional circulation system.

(c) Temporary impacts would occur during installation of support columns in the riverbed as well as construction of bridge abutments. Excavations will be designed to minimize riverbed disturbance while satisfying the structural requirements of construction. The construction disturbance zone is estimated at 100 feet wide on each side of the bridge, but the actual distance will vary dependent upon the design of the facility and construction methods employed. Specific information would be provided at the time of bridge design. As with utility crossings, disturbed areas would be revegetated with native species upon completion of construction activities consistent with the Specific Plan and federal and state permit requirements.

(d) The bridge crossings would have support columns in the riverbed, but the crossings are elevated structures so as to reduce impacts on River vegetation and sensitive species and to allow species that move along the river course to continue to use existing resources. The elevated bridge crossings replace the existing at-grade agriculture crossings, which would reduce the amount of direct disturbance to the riverbed and its environs.

(e) The three proposed bridges would connect the development areas south of the Santa Clara River to SR-126. SR-126 is a major east-west arterial along the north bank of the River serving local and regional traffic that is proposed for widening to six lanes from Potrero Canyon eastward through the Specific Plan boundary. These bridge routes also connect to, and are a continuation of, existing arterial roads north of SR-126, namely Commerce Center Drive, Chiquito Canyon Road and San Martinez Grande Road. Each of the three bridges is an essential feature of the overall Specific Plan circulation system, and each plays an essential role in providing the necessary traffic accessibility and capacity for the Specific Plan. Consistent with the County's General Plan, the bridge locations and designs were selected in such a way as to minimize impacts to sensitive biotic resources in and adjacent to the River, while at the same time, balancing the topographical constraints of the site and engineering requirements of the structures and adjoining roadways.

(f) The Santa Clara River, which flows westerly, parallels the southerly side of SR-126 and, in some areas, is immediately adjacent to this four-lane highway. The existing ground between the north side of the river and SR-126 is fairly level, while the southerly side of the river has bluffs several hundred feet high with some major drainages cutting the bluffs into segments. The basic design concept is to provide safe, four-way connections with existing roadways from the north, then extend southerly across SR-126 and the Santa Clara River, preserving as much as possible the biotic resources by spanning the river with bridges. After crossing the Santa Clara River, the design goal is to minimize grading of the bluffs by laying roads between bluff segments, along the sides of incised drainages.

(g) During the Commission hearings, the Potrero Bridge was scrutinized further to determine if increasing the span (length) of the bridge would reduce environmental impacts to the river within SEA 23. The proximity of development on the north side of the River adjacent to the Potrero Bridge was

an issue previously reviewed by the Commission during the original approval process in 1996 and 1997. As a result of those concerns, the original Specific Plan was specifically revised in this area to reduce the direct and indirect impacts to the River, and to reduce the risk of bank erosion. The significant changes made at that time included: (a) 5.6 acres of development area was eliminated and converted to River corridor; (b) the Commercial and Medium residential designations were reclassified to Mixed Use to reduce the potential for more intrusive land uses; and (c) 190 residential units were eliminated.

By way of background, the Potrero Valley Road is a secondary highway in both the Specific Plan and the County Master Plan of Highways. The Potrero Bridge is the longest bridge in the Specific Plan with a total length of approximately 1,300 feet and a width of 84 feet (*see*, FAA, Section 2.4.7.4 and 2.4.7.5). At Commission hearings, discussions took place regarding the lengthening of this bridge span, and an exhibit was presented in the Commission's August 27, 2001 Staff Report (Exhibit 2), depicting the bridge with an increased span. As shown on the exhibit, the southerly abutment is located as close to the mouth of Potrero Valley as practicable to preserve the large sensitive cottonwood riparian habitat south of the active Santa Clara river channel.

Potential impacts from the Potrero Bridge (without any increase in its span) included loss of habitat from construction due to piers and the bridge "shadow effect" (2.5 acres), and changes in velocity, scouring or water depth due to narrowing of the watercourse. By extending the length of the bridge by an additional two spans (for a total length of 1,500 feet), the bridge "shadow effect" would increase by 0.4 acres, but no sensitive riparian habitat would be impacted, only existing farm field. The location of bank stabilization would also need to be modified if the bridge abutment is moved north. However, by lengthening the bridge by two spans (for a total of 1,500 feet), an additional 2.9 acres of farm field could potentially become part of the river bottom to offset the shadow effect. Based on the Final Additional Analysis, this would have a beneficial impact by reducing river velocities 18 percent, and by increasing the amount of habitat available to the UTS. The width of the post-project floodplain would be increased in this area, allowing floodwaters to slow down and thereby reduce scour. This would have a beneficial impact and minimize the change in flows in the river system.

(h) The Commission also relies upon its findings regarding wildlife movement (*i.e.*, migratory paths) in Design Compatibility Criterion No. 3, above.

42. **Other Relevant General Plan Policies.** The Commission finds that the proposed bridge crossings conform to other policies of the County's General Plan related to development within SEAs. For example, the Commission considered General Plan Circulation Element Policy 22, which calls for "avoidance" of the "construction of transportation facilities within significant ecological areas unless found essential following a detailed analysis of alternatives, including a

"no project" alternative." Even if the transportation facility is still found to be necessary after the alternatives analysis, this policy requires that the facility be constructed "in the most environmentally sensitive manner."

(a) The Commission considered a variety of alternative locations and configurations for each bridge crossing, as well as alternative spans for each bridge, taking into account natural constraints such as geography and sensitive habitat, as well as safety and engineering constraints such as intersection angles, minimum curve radii, super-elevation, design speed and sight distance. The Commission considered a no project alternative, but rejected the alternative as infeasible because many of the basic objectives of the Specific Plan would not be attained and many of the benefits associated with the Specific Plan would not be realized. The Commission also considered the fact that the bridge crossings would serve Specific Plan and regional transportation needs, would provide necessary connections in the County's Master Plan of Arterial Highways, would provide access between the Specific Plan site and the commercial centers north of SR-126 and would provide emergency access route alternatives. Based on its consideration of alternative bridge locations and spans, and geographical, design and safety constraints, the Commission concludes that the three bridge crossings, at the proposed locations, are essential for the safe and adequate circulation of traffic for the Specific Plan and the region, and will be constructed in the most environmentally sensitive manner.

(b) In addition, the Commission has determined that the bridge crossings would advance many other General Plan goals related to transportation, land use, noise control, safety, energy conservation and air quality. The Commission's determination is based on the discussion of these goals, and how the proposed bridge crossings contribute to attaining these other General Plan goals, which is found in the Final Additional Analysis, at pages 2.4-3-2.4-38.

(c) Recognizing the resource values within existing SEA 23 and the constraints imposed by competing priorities and objectives, on balance, the Commission finds that the road and utility crossings do not conflict with critical resources, habitat areas or migratory paths in SEA 23, particularly when considered in the context of the SEA design compatibility criteria (discussed above) and the other relevant General Plan policies (discussed above).

43. **Existing Permitted Uses.** Oil and natural gas operations, agricultural operations and grazing operations currently exist, and will continue to exist in both of the aforementioned SEAs as permitted uses. Although these uses predate the SEA designation and will be "grandfathered" as existing uses in the Specific Plan, they are considered consistent with the SEA General Plan compatibility criteria for a number of reasons. First, existing uses were not designated as incompatible when the SEAs were created. Existing agricultural, grazing, and oil and gas uses

were considered compatible with the resource values present in the SEAs since there was no indication that the County intended to regulate those existing uses under either the SEA General Plan provisions or Zoning Ordinance at the time of their adoption. Second, these uses have been operating since (and were operating prior to) the formation of the SEAs. Third, the County General Plan indicates that there is no intent under the SEA procedure to preclude "reasonable use of privately held lands." In addition, the General Plan recognizes the need to balance competing priorities between resource preservation and other critical public needs. Rather than unreasonably restrict such uses, the General Plan seeks to provide a process for reconciling conflicts between proposed land uses and the preservation of identified SEAs. The continuing operation of agricultural, grazing and oil and natural gas operations indicates the absence of such conflicts. In addition, grazing will be subject to the provisions of the Resource Management Plan (Chapter 2.6 of the Specific Plan), which provides a set of standards by which biological and cultural resources will be managed to avoid impacts to sensitive areas, including the SEA. Oil and natural gas operations will be operated in accordance with all state and federal laws and abandoned oil-related sites must be remediated to the satisfaction of all State and County requirements.

44. **Prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR.** In conjunction with its prior adoption of this CUP, the Board of Supervisors found that the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR (SCH No. 95011015) had been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*) and the State and County Guidelines relating thereto. The Board found that the Final EIR contained a description of the project, documented the project's potential impacts, and identified mitigation measures which will be implemented as part of the project. The Board stated that it had independently reviewed the information contained in the Final EIR.

45. The Board further found that implementation of the project will result in specifically identified significant effects upon the environment. However, except for adverse effects upon agricultural resources (conversion of prime agricultural land), visual qualities, air quality, biological resources and solid waste disposal, which could not be found to be completely mitigated, the Board found that such specifically identified significant adverse effects could be

reduced to acceptable levels with the mitigation measures identified in the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR and the adopted Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

46. With respect to the adverse effects upon agricultural resources (conversion of prime agricultural land), visual qualities, air quality, biological resources and solid waste disposal, which could not be adequately mitigated, the Board of Supervisors determined that the substantial benefits resulting from implementation of the project outweighed the potential unavoidable adverse effects and were acceptable based on the overriding considerations set forth in the Board's prior CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project. The Board's prior CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, which were concurrently adopted by the Board, are incorporated herein by this reference, as if set forth in full.

47. The Board further found that the mitigation measures in the Final EIR were incorporated into the conditions of approval for this conditional use permit and related parcel map (VTPM No. 24500). The Board also found that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan contained in the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR, and attached as an exhibit to the Board's prior CEQA Findings, identified the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential adverse impacts to the environment is ensured.

48. **Final Additional Analysis.** The Commission makes the following findings with respect to the Final Additional Analysis:

(a) The Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015) has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the Court's decision and writ.

(b) The Commission has independently reviewed the information contained in the Final Additional Analysis, in conjunction with its review of the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR.

(c) When certifying the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR, the Board of Supervisors previously acknowledged that the Specific Plan could potentially have significant environmental impacts. To minimize those impacts, the Board required the adoption of numerous mitigation measures, which were contained in the adopted Mitigation Monitoring Plan. Even after mitigation, the Specific Plan still posed certain unavoidable significant environmental impacts. As permitted under CEQA, the Board approved the Specific Plan despite its unavoidable impacts, finding in its CEQA Findings and Statement of

Overriding Considerations that the substantial benefits resulting from implementation of the Specific Plan outweighed those impacts.

(d) The Final Additional Analysis does not identify any significant environmental impacts not fully addressed in the prior Newhall Ranch Final EIR and adopted Mitigation Monitoring Plan. Nonetheless, the Final Additional Analysis identifies additional and revised mitigation measures that further minimize the Specific Plan's impacts. Those measures are presented in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan, attached as an exhibit to the "Additional CEQA Findings." Both the "Additional CEQA Findings" and revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan are incorporated herein by this reference.

(e) The mitigation measures in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan are also incorporated into the conditions of approval for this conditional use permit. The revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan, attached as an exhibit to the "Additional CEQA Findings," identifies the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential adverse impacts to the environment is ensured.

BASED UPON THE FOREGOING FINDINGS, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

1. The proposed development will be consistent with the adopted General Plan for the area.

2. The Specific Plan adjusts the existing SEA 23 boundaries by removing acreage from the SEA; the existing SEA will nevertheless remain in a viable and largely natural condition, particularly when taking into account major factors influencing the realization of General Plan objectives in this regard, including competing priorities between resource preservation and other General Plan policies and objectives.

3. The proposed development conforms with the General Plan's SEA "design compatibility criteria," in that:

(a) The proposed development is designed to be highly compatible with biotic resources present in SEA 23, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas;

(b) The proposed development is designed to maintain waterbodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state in SEA 23;

(c) The proposed development is designed so that wildlife movement corridors are left in a natural and undisturbed state within SEA 23;

(d) The proposed development retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resources in SEA 23 from the proposed development;

(e) The proposed development provides fences or walls where necessary to buffer important habitat in SEA 23 from proposed development; and

(f) The proposed development locates and designs roads and utilities serving the development so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas or migratory paths in SEA 23.

4. The Specific Plan is sensitive to, and compatible with, the biotic resources of SEA 23;

5. The proposed development at the locations proposed will not:

(a) Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area; or

(b) Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or

(c) Jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

6. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping, other development features prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance, or as otherwise required in order to integrate said uses with the uses in the surrounding areas.

7. The site is adequately served:

(a) By highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate; and

(b) By other public or private service facilities as are required.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

1. Certifies that the Final Additional Analysis has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, the

County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines and the Court's decision and writ in the prior Newhall Ranch litigation, and that the Final Additional Analysis reflects the independent judgment of the Commission;

2. Certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015), in conjunction with its review of the previously certified Newhall Ranch Final EIR prior to its approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5);

3. Adopts the attached Additional CEQA Findings for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant, which include a determination that the On Site Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts) for the Water Reclamation Plant site, as described in subsection 3.5.4 of the Final Additional Analysis, is the environmentally superior WRP site alternative;

4. Approves and adopts the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the project, incorporated in the Final Additional Analysis, and pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, finds that the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

5. Approves Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5), subject to the attached conditions.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 94-087-(5)
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
NEWHALL RANCH

The following conditions of approval relate to the Newhall Ranch Conditional Use Permit No. 94-087-(5). The conditions apply to both Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") 20 and SEA 23. Portions of SEA 20 and SEA 23 are located within the subject property, commonly known as "Newhall Ranch." The conditions identified under the heading, "**SEA 20 Conditions of Approval**" were previously adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1999, remain valid in all respects, and are repeated here for convenience only. Therefore, the Regional Planning Commission ("the Commission") of the County of Los Angeles ("the County") is not readopting those conditions.

The conditions adopted by the Board on March 23, 1999, as they relate to **SEA 23,** were set aside in response to the Court's decision and writ issued in August 1999, in connection with the prior Newhall Ranch litigation. After reconsidering the Newhall Ranch project approvals, the Commission hereby adopts the conditions identified under the heading, "**SEA 23 Conditions of Approval.**"

SEA 20 Conditions of Approval

The following general conditions apply throughout the entire project unless otherwise specified.

1. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.

2. This grant shall not be effective until:

   (a) The permittee and the owner of the property involved (if other than the permittee) have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning their affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant; and

   (b) An ordinance changing the zoning of the property from A-2-2, A-2-5 and M-1.5 to "Specific Plan," as recommended in Zone Change No. 94-087-(5), has been adopted by the Board of Supervisors and has become effective.

3. It is declared and made a condition of this permit that if any condition hereof is violated, or if any law, statute, or ordinance is violated, the permit shall be suspended and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse; provided that the permittee has been given written notice to cease such violation and has failed to do so for a period of thirty (30) days.

4. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or a hearing officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or hearing officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety, or so as to be a nuisance.

5. The subject property shall be developed, maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant, with all requirements of Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 24500, and with existing laws, statutes, ordinances or other regulations applicable to any vesting development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

6. If any future inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse the Department of Regional Planning for all additional enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance.

The following conditions relate to the environmental mitigation measures established for this project.

7. The environmental mitigation measures set forth in the "Mitigation Monitoring Plan" for the project are hereby incorporated by reference and are made conditions of this conditional use permit. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan is an exhibit to the "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations" which have been adopted by the Board of Supervisors in connection with its certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant (SCH No. 95011015). The Mitigation Monitoring Plan is on file at the Department of Regional Planning.

8. Monitoring Report Requirements: As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the permittee shall submit mitigation monitoring reports to the Department of Regional Planning. The reports shall describe the status of compliance with the mitigation measures adopted as conditions of this grant.

   The reports shall be submitted and approved in the following sequence:

   (a) Prior to, or concurrent with, a submittal to be approved by the Department of Regional Planning, and prior to issuance of grading permits by the Department of Public Works; and

(b) Additional reports as deemed necessary by the Department of Regional Planning.

9. An Environmental Documentation Deposit Account shall be established and maintained pursuant to Section 12.040.020 of the Los Angeles County Code to defray the costs of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the reports required by Condition No. 8 hereof.

10. All mitigation measures listed in the Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 95011015) shall be implemented in a timely manner and in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

The following conditions relate to graffiti removal.

11. All structures, walls and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings or signage that do not provide pertinent information about the premises.

12. In the event of such extraneous markings occurring, the permittee shall remove or cover the markings, drawings or signage within 24 hours following such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint used in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations, or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.

The following conditions relate to the permittee's obligations in the event of a legal challenge.

13. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County of Los Angeles ("County"), its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009, or other applicable limitation period. The County shall promptly notify the permittee of any claim, action or proceeding and the County shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the permittee of any claim, action or proceeding, or if the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the permittee shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the County.

14. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay the Department of Regional Planning (Department) an initial deposit of $5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, court testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:

(a) If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred by the department reach 80 percent of the amount of deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation; and

(b) At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee according to Section 2.170.010 of the Los Angeles County Code.

15. It is hereby declared that if any provision of this permit is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.

SEA 23 Conditions of Approval

The following general conditions apply throughout the entire project unless otherwise specified.

1. General Condition Nos. 1 through 6, above, are adopted as applied to SEA 23.

The following conditions relate to the environmental mitigation measures established for this project.

2. The environmental mitigation measures set forth in the "Revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan" for the project are hereby incorporated by reference and are made conditions of this conditional use permit. The Revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan is an exhibit to the "Additional CEQA Findings," which have been adopted by the Commission in connection with its certification of the Final Additional Analysis for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Water Reclamation Plant (SCH No. 95011015). The Revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan is on file at the Department of Regional Planning.

3. Monitoring Report Requirements: As a means of ensuring the effectiveness of the mitigation measures set forth in the "Revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan," the permittee shall submit mitigation monitoring reports to the Department of Regional Planning. The reports shall describe the status of compliance with the mitigation measures adopted as conditions of this grant.

The reports shall be submitted and approved in the following sequence:

(a) Prior to, or concurrent with, a submittal to be approved by the Department of Regional Planning, and prior to issuance of grading permits by the Department of Public Works; and

(b) Additional reports as deemed necessary by the Department of Regional Planning.

4. An Environmental Documentation Deposit Account shall be established and maintained pursuant to Section 12.040.020 of the Los Angeles County Code to defray the costs of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the reports required by Condition No. 3 hereof.

5. All mitigation measures listed in the previously certified Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 95011015) and the Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015) shall be implemented in a timely manner and in accordance with both the previously adopted Mitigation Monitoring Plan and the Revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

The following conditions relate to graffiti removal.

6. General Condition Nos. 11 and 12, above, are adopted as applied to SEA 23.

The following conditions relate to the permittee obligations in the event of a legal challenge.

7. General Condition Nos. 13, 14 and 15, above, are adopted as applied to SEA 23.

The following new conditions were added by the Commission, which relate to SEA 23 and other areas.

8. The length of the proposed Potrero Bridge shall be extended by an additional two spans for a total length of 1,500 feet to further minimize intrusion into the floodplain in conjunction with the future bridge design, subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works.

9. The On Site Alternative (Reduced Habitat Impacts) for the Water Reclamation Plant site, as described in subsection 3.5.4 of the Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 95011015) and as depicted in Figure 3.0-7 of that document, shall be implemented.

10. The permittee shall work with the County's biologist to enhance and increase the effectiveness of animal movement protections within the Salt Creek wildlife corridor, including the possible use of fencing.

Additional conditions/mitigation measures recommended by the Regional Planning Commission

The action of the Regional Planning Commission on October 24, 2001 related to the Newhall Ranch Additional Analysis included adding three conditions or mitigation measures, as appropriate, to those already presented in the public hearing materials. The Commission recommended that the following items be incorporated into the final adopted documents in an appropriate location:

1. Sediment:

"Clean sediment, periodically removed from debris basins within or outside the Specific Plan, may be placed into the Santa Clara River area as approved by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by DPW."

2. Saugus Recharge:

"Prior to approval of the first subdivision map which permits construction, a report will be provided by the applicant which evaluates methods to recharge the Saugus aquifer within the Specific Plan, including the identification of appropriate candidate land areas for recharge. The report shall be subject to approval of the Department of Public Works (DPW) and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by DPW."

3. Recreational Vehicle Storage on residential properties:

"All purchasers of homes within any subdivision in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are to be provided with a disclosure statement in the purchase/sales documentation making the purchaser(s) aware that the parking and storage of recreational vehicles on the purchased home/lot must satisfy the standards established by the County of Los Angeles and/or as contained in the Conditions Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs), whichever is more restrictive."

These three items have been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring Plan and Conditions for the Specific Plan (Exhibit I).

New and Revised Mitigation Measures, and New Conditions of Approval

Since the Newhall Ranch EIR was originally adopted by the Board of Supervisors ("Board") in March 1999 and as a result of the comments received during the public review process as well as consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, County staff and/or the Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") have recommended adopting many new mitigation measures and conditions of approval as well as revising several mitigation measures originally adopted by the Board.

New mitigation measures occur in the topical areas of spineflower and other sensitive plant species, water resources, and for the Water Reclamation Plant. Revised mitigation measures occur in the topical areas of flood (water quality), spineflower and other sensitive plant species, and water resources (revisions to measures are provided in underlined and strikeout text). In addition, several additional conditions of approval have been recommended to the Board by the Commission. In the information presented below, new measures and conditions are distinguished from revised measures and conditions as appropriate.

Mitigation Measures – Flood (Water Quality)

Original Mitigation Measure Revised by Staff in March 2003:

4.2-8. The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall comply with all appropriate requirements of the County of Los Angeles Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP") requirements, <u>and comply with the SWRCB-issued General Permit for Construction Activity Storm Water (SWRCB Order 99-08-DWQ), as it may be amended from time to time or replaced by other applicable stormwater permits.</u> ~~or demonstrate equivalency to these requirements.~~

Mitigation Measures - Spineflower and Other Sensitive Plant Species (Biota)

Original Mitigation Measure Revised by the Regional Planning Commission and Staff in October 2001:

4.6-53. If, at the time any subdivision~~s~~ map proposing construction ~~are~~ is ~~processed~~<u>submitted</u>, the County determines through an Initial Study, or otherwise, that there may be rare, threatened or endangered, plant or animal species on the property ~~being~~ to be subdivided, then, in addition to the prior

surveys conducted on the Specific Plan site to define the presence or absence of sensitive habitat and associated species, ~~a~~current, updated site-specific surveys for all such animal or plant species shall be conducted in accordance with the consultation requirements set forth in Mitigation Measure 4.6-59 within those areas of the Specific Plan where such animal or plant species occur or are likely to occur.

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

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

Original Mitigation Measure Revised by Staff in November 2002:

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

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

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

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

4) **Development/Disturbance and Further Mitigation**. Prior to any development within, or disturbance to, habitat occupied by rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species, or to any portion of the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay, as defined below, all required permits shall be obtained from both USFWS and CDFG, as applicable. It is further anticipated that the federal and state permits will impose conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law that are beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Final EIR (March 1999), the Newhall Ranch DAA (April 2001) and the Newhall Ranch Revised DAA (2002). It is also anticipated that conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law for project-related impacts on endangered, rare or threatened species and their habitat will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan development footprints, roadway alignments, and the limits, patterns and techniques associated with project-specific grading at the subdivision map level.

~~Prior to development within or disturbance to habitat occupied by species listed as endangered, a formal consultation with the USFWS and a Section 2081 Permit with the CDFG shall occur.~~ (Version Adopted in 1999)

~~Prior to any development within, or disturbance to, habitat occupied by rare threatened, or endangered plant or animal species, a formal consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS") shall occur, and all required permits shall be obtainted from both the USFWS and the California Department of Fish and Game, as applicable. It is further anticipated that the federal and state permits will impose conditions and mitigation measures required by federal and state law that are beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Final EIR and the Newhall Ranch Additional Analysis.~~ (Version Recommended in April 2001)

New Mitigation Measures Recommended by Staff in November 2002 with Revisions Made in March 2003

Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay

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

Spineflower Preserves

4.6-66. Direct impacts to known spineflower populations within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area shall be avoided or minimized through the establishment of one or more on-site preserves that are configured to ensure the continued existence of the species in perpetuity. Preserve(s) shall be delineated in consultation with the County and CDFG, and will likely require changes and revisions to Specific Plan development footprints for lands within and around the Spineflower Mitigation Area Overlay (**Figure 2.6-8**).

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

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

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

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

Annual viability reports shall be submitted to the County and CDFG for 10 years following delineation of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) to ensure long-term documentation of the spineflower population status within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s). In the event annual status reports indicate the spineflower population within the Newhall Ranch preserve(s) is not stable and viable 10 years following delineation of the spineflower preserve(s), the project

applicant, or its designee, shall continue to submit annual status reports to the County and CDFG for a period of no less than an additional 5 years.

Connectivity, Reserve Design and Buffers

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

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

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

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

Buffer configurations may include the width of any adjacent roadway system or associated rights-of-way, because roadways and rights-of-way can afford some protection to the spineflower preserve(s) and contribute to the effectiveness of the buffers by further avoiding or minimizing the potential indirect impacts of future development. In designing buffers that include roads, the design shall take into account edge effects from the roads by assessing, among other factors, the likelihood of disturbance based upon topography, road runoff and adjacent vegetation types.

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

Preserve Protection/Fencing

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

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

The plans and specifications for the permanent fencing and signage shall be approved by the County and CDFG prior to the final phase of construction of

any Newhall Ranch subdivision map adjacent to a Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s).

Preserve Protection/Hydrological Alterations

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

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

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

Road Construction Measures

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

(a) Commerce Center Drive;

(b) Magic Mountain Parkway;

(c) Chiquito Canyon Road;

(d) Long Canyon Road;

(e) San Martinez Grande Road;

(f) Potrero Valley Road;

(g) Valencia Boulevard; and

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

Engineering, Design and Grading Modifications

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

Fire Management Plan

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

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

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

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

Water Flow Diversion and Management

4.6-73 At the subdivision map level, the project applicant, or its designee, shall design and implement project-specific design measures to minimize changes in surface water flows to the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) for all Newhall Ranch subdivision maps adjacent to the preserve(s) and buffers<u>, and avoid and minimize indirect impacts to the spineflower</u>. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for each such subdivision map, the project applicant, or its designee, shall submit for approval to the County plans and specifications that ensure implementation of the following design measures:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Biological Monitor

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

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

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

Construction Impact Avoidance Measures

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

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

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

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

Reassessment Requirement

4.6-76 In conjunction with submission of the first Newhall Ranch subdivision map in either Mesas Village or that portion of Riverwood Village in which the San Martinez spineflower location occurs, the project applicant, or its designee, shall reassess project impacts, both direct and indirect, to the spineflower populations using subdivision mapping data, baseline data from the Newhall Ranch Final EIR and data from the updated plant surveys (see, Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 4.6-53).

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

Newhall Ranch Monitoring and Management

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

Monitoring. The purpose of the monitoring component of the plan is to track the viability of the Newhall Ranch spineflower preserve(s) and its populations, and to ensure compliance with the adopted Newhall Ranch Mitigation Monitoring Program (Biota section).
The monitoring component of the plan shall investigate and monitor factors such as population size, growth or decline, general condition, new impacts, changes in associated vegetation species, pollinators, seed dispersal vectors and seasonal responses. Necessary management measures will be identified. The report results will be sent annually to the County, along with photo documentation of the assessed site conditions.

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

For a period of three years from Specific Plan re-approval, all areas of potential habitat on the Newhall Ranch site will be surveyed annually in the spring with the goal of identifying previously unrecorded spineflower populations. Because population size and distribution limits are known to vary depending on rainfall, annual surveys shall be conducted for those areas proposed for development in order to establish a database appropriate for analysis at the project-specific subdivision map level (rather than waiting to survey immediately prior to proceeding with the project-specific subdivision

map process). In this way, survey results gathered over time (across years of varying rainfall) will provide information on ranges in population size and occupation. New populations, if they are found, will be mapped and assessed for inclusion in the preserve program to avoid impacts to the species.

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

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

After any population decline documented in the annual populations census following County re-approval of the Specific Plan, the project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for conducting an assessment of the ecological factor(s) that are likely responsible for the decline, and implement management activity or activities to address these factors where feasible. If a persistent population decline is documented, such as a trend in steady population decline persistent for a period of 5 consecutive years, or a substantial drop in population detected over a 10-year period, spineflower may be introduced in appropriate habitat and soils in the Newhall Ranch preserve(s), utilizing the bulk spineflower seed repository, together with other required management activity or activities. These activities shall be undertaken by a qualified botanist/biologist, subject to approval by the County with the concurrence of CDFG. The project applicant, or its designee, shall be responsible for the funding and implementation of the necessary management activity or activities, as approved by the County and CDFG.

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

Translocation/Reintroduction Program

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ongoing Agricultural Activities

4.6-79 The project applicant, or its designee, shall engage in regular and ongoing consultation with the County and CDFG in connection with its ongoing agricultural operations in order to avoid or minimize significant <u>direct</u> impacts to the spineflower.

In addition, the project applicant, or its designee, shall provide 30 days advance written notice to the County and CDFG of the proposed conversion of its ongoing rangeland operations on Newhall Ranch to more intensive agricultural uses. The purpose of the advance notice requirement is to allow the applicant, or its designee, to coordinate with the County and CDFG to avoid or minimize significant impacts to the spineflower prior to the applicant's proposed conversion of its ongoing rangeland operations to more intensive agricultural uses. <u>This coordination component will be implemented by or through the County's Department of Regional Planning and/or the Regional Manager of CDFG. Implementation will consist of the County and/or CDFG conducting a site visit of the proposed conversion area(s) within the 30-day period, and making a determination of whether the proposed conversion area(s) would destroy or significantly impact spineflower population in or adjacent to those areas. If it is determined that the conversion area(s) do not destroy or significantly impact spineflower populations, then the County and/or CDFG will authorize such conversion activities in the proposed conversion area(s). However, if it is determined that the conversion area(s) may destroy or</u>

significantly impact spineflower populations, then the County and/or CDFG will issue a stop work order to the applicant, or its designee. If such an order is issued, the applicant, or its designee, shall not proceed with any conversion activities in the proposed conversion area(s). However, the applicant, or the designee, may take steps to relocate the proposed conversion activities in an alternate conversion area(s). In doing so, the applicant, or its designee, shall follow the same notice and coordination provisions identified above. This conversion shall not include ordinary pasture maintenance and renovation or dry land farming operations consistent with rangeland management.

Mitigation Measures - Water Resources

Original Mitigation Measures Revised by Staff in April 2001:

4.11-6 In conjunction with the submittal of applications for tentative tract maps or parcel maps which permit construction, and prior to approval of any such tentative maps, ~~Prior to recordation of any final subdivision map that allows construction,~~ and in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County General Plan Development Monitoring System (DMS), as amended, Los Angeles County shall require the applicant of the map ~~subdivision~~ to obtain written confirmation from the retail water agency ~~that a~~ identifying the source(s) of water ~~source is~~ available to ~~supply~~ serve the map ~~subdivision~~ concurrent with need. If the applicant of such map ~~the subdivision~~ cannot obtain confirmation that a water source(s) is available for buildout of the ~~subdivision~~ map, the ~~subdivision~~ map shall be phased with the timing of an available water source(s), consistent with the County's DMS requirements.

4.11-9 Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that the Upper Santa Clara Water Committee (or Santa Clarita Valley Water Purveyors), made up of the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 36, Newhall County Water District, Santa Clarita Water ~~Company~~ Division of CLWA and the Valencia Water Company, prepare an annual water report that will discuss the status of groundwater ~~levels~~ within the Alluvial and Saugus Aquifers, and State Water Project water supplies as they relate to the Santa Clarita Valley. The report will also include an annual update of the actions taken by CLWA to enhance the quality and reliability of existing and planned water supplies for the Santa Clarita Valley. In those years when the Committee or purveyors do~~es~~ not prepare such a report, the applicant at ~~his~~its expense shall cause the preparation of such a report that is acceptable to the County to address these issues. This annual report shall be provided to Los Angeles County who ~~may~~will ~~use~~ consider the report as part of ~~the~~ its local land use decision-making process. (To date, four such water reports have been prepared (1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001) and provided to both the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita.)

4.11-10 Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(2), the County shall recommend that Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), in cooperation with other Santa Clarita Valley retail water providers, continue to update the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for Santa Clarita Valley once every five years (on or before December 31) to ensure that the County receives up-to-date information about the existing and planned water supplies in the Santa Clarita Valley. The County will consider the information contained in the updated UWMP in connection with the County's future local land use decision-making process. The County will also consider the information contained in the updated UWMP in connection with the County's future consideration of any Newhall Ranch tentative subdivision maps allowing construction.

~~In conjunction with the submittal of applications for and prior to approval of tentative tract and parcel maps which permit construction, a letter from the retail water provider will be submitted to the County identifying the source(s) of supply of water for the land uses within that tentative tract or parcel map. The source(s) of water identified shall not result in the net use of groundwater over that which is planned for the Santa Clarita water basin, which is identified as the annual safe perennial yield of the Alluvial Aquifer and the annual recharge rate of the Saugus Aquifer in the Final EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan or subsequent environmental documentation.~~ (See**, Mitigation Measure 4.11-15**, below.)

New Mitigation Measures Recommended by Staff in April 2001 with Revisions Made in March 2003:

4.11-11 With implementation of the proposed Saugus ASR program, ASR wells shall be spaced so that adjacent non-project wells will not lose pumping capacity as a result of drawdown occurring during pumping of the ASR wells.

4.11-12 With implementation of the proposed Saugus ASR program, the ultimate number of ASR wells to be constructed shall be sufficient to inject the ultimate target injection volume of 4,500 acre-feet per year and withdraw the ultimate target withdraw volume of 4,100 acre-feet per year.

4.11-13. With implementation of the proposed Saugus ASR program, ASR wells shall be constructed in the following two general areas:

(a) South of the Santa Clara River and west of Interstate 5. This location includes areas within the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan boundary. (This area is referred to as the “south ASR well field.”); and

(b) North of the Santa Clara River and west of Castaic Creek. (This location is referred to as the "north ASR well field.")

4.11-14 The Saugus Groundwater Banking/ASR program injection water must meet the water quality requirements of the State Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. The water extracted for use on the Specific Plan site shall meet the Title 22 drinking water standards of the State Department of Health Services.

4.11-15 Groundwater historically and presently used for crop irrigation on the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site and elsewhere in Los Angeles County shall be made available by the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, to partially meet the potable water demands of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The amount of groundwater pumped for this purpose shall not exceed 7,038 AFY. This is the amount of groundwater pumped historically and presently by the Newhall Land and Farming Company in Los Angeles County to support its agricultural operations. Pumping this amount will not result in a net increase in groundwater use in the Santa Clarita Valley. To monitor groundwater use, the Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide the County an annual report indicating the amount of groundwater used in Los Angeles County <u>and the specific land upon which that groundwater was historically used for irrigation. For agricultural land located off the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site in Los Angeles County, at the time agricultural groundwater is transferred from agricultural uses on that land to Specific Plan uses, The Newhall Land and Farming Company, or its assignee, shall provide a verified statement to the County's Department of Regional Planning that Alluvial aquifer water rights on that land will now be used to meet Specific Plan demand.</u>

4.11-16 The agricultural groundwater used to meet the needs of the Specific Plan shall meet the drinking water quality standards required under Title 22 prior to use.

4.11-17 In conjunction with each project-specific subdivision map for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the County shall require the applicant of that map to cause to be prepared a supplemental or subsequent Environmental Impact Report, as appropriate, pursuant to CEQA requirements. By imposing this EIR requirement on each Newhall Ranch tentative subdivision map application allowing construction, the County will ensure that, among other things, the water needed for each proposed subdivision is confirmed as part of the County's subdivision map application process. This mitigation requirement shall be read and applied in combination with the requirements set forth in revised **Mitigation Measure 4.11-6**, above.

4.11-18. The storage capacity purchased in the Semitropic Groundwater Banking Project by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan applicant shall be used in conjunction with the provision of water to the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The applicant, or entity responsible for storing Newhall Ranch water in this groundwater bank, shall prepare an annual status report indicating the amount of water placed in storage in the groundwater bank. This report shall be made available annually and used by Los Angeles County in its decision-making processes relating to build-out of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

New Mitigation Measures Recommended by Staff in November 2002 with Revisions Made in March 2003:

4.11-19. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Water Resource Monitoring Program has been entered into between United Water Conservation District and the Upper Basin Water Purveyors, effective August 20, 2001.[1] The MOU/Water Resource Monitoring Program, when executed, will put in place a joint water resource monitoring program that will be an effective regional water management tool for both the Upper and Lower Santa Clara River areas as further information is developed, consistent with the MOU. This monitoring program will result in a database addressing water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over various representative water cycles. The parties to the MOU intend to utilize this database to further identify surface water and groundwater impacts on the Santa Clara River Valley. The applicant, or its designee, shall cooperate in good faith with the continuing efforts to implement the MOU and Water Resource Monitoring Program.

As part of the MOU process, the United Water Conservation District and the applicant have also entered into a "Settlement and Mutual Release" agreement, which is intended to continue to develop data as part of an on-going process for providing information about surface and groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley. In that agreement, the County and the applicant have agreed to the following:

> "4.3 Los Angeles County and Newhall will each in good faith cooperate with the parties to the MOU and will assist them as requested in the development of the database calibrating water usage in the Saugus and Alluvium aquifers over multi-year water cycles. Such cooperation will include, but not be limited to, providing the parties to the MOU with historical well data and other data concerning surface water and groundwater in the Santa Clara River and, in the case of Newhall, providing Valencia Water Company with access to wells for the collection of well data for the MOU.

---

[1] *See,* **Appendix F** to Final Additional Analysis [Memorandum of Understanding Between the Santa Clara River Valley Upper Basin Water Purveyors and United Water Conservation District, dated August 2001].

4.4 Los Angeles County and Newhall further agree that the County of Los Angeles will be provided with, and consider, the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program in connection with, and prior to, all future Newhall Ranch subdivision approvals or any other future land use entitlements implementing the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. If the then-existing data produced by the MOU's monitoring program identifies significant impacts to surface water or groundwater resources in the Santa Clara River Valley, Los Angeles County will identify those impacts and adopt feasible mitigation measures in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act."

4.11-20 The Specific Plan applicant, or its successors, shall assign its acquired Nickel Water rights to the Valencia Water Company or Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), and, in consultation with~~, and~~ the Valencia Water Company, CLWA or their designee(s), the applicant shall ensure that the Nickel Water is delivered to the appropriate place of use necessary to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan at the time of need, as determined by the County of Los Angeles through required SB221 and/or SB610 analyses for future subdivision map applications. Upon approval of the Specific Plan, the applicant, Valencia Water Company, CLWA or a designee, will take delivery of the Nickel Water, so that such water will be used, or stored for use, for the Specific Plan in future years.

New Mitigation Measures Recommended by Staff in March 2003:

4.11-21 The applicant, in coordination with RWQCB staff, shall select a representative location upstream and downstream of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and sample surface and groundwater quality. Sampling from these two locations would begin upon approval of the first subdivision map and be provided annually to the RWQCB and County for the purpose of monitoring water quality impacts of the Specific Plan over time. If the sampling data results in the identification of significant new or additional water quality impacts resulting from the Specific Plan, which were not previously known or identified, additional mitigation shall be required at the subdivision map level.

4.11-22 Beginning with the filing of the first subdivision map allowing construction on the Specific Plan site and with the filing of each subsequent subdivision map allowing construction, the Specific Plan applicant, or its designee, shall provide documentation to the County of Los Angeles identifying the specific portion(s) of irrigated farmland in the County of Los Angeles proposed to be retired from irrigated production to make agricultural water available to serve the subdivision. As a condition of subdivision approval, the applicant or its

designee, shall provide proof to the County that the agricultural land has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the subdivision.

Mitigation Measures - Water Reclamation Plant

New Mitigation Measure Recommended by Staff in March 2003:

5.0-52(b) The applicant shall initiate a request to the new County sanitation district formed for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site to adopt an ordinance prohibiting the installation and use of self-regenerating water softeners within the new sanitation district prior to connection of the first residential unit to the sanitary sewer system.

Additional Conditions of Approval

Additional Conditions Recommended by Staff in March 2003:

In addition to the revised and additional mitigation measures, staff recommends that the Board consider imposing the following additional conditions in connection with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in order to ensure continued disclosure of environmental information:

(a) Require the applicant to submit a signed statement, filed concurrently with the filing of any departmental development application, obligating the applicant to disclose to the Department of Regional Planning the existence of any endangered or threatened species that are known or suspected to exist on the subject property.

(b) Require the applicant to report to the Department of Regional Planning the results of all on-site biological surveys within thirty (30) days after completion of the survey work.

(c) Require the applicant to schedule a consultation meeting between the Department of Regional Planning, the applicant and environmental consultant(s) to discuss the results of the survey work, and to ensure public disclosure of the survey results in the required environmental documentation for the proposed project.

Additional Conditions Recommended by the Regional Planning Commission in October 2001:

When the Commission recommended in October 2001 that the Board certify the Additional Analysis and re-adopt the Specific Plan, the Commission recommended that the Board consider imposing the following additional conditions in connection with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan:

(d) Clean sediment, periodically removed from debris basins within or outside the Specific Plan, may be placed into the Santa Clara River area as approved by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by DPW.

(e) Prior to approval of the first subdivision map which permits construction, a report will be provided by the applicant which evaluates methods to recharge the Saugus Aquifer within the Specific Plan, including the identification of appropriate candidate land areas for recharge. The report shall be subject to approval by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by DPW.

(f) All purchasers of homes within any subdivision in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan are to be provided with a disclosure statement in the purchase/sales documentation making the purchaser(s) aware that the parking and storage of recreational vehicles on the purchased home/lot must satisfy the standards established by the County of Los Angeles and/or as contained in the Conditions Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs), whichever is more restrictive.

If adopted, these conditions would be made part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Mitigation Monitoring Program.

MINUTES OF THE SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AREA TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SEATAC) MEETING OF JANUARY 14, 2003

(Approved as amended February 27, 2003)

PERSONS IN ATTENDANCE:

SEATAC MEMBERS	**REGIONAL PLANNING STAFF**
Martin Cody, PhD	Joe Decruyenaere
Janet Fahey, PhD	Hsiao-ching Chen, PhD
Richard Friesen, PhD	Daryl Koutnik
Frank Hovore	Lee Stark
Mickey Long	
Carl Wishner	

Project 94-087 Representatives

Keith Babcock	(818) 879-1100
June Collins	(766) 942-5197
Mark Subbotin	(661) 255-4069
Tom Worthington	(818) 879-1100

Project 02-232 Representatives

Keith Babcock	(818) 879-1100
Larry Lodwick	(818) 879-1100

MINUTES

JANUARY 14, 2003

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Fahey moved and Friesen seconded to approve the December 2, 2002 SEATAC minutes as written.

   Note: Mickey Long was unable to attend the meeting and submitted his comments on the projects via email, beforehand. This meeting was rescheduled from the original January 6, 2003 date at the request of SEATAC.

NEW BUSINESS

2. **Project 94-087** – See Attachment Item 2.

3. **Project 02-232** – See Attachment Item 3.

****

NOTE: SEATAC MEETINGS ARE INFORMAL WORKING SESSIONS. MEMBERS ARE APPOINTED VOLUNTEERS IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY. MINUTES ARE PREPARED BY PLANNING STAFF PRIMARILY FROM NOTES. SESSIONS ARE ALSO TAPE RECORDED BUT THE TAPES ARE PRIMARILY FOR BACK-UP USE BY STAFF. VISITORS ARE ADVISED TO TAKE PROPER NOTES AND/OR RECORD THE SESSION. ISSUES NOT DISCUSSED BY SEATAC DO NOT IMPLY TACIT APPROVAL. NEW OR CLARIFIED INFORMATION PRESENTED IN SUBSEQUENT SUBMITTALS MAY RAISE NEW ISSUES AND MAY REQUIRE FURTHER ANALYSIS. MINUTES ARE GENERALLY APPROVED AT THE NEXT SEATAC MEETING. DRAFT MINUTES MAY BE REQUESTED BUT ARE SUBJECT TO REVISION.

SEATAC REPORT AND COMMENTS

PROJECT 94-087 – SPECIFIC PLAN

SEATAC MEETING DATE JANUARY 14, 2003

Draft Additional Analysis Dated November 2002

Initial SEATAC Meeting for Draft Additional Analysis

PROPOSED PROJECT: 94-087 – The proposed project is the build-out of the 11,963 acre Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, including 21,615 dwelling units on 4,835 acres (including an 18-hole golf course, 10 neighborhood parks and seven schools), 630 acres of mixed uses (including residential, office and retail commercial), 67 acres of commercial uses, 256 acres of business park uses, 37 acres of visitor-serving uses, 6,138 acres of open area, 3 community parks on 186 acres, and 367 acres of arterial roads and community facilities (including a new 6.9 million gallon per day water reclamation plant, one library and two fire stations). The build-out of the specific plan is projected to occur over approximately 25 to 30 years and to result in an on site population of approximately 60,000 persons. The project is located partially within SEAs 20 (Santa Susanna Mountains) and SEA 23 (Santa Clara River) along Highway 126 between Highway 5 and the Los Angeles County/Ventura County line.

SEA DESCRIPTION: The Santa Susana Mountains **(SEA No. 20)** is one of several relatively small ridge systems that form the western Transverse Ranges and blend eastward into the larger San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains. The Santa Monica Mountains are also part of this system and form a coastal barrier shielding the interior ridges from the direct influences of moist marine air, making these interior ridges drier than the coastal ones. The vegetation of the Santa Susana Mountains consists of coastal sage scrub on south-facing slopes, dense chaparral on north-facing slopes, and oak, walnut and riparian woodlands in valleys. The oak woodland communities are extremely diverse, supporting six species of oaks. These include coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), valley oak (*Q. lobata*), canyon live oak (*Q. chrysolepis*), scrub oak (*Q. berberidifolia*), interior live oak (*Q. wislizenii*), and a single known location of Palmer's oak (*Q. palmeri*). The latter species is known in Los Angeles County only from this area. The walnut woodlands are frequently found in canyons of intermittent streams and consist primarily of California black walnut (*Juglans californica*), flowering ash (*Fraxinus dipetala*), Mexican elderberry (*Sambucus mexicana*), and coast live oak. Fires appear to promote the expansion of walnut woodlands. Unusual California walnut-flowering ash woodlands occur at mid-elevations within canyons of the north slopes. This community appears to be unique to the Santa Susana Mountains. The bigcone spruce (*Pseudotsuga macrocarpa*)-canyon live oak forest at higher elevations represents one of the northwesternmost examples of this community.

The Santa Susana Mountains are the main representative of these low, dry interior mountain ranges in Los Angeles County. The core of this range is in good condition and has not been heavily disturbed by human use. These mountains are becoming isolated from surrounding natural areas by continued urban expansion in the San Fernando, Simi, and Santa Clarita Valleys. The Santa Susana

Mountains have become an important wildlife corridor for gene flow and species movement between the San Gabriel and Santa Monica Mountains via the Simi Hills.

Santa Clara River **(SEA No. 23)** is so designated because it accommodates the habitat of the unarmored threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni*). The reason the unarmored threespine stickleback has been able to survive in the Santa Clara River is that its habitat has not been disturbed. The vegetation consists of fresh water marsh, coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, and riparian woodland communities. The primary concern for the survival of the unarmored threespine stickleback is the loss of suitable habitat. It requires clean, free-flowing perennial streams and ponds surrounded by native vegetation.

The entire watershed of the Santa Clara River should be considered as a buffer zone. No developments should be allowed that will change natural drainage patterns or increase runoff and water pollution.

SEATAC COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROJECT 94-087:

1. The argument that displacement of wildlife will be gradual and occur over 20 to 30 years is unfounded. A buildout faster than the stated 20 to 30 years is conceivable, and it is likely that the first construction activities will displace disproportionately more wildlife relative to later phases. Regardless of the timing of displacement, the adjacent areas will not have the capacity to support the wildlife that they currently contain plus the addition of displaced immigrants from the Newhall Ranch site, and overall wildlife loss will be the result.
2. Arroyo toad (*Bufo californicus*) and issues relating to the Santa Clara River are not adequately addressed in the project EIR. Arroyo toad is recorded upstream and downstream from the Newhall Ranch site. It is likely that toads occupy regions within the project property, if only during migration from offsite areas. If resident toads exist they will be displaced by development of the project, and movement between upstream and downstream areas would be made unlikely with bank hardening along the Santa Clara River. The discussion of impacts to arroyo toad by flow velocity changes due to bank hardening is misleading. The primary impact to arroyo toad will be through the loss of bank habitat, not through changes in flow velocities.
3. Prior consultants (Courtois) are not credible per the California Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service.
4. Confidentiality agreements between Newhall Land and biological consultants have cast doubt on the completeness of the reports submitted for this project. The validity of earlier surveys is questioned. The DAA shows numerous sensitive plants to be present on the site which were not found during the EIR surveys, creating a much greater level of habitat and resource sensitivity than was analyzed in that document. It strongly calls into question the value of the EIR surveys and conclusions relative to other sensitive species presence, particularly the arroyo toad.
5. The statement that the project is "highly compatible with biotic resources" is not in agreement with SEATAC precedent. SEATAC has never found a project to be highly compatible with the protection of natural resources if that project results in a loss of acreage to natural habitats.

6. Development of disturbed lands does not indicate lack of impacts to biological resources. Disturbed lands provide substantially more value to wildlife and plant species, especially raptors and large predators, than does developed land.
7. The tone in parts of the analysis, such as the discussion of increased intensity of agriculture and the speculation that more impactful development will occur elsewhere if the present project is not approved, is threatening and implies punitive retaliation for the adoption of alternatives not preferred by the applicant. Such language is wholly inappropriate in a CEQA document.
8. The assertion that the Non-River Alternative for water treatment plant siting would result in the incompatible juxtaposition of this plant with residential land use refers to an incomplete alternative. Nowhere has it been stated that residential uses, although described in the specific plan, are required in the areas adjacent to the Non-River site. A realistic alternative will propose fewer impacts, not a rearrangement of the impacts resulting from the project as proposed.
9. Deferring decisions pertaining to biological impacts until the individual subdivision map submittal phase could pose a number of problems (i.e., the assessment of impacts related to road alignments approaching Newhall Ranch), and impacts must be considered in a holistic manner. The piecemealing of impacts will be difficult to avoid without careful planning. All subdivision map submittals are to be preceded by surveys.
10. Translocation of San Fernando spineflower (SFV) is unlikely to be successful. There is very little understanding of the species' ecology and site requirements. The species is known to occur only on land owned by Newhall Land & Farming and on the Ahmanson Ranch site; it is thus too rare to be wagered with unproven translocation or attempts at habitat engineering. It is likely that the current distribution of SFV populations is a reflection of nearly all of the habitable space available to it. Conservation of existing disturbance regimes, hydrology and soil characteristics is the best guarantor of continuance of these populations. If translocation is a rejected alternative presented in the present document illustrate the full range of potential alternatives, this ought to be clearly stated in the analysis.
11. A population viability analysis study for SFV will be necessary before management of SFV can be reasonably proposed.
12. Existing actions that prejudice the ability to avoid impacts to SFV, such as disking land for agricultural purposes, shall be eliminated.
13. Setbacks of 150 and 300 feet are, in all likelihood, insufficient to protect SFV in perpetuity. The extent of buffer areas will depend on adjacent uses and must account for the potential (inevitable) introduction of Argentine ants into areas with nearby irrigation. SFV is likely to depend on insect pollinators and seed dispersers (native ants), which would be displaced and predated upon by non-native Argentine ants. Argentine ants do not serve any known pollination or seed-dispersal function; the ant species is known to be supported by development and may range hundreds of meters from irrigated areas.
14. Propose an Argentine ant control program as part of the mitigation measures.
15. Clarify what is meant by "unconfirmed" spineflower locations on page 2.6-6.
16. Identify land-use symbols on Figure 2.6-2.
17. Include a map of the project in context of the entirety of SEAs 20 and 23.

18. Include a depiction of the extent and quality of the SFV seedbank in maps of SFV distribution. SFV management protocols shall include measures to conserve the seedbank. Any seed collection activities will require a take permit from CDFG.
19. Conservation plans for SFV should be based on population distributions rather than numbers of individual plants within populations. Although the sampling procedures used by separate consultants may not yield comparable data, making statistically rigorous estimates of populations size unobtainable, the limited data that are available suggest that populations can vary widely from year to year, making management of population size an untenable goal.
20. Propose a fire management plan for areas adjacent to SFV populations. Set backs to development shall be sufficient to protect SFV from brush clearance.
21. Roads do not provide buffer habitat. Roadways shall be prohibited from SFV preserve areas, and from their buffers.
22. Pre-development soils characteristics shall be maintained in reserve areas.
23. Correct the common name for *Opuntia basilaris* var. *brachyclada* from short-leaved beaver tail cactus to short-jointed beaver tail cactus.
24. Strike permissive language, such as "to the extent practicable" and "where feasible" from the document since this is not enforceable.
25. Monitoring of SFV management practices shall continue for the life of the project, not just five or ten years.

ACTION TAKEN: No further SEATAC review is required; SEATAC recommendations are to be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors.

SEATAC REPORT AND COMMENTS

PROJECT 02-232 – SPECIFIC PLAN

SEATAC MEETING DATE JANUARY 14, 2003

Biological Constraints Analysis Dated December 2002

Initial SEATAC Meeting

PROPOSED PROJECT: 02-232 – The proposed project is a Specific Plan for the construction of up to 23,000 homes, approximately 13.1 million sq. ft. of non-residential development and 5,700 acres of mixed-use recreational and open space areas on 12,000 acres in SEA Nos. 58 (Portal Ridge/Liebre Mountain) and 59 (Tehachapi Foothills).

SEA DESCRIPTION: The Portal Ridge/Liebre Mountain area **(SEA No. 58)** is in close proximity to the Mojave Desert, the San Gabriel Mountains and the Tehachapi Foothills. This position, at the intersection of three major geographic regions has produced the most diverse and unique flora in the County. The area contains ten distinct plant communities, representing transitions between desert, foothill and montane environments. The diversity of the area is further enhanced by the presence of many northern species, some of which are rare in the County, reaching their southern limits here.

Foothill woodland is an uncommon plant community that occurs in this area. It contains parklands of both blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*) and valley oak (*Q. lobata*), and foothill pine (*Pinus sabiniana*) woodland. This community is more common in northern and central California where it forms a ring forest along foothill and valley borders in the inner Coastal Ranges and western foothills of the Sierra Nevada. The distribution of this community extends south through the Tehachapi Mountains to the San Gabriel Mountains to reach its southern limit on Portal Ridge/Liebre Mountain. This is the only place this community is found in the County. Similarly, several of the component species including blue oak, foothill pine and California buckeye reach their southern limits here and are found nowhere else in the County.

On lower slopes and in the valleys south of the main ridgeline, southern oak woodland, valley grassland, riparian woodland and coastal sage scrub can be found. Higher slopes and ridge tops are covered with chaparral and yellow-pine forest. On north-facing slopes, which are under desert influences, pinyon-juniper woodland habitat is present, Joshua tree woodland or sagebrush scrub covers the lower desert hillsides in the area. All of these communities are relatively common in the County with the exception of sagebrush scrub. This community, dominated by great basin sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*), is not common in California south of the Owens Valley. Populations in southern California are probably relicts from an earlier time when the community extended much further south than it does today. Despite the commonness of many of the plant communities present, this area is very valuable because it possesses such a concentrated diversity of vegetation types. This creates an outstanding opportunity for educational use, nature study and scientific research.

The Portal Ridge/Liebre Mountain area is relatively large, and the precise locations of its most unique resources are, in many cases, not well mapped. For this reason, the priority group

assigned to it reflects only the value of the entire area for scientific research. Further studies should be conducted to determine exact locations of the more unique resources within the area. Areas containing sagebrush scrub should be identified and placed in Class 2. Foothill woodland habitat should also be set apart and given a Class 3 rating. Additional highly valuable resources should be identified and rated as they are found. Enough of the area should be preserved so that interfacies among communities can be maintained.

The grassy, south-facing slopes of the Tehachapi Foothills **(SEA No. 59)** are one of the best foothill wildflower sites in southern California. In addition, the area is located at the junction of the Mojave Desert, the Transverse Ranges and the Tehachapi Mountains and possesses floral and faunal components from each region. As a result, the area is extremely diverse and contains many unique ecological relationships of scientific value.

Characteristic plant species include buttercup (*Ranunculus* sp.), California poppy (*Eschscholzia californica*), purple owl's clover (*Castilleja exserta*) and many species of the sunflower family (Asteraceae). Spectacular wildflower displays are common here.

Several other plant communities are found in the area. These include chaparral, riparian woodland, foothill woodland, southern oak woodland and valley grassland. Additionally, natural springs are scattered along the slopes sustaining numerous wetlands species (e.g. *Juncus* and *Eleocharis* spp.). This variety of habitats and the overlap of mountain and desert influences make the area very valuable.

SEATAC COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROJECT 94-087:

1. Include in Table 1 information on permits and methods used by the listed references.
2. The discussion of regional open space shall include only areas that are biologically functional, not those areas impacted by activities such as off-road vehicles.
3. Elaborate on initial field assessments.
4. Quail Lake is not off site but surrounded by the project. Thus it should be considered within the development envelope.
5. The report does not adequately identify constraints to development on the property. Appropriate consideration of constraints will identify areas in which development should not proceed, and these will include vernal pools and any "pinch" points to wildlife movement, such as Quail Lake and I-5 undercrossings.
6. Site values are not decreased by the proximity of I-5. I-5 is an existing condition and the site values are what they are, regardless. The presence of I-5 poses a constraint due to linkage factors, and should be considered in this context.
7. Linkages designed to serve wide-ranging megafauna are not adequate to accommodate dispersal-limited species. Linkages should include a diversity of high-quality habitat to ensure that smaller-bodied species can live within linkages and move through them over the course of generations, rather than hours or days.
8. Corridors and linkages shall be mapped. Identify and photograph I-5 crossings.
9. Implementation of this project, if approved, should incorporate measures such as habitat bridges to reestablish lost linkages along the California Aqueduct.
10. Plant species diversity may be low compared to other regions; however, statements such as this miss the point that the vegetation that does occur (especially dominant shrubs such as rabbitbrush, *Chrysothamnus nauseosus*) provides a valuable resource to a diversity of insects and thus to other insect-dependent species.

11. Revise the species account lists – silver spot butterfly and tricolored blackbird may occur in the area; Tehachapi pocket mouse is highly unlikely to occur in the area; many sensitive bat species are likely to occur; refer to Zeiner et al. for information on bat distributions; revisit mammal taxonomy.

ACTION TAKEN: Further SEATAC review is required; prepare a revised Biological Constraints Analysis that specifically depicts the biological constraints of the project site, addressing the above SEATAC Comments and Recommendations.