

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

One Valley One Vision (OVOV) is a joint effort between the County of Los Angeles (County), City of Santa Clarita (City), and Santa Clarita Valley (Valley) residents and businesses to create a single vision and set of guidelines for the future growth of the Valley and the preservation of natural resources. Realizing that development within both jurisdictions can have regional implications, the County and City have jointly endeavored to prepare planning policies and guidelines to guide future development within the Santa Clarita Valley. The result of this work effort will require the adoption of two separate documents. The County will adopt a new Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan to replace the 1990 Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan and prepare its own environmental impact report (EIR) while the City will adopt a new General Plan and EIR. This EIR has been prepared to evaluate the potential impacts of the policies of the County's Area Plan.

The OVOV planning process reflects the County's and City's mutual decision to coordinate land uses and the pace of development with provision of adequate infrastructure, conservation of natural resources, and common objectives for the Valley. Major goals of the OVOV joint planning effort were to achieve greater cooperation between the County and the City; coordinated planning for roadways, infrastructure, and resource management; and an enhanced quality of life for all who live and work in the Santa Clarita Valley.

The County of Los Angeles' Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update (Area Plan) is the proposed project in this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Area Plan is a component of the Los Angeles County General Plan and is intended to provide focused goals, policies, and maps to guide the regulation of development within the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley. This updated Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan replaces in its entirety the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on February 16, 1984, and subsequently updated on December 6, 1990, which had previously served as the basic planning tool for the unincorporated portions of the Santa Clarita Valley. This Area Plan, as it may be amended from time to time, is intended to serve as a long-term blueprint for development over the next approximately 20-year planning period, except where specific policies address other target dates as set forth in the plan.

PROJECT SUMMARY

The County of Los Angeles' objectives for the programmatic Area Plan EIR are as follows:

- Identify current and projected environmental conditions, which may affect or be affected by the Area Plan.
- Update the Area Plan development projections for the year 2020, including projections for dwelling units, non-residential square footage, population and employment.
- Provide an environmental analysis of the proposed goals, objectives, and policies and disclose to the public the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Area Plan.
- Evaluate alternatives to the proposed Area Plan.
- Foster public participation in the planning process for the Area Plan.
- Conform with 21000 et seq. of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which requires that environmental impacts be addressed and mitigated. Identify a mitigation framework, which could eliminate or reduce potentially significant environmental impacts of the Area Plan.
- Provide a legally defensible environmental foundation upon which decisions may be evaluated and justified.
- Prepare and certify an Area Plan EIR (Program EIR) that will serve as a first tier environmental document, consistent with the requirements of Section 15152 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.
- Provide a basis for informative decisions when considering the 20-year development associated with implementation of the Area Plan.

PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The OVOV Planning Area combines two geographical areas, the unincorporated area of the County within Santa Clarita Valley and the City of Santa Clarita (City) corporate limits. The OVOV Planning Area was defined mutually by the County and City and represents the area for which both jurisdictions have joint interest in planning. The OVOV Planning Area is located in Southern California in the northern portion of Los Angeles County (North County) (**Figure 2.0-1, Regional Location Map, and Figure 2.0-2, Vicinity Map**). It is situated at the convergence of Los Angeles and Ventura counties, approximately 35 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles. The OVOV Planning Area includes the County communities of Stevenson Ranch, Castaic, Val Verde, Agua Dulce, the future Newhall Ranch and the City and its four communities of Canyon Country, Newhall, Saugus, and Valencia (**Figure 2.0-3, Community Locations**.)

Several mountain ranges frame the OVOV Planning Area including the San Gabriel Mountains, Santa Susana Mountains, and the Sierra Pelona Mountains. At its western most edge, the OVOV Planning Area extends from a point south of Pyramid Lake on the Ventura County border southeast to Oat Mountain and extends into the Angeles National Forest to the east. The easternmost boundary includes the community of Agua Dulce. From this point, it continues to the northwest, parallel to the southern boundary of the City of Palmdale through the Angeles National Forest, and proceeds northward approximately 5 miles north of the uppermost portion of Castaic Lake. In addition to the major ridgelines forming the boundaries of the Valley, prominent scenic resources include the Santa Clara River Valley, creeks, canyons, and forestlands. The Angeles National Forest surrounds much of the OVOV Planning Area to the south and the north (**Figure 2.0-2**).

TOPICS OF KNOWN CONCERN

To determine which environmental topics should be addressed in this EIR, the County of Los Angeles prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) from July 28, 2008, through December 31, 2008, in order to receive input from interested public agencies and private parties. On August 4, 2008, a scoping meeting was held at City Hall in Santa Clarita. The NOP and scoping meeting are discussed further under heading “EIR Format and Content” of this chapter.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Community Services
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, Seismicity
- Global Climate Change
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Circulation
- Utilities and Infrastructure
- Water Service

IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

This EIR has been prepared to assess potentially significant impacts on the environment that could result from implementation of the proposed Area Plan. For a detailed discussion regarding potential impacts, refer to **Section 3.0** of this EIR. In accordance with Section 15126 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a summary of project impacts is provided in the following summary table (**Table ES-1**). Also provided in the summary table is a list of the proposed mitigation measures that are recommended in response to project impacts identified in this program EIR, as well as a determination of the level of significance of the impact after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

ALTERNATIVES

The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to identify potentially feasible ways to avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the proposed project. According to the *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6, an EIR needs to examine a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or its location, which would feasibly meet most of the basic objectives of the project while avoiding or substantially lessening significant impacts. When addressing feasibility, the *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6 states that “among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent).” Therefore, based on the *State CEQA Guidelines*, several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR and the level of analytical detail that should be provided for each alternative. These factors include (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed project; (2) the ability of alternatives to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts associated with the project; (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the project; and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives. These factors are unique for each project. Each alternative selected for evaluation in this EIR is described in brief below. **Section 6.0, Alternatives**, provides a comparative analysis of these alternatives and concludes that the environmentally superior alternative would be Alternative 2.

Alternative 1 - No Project

Section 15126(e)(1) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires evaluation of the No Project Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Area Plan would not be adopted and buildout within the County’s Planning Area would continue to occur under the existing Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan,

Specific Plans, and Master Plans. The no project analysis will discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation was prepared as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the OVOV Area Plan (proposed project) is not approved. Buildout of the existing Areawide Plan circulation map is assumed.

Alternative 2 – Preservation Corridor Alternative

This alternative would support the South Coast Missing Linkages wildlife corridor and the proposed Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the region. The South Coast Wildlands is an organization that proposed a wildlife corridor between two separated parts of the Angeles National Forest. This alternative would propose a density reduction creating more open space for wildlife movement. The land use category for this region would change from 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres (1 du/2ac) to 1 du/10 ac. Policies would be developed to create minimal obstructions on these properties to allow wildlife movement.

Alternative 3 – Transit Corridor/Increased Employment Opportunity Alternative

This alternative would create a mixed use transit corridor around the proposed Lang Station. High density residential located next to a major transportation/transit corridor would support policies in Los Angeles County's Housing Element and the vision created in the OVOV planning process. The types of development recommended for this area would be designed at an urban density and have a mix of commercial uses. Adjacent to the proposed high density transit corridor would be a proposed business/office park located just north of the area. This would create an employment center near the transportation/transit corridor and give other residents an opportunity to work and live in the Valley.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an environmentally superior alternative among those evaluated in an EIR. Furthermore, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project/No Development Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives. For the OVOV Area Plan project, based on the analysis included in **Section 6.0, Alternatives**, Alternative 3 – Preservation Corridor Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project because it would avoid and/or substantially reduce the severity of significant impacts associated with implementing the proposed project. This alternative would reduce the severity of the significant and unavoidable biological impacts to less than significant. For an environmental perspective, this alternative is superior to the proposed project as it reduces the level of impacts for all resource areas compared with the proposed project, with the exception

of impacts on agricultural resources and hazards and hazardous materials, which would be comparable. This alternative, however, would not meet all of the project objectives as would the proposed Area Plan.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The *State CEQA Guidelines*¹ require that a Draft EIR summary identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by other agencies and the public. In addition to those areas identified in the Notice of Preparation (NOP), as potentially significant, some issues of concern were expressed at a public scoping meeting for the draft EIR and through responses to the NOP. The following issues of concern can generally be grouped as transportation and circulation (modes such as bicycle, bus, rail, pedestrian, and automobile), trail systems (equestrian, bicycle, other recreational trails and trail access), parks and recreation, preservation of special standard districts, global climate change, sustainability, energy efficiency and alternative modes of energy; mineral resources and mining, ridgeline and oak tree preservation, location of high density areas, water planning and conservation, housing for low-income residents, teachers, government workers, and police; inclusionary zoning, cultural resources and public facilities for art/cultural uses, public health, senior housing and the aging population, noise, biological resources and open space preservation. These issues have been incorporated into the environmental analysis of the proposed project contained within **Section 3.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**, of this draft EIR.

APPROVALS AND ACTIONS

Each of the Area Plan Elements contains an outline of the steps necessary to implement each element. At the conclusion of the Area Plan EIR public hearing process, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission will vote on whether to recommend certification of the adequacy of the Area Plan EIR to the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and to recommend approval of the proposed Area Plan EIR. The Area Plan is a comprehensive policy-level document and future actions will be required for its implementation. These future actions include, but are not limited to the following:

- Adoption/approval of community plan updates
- Public facilities financing plan updates
- Revisions to the County's Development Code and other applicable ordinances
- Revisions to the County Zoning Ordinance and Map and Community Standards District to be consistent with the Land Use Map

1 California Public Resources Code, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15123.

- Update of master plans for drainage, streets, trails, parks, and other County infrastructure and facilities in conformance with the Area Plan
- Amend the Highway Plan to reflect the OVOV Circulation Plan and to be consistent with the County's Highway Plan for the Santa Clarita Valley
- Adopt the Valleywide Bikeway Plan in the Circulation Element
- Revise the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to incorporate needed capital projects identified in the Area Plan update

RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

Under CEQA, a public agency, other than a lead agency, that has discretionary approval power over the proposed project is considered a "responsible agency" (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15381). No public agency, other than the County of Los Angeles, has discretionary approval power over the proposed project; however, if the County approves this project, subsequent implementation of various project components could require discretionary approval authority from responsible agencies. Trustee agencies have jurisdiction over certain resources held in trust for the people of California but do not have a legal authority over approving or carrying out projects (e.g., California Department of Fish and Game).

**Table ES-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures**

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>3.1 Land Use</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan incorporates policies that would ensure that buildout of the County’s Planning Area does not physically divide an existing community (for example, by construction of a major roadway) and would ensure that a community’s character is maintained. Land use policies are included to promote revitalization, promote green building, sustainability, and development of diverse housing options to serve residents of the County’s Planning Area. Potential impacts on land uses would be less than significant.</p> <p>The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the regional planning authority for the Southern California Region. The proposed Area Plan and Land Use Map would be consistent with SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan Policies and Compass/Growth Visioning Principles, and ensure that habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans are not impacted within the County’s Planning Area. The proposed Area Plan’s policies protect and designate areas of natural environmental importance such as the Santa Clara River floodplain, local SEAs, and rivers, streams, and associated tributaries throughout the County’s Planning Area as Open Space or Non-Urban Land Use designations. The County’s proposed Area Plan would not conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.2 Transportation and Circulation		
<p>The proposed Area Plan would promote denser, transit-oriented development in areas where transit use is already high. Emphasis is also placed on introducing mixed-use development in order to allow residents to reach services in ways that are not exclusively automobile-dependent, such as by walking, biking and rail. Grouping mixed uses together also reduces the need for residents to make multiple vehicle trips to obtain services and reach employment centers, resulting in a net reduction in the number of vehicles on the roadway. For these reasons, trip generation, vehicle miles traveled, and impacts on arterial roadways and intersections would be incrementally reduced with the proposed Area Plan as compared with the existing Area Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Adherence to the proposed Area Plan policies would ensure that the planned improvements to the I-5 and SR-14 freeways would be implemented. With these roadway improvements, operating conditions along both freeways would improve. Operating conditions along Congestion Management Program (CMP) roadways would improve with buildout of the proposed County Area Plan and City General Plan in place of the current County Area Plan and City General Plan; impacts on CMP roadways would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan policy ensures consistency with the Airport Land Use Plan for the Agua Dulce Airport, the only airport that influences land use within the OVOV Planning Area. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies would establish several roadway design standards for future development within the County’s Planning Area. Since the proposed Area Plan would provide the framework to avoid roadway hazards, as opposed to increasing their occurrence, impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.2 Transportation and Circulation (continued)		
<p>The proposed Area Plan policies are designed to maintain adequate emergency access throughout the County’s Planning Area. They would promote mobility to allow for acceptable response times by emergency vehicles, and ensure emergency access to various types of properties. Additionally, the County would maintain a current evacuation plan. Since the proposed Area Plan would provide the framework to ensure adequate emergency access, impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies would allow adjustments to the parking requirements for individual development projects, where appropriate. Implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not generate a parking demand that exceeds code requirements. Therefore, parking demand impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan policies address the deficiencies in the existing alternative transportation system, and provide direction for the expansion and improvement of alternative transportation throughout the Santa Clarita Valley. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Area Plan would encourage and enhance, as opposed to conflict with, plans supporting alternative transportation. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan policies would encourage the creation of walkable communities and neighborhoods by considering pedestrian access in all phases of development planning, including site design, subdivision design, and public improvement projects. Additionally, the policies seek to create a unified and well-maintained bikeway system, which includes connection of the gaps in the existing system. The proposed Area Plan has been designed to reduce, as opposed to cause, hazards and barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists; therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.</p>		

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>3.3 Air Quality</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan policies are designed to reduce air emissions during construction by reducing the amount of infrastructure that would be required, reducing volatile organic compound (VOCs) emissions from pavement, reducing fugitive dust emissions; encouraging use of recycled content building materials, and by cooperating with other appropriate agencies to identify pollution sources and adopt strategies to reduce their emissions. Implementation of these policies would reduce potential Area Plan air quality impacts under this criterion to less than significant.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed policies would further ensure that the Area Plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Final 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, and that air quality impacts under this criterion would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed policies would reduce to less than significant mobile and stationary source emissions of pollutants that currently exceed state and/or federal standards, and for which the project region is nonattainment.</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan policies are designed to reduce emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and the potential for CO hotspots, as well as reducing potential to exposure to TACs by sensitive receptors. Implementation of these policies would reduce potential Area Plan air quality impacts under this criterion to less than significant.</p> <p>Odor impacts associated with the proposed Area Plan would be less than significant. The proposed policies are designed to ensure the potential sources of odors in the OVOV Planning Area would be less than significant. Implementation of these policies would reduce potential Area Plan air quality impacts under this criterion to less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.4 Global Climate Change		
<p>The proposed policies are designed to reduce GHG emissions during construction. Implementation of these policies would reduce potential Area Plan air quality impacts under this criterion to less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed policies are designed to directly and indirectly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and to sequester carbon dioxide. Implementation of these policies would reduce potential Area Plan air quality impacts under this criterion to less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan and General Plan would not impede or conflict with the state’s goal of meeting AB 32. As demonstrated both the proposed Area Plan and General Plan would be consistent with project design features and mitigation measures recommended by CARB, OPR, the California Climate Action Team, and the Office of the Attorney General and would achieve reductions in GHG emissions from business as usual conditions so as to not impede the state’s ability to meet AB 32. As a result, the project would result in a less than significant impact on global climate change.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.5 Agricultural Resources		
<p>Implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies would provide the conservation needs for Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance located within the County’s Planning Area, and thus would not result in the urbanization of these Important Farmlands. The Land Use Policy Map would, therefore, be consistent in providing that these Important Farmland areas are designated as Rural designations on the proposed Land Use Policy Map; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan does not contain any policies that would reduce the exposure of future residents to nuisances associated with agricultural operations or expose farms to nuisances exposed from urban uses. Therefore, these potential impacts would continue to be significant. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM 3.5-1 would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>3.5-1 The County of Los Angeles shall implement a Right-to-Farm Ordinance in order to protect existing agricultural operations from future residents that could produce nuisances and to inform new residents of existing agricultural operations within the County’s Planning Area that could produce nuisances such as excess noise, odor, vector control problems, vermin infestation, and pesticide overspray with implementation of the proposed Area Plan.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>3.6 Aesthetics</p> <p>Resources within the County’s Planning Area as well as the City’s Planning Area include a variety of natural and manmade elements as well as the viewsheds to those elements that serve as visual landmarks and contribute to the unique character of the County’s Planning Area. Although specific scenic resources in the County’s Planning Area are identified, it is not intended to provide an exhaustive inventory, as the nature of these resources is somewhat subjective and not easily quantified. Implementation of the proposed Area Plan would increase development within the unincorporated portion of the Santa Clarita Valley, which, if unregulated, would contribute to the obstruction of views, damage scenic resources, conflict with the Valley’s rural character, and generate substantial levels of light and glare. However, the proposed Area Plan includes policies that would ensure the protection of scenic resources and corridors, promote quality construction that enhances the County Planning Area’s urban form, increase open space, and landscaping, and limit light overspill. For these reasons, implementation of the County’s Area Plan would result in a less than significant impact on aesthetics.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.7 Biological Resources		
<p>Potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed Area Plan are those relating to special-status species, sensitive communities, federally protected wetlands, wildlife movement, and nursery sites. The proposed Area Plan policies address avoidance and minimization of impacts on habitats, provisions for the acquisition of habitats in cooperation with conservation groups, provisions for no net loss of jurisdictional wetlands within the County’s Planning Area, and provisions for the identification and protection of at least one designated wildlife corridor linking the two units of the Angeles National Forest through the Valley.</p> <p>The proposed policies do not provide a mechanism for the compensation of lost habitats when avoidance of impacts or minimization of impacts to a level that is less than significant is considered to be infeasible; mitigate for the direct mortality of individuals of listed, proposed, or candidate species. In conjunction with the proposed Area Plan policies, mitigation measures MM 3.7-1 through 3.7-3 would reduce these potential impacts. MM 3.7-1 requires preparation of biological site survey reports prepared by a qualified biological consultant for proposed projects. MM 3.7-2 addresses direct mortality of special-status species through construction activities. MM 3.7-3 addresses impacts on sensitive habitats from implementation of the proposed Area Plan through land acquisition.</p>	<p>3.7-1 Biological site survey reports shall include an analysis of the potential for a proposed project to result in direct mortality of individuals of listed, proposed, or candidate species, losses of habitats occupied by such species, and losses of opportunity for habitat connectivity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports must be prepared by qualified biological consultants. • Reports must include specific information regarding site location, on-site and surrounding biological resources, observed and detected species, site photographs, vegetation map, literature sources, timing of surveys, project footprint, anticipated project impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and additional recommended surveys. <p>3.7-2 If special-status species may potentially be subject to direct loss through implementation of construction activities, mitigation measures proposed as part of biological site survey reports shall include a requirement for preconstruction special-status species surveys, followed by measures to ensure avoidance, relocation or safe escape of special-status species from construction activity, whichever action is the most appropriate. If special-status species are found to be brooding, denning, nesting, etc. on site during the preconstruction survey, construction activity shall be halted until offspring are weaned, fledged, etc. and are able to escape the site or be safely relocated to appropriate off-site habitat areas. A qualified biologist shall be on site to conduct surveys, to perform or oversee implementation of protective measures, and to determine when construction activity may resume.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.7 Biological Resources (continued)		
<p>Although the loss of sensitive habitats may be compensated for through land acquisition, the loss of special-status species and wildlife movement opportunities would remain significant. Special-status species are dependent on a variety of habitat types, not all of which are necessarily sensitive, such as annual grassland and various common scrub and chaparral types. Consequently, the conversion of all types of currently undeveloped wildlife habitat to Residential, Commercial and Industrial uses permitted under the proposed Area Plan would result in impacts on special-status species that would remain significant at the plan level.</p> <p>Impacts on wildlife movement opportunities would also be significant and unmitigable because of the loss of connectivity for wildlife movement through the County’s Planning Area; this connectivity would not be recoverable once the area has been developed.</p>	<p>3.7-3 Impacts on sensitive habitats resulting from implementation of the Area Plan shall be compensated for through the acquisition of lands described in Policies CO 10.1.3, CO 10.1.11 and CO 10.1.12. Said acquisition shall prioritize habitat types that are particularly at risk in the region. At risk habitats include but are not limited to waterways, wetlands and vernal pools; alluvial scrub; native grasslands; savannas, woodlands and forests; holly-leaf cherry and Great basin sagebrush associations; and rocklands.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.8 Cultural Resources		
<p>Cultural resources are defined as prehistoric and historic sites, structures, and districts, or any other physical evidence associated with human activity considered important to a culture, a subculture, or a community for scientific, traditional, religious, or any other reason. For analysis purposes, cultural resources may be categorized into three groups: archaeological resources, historic resources, and contemporary Native American resources. Paleontological resources, while not generally considered a “cultural resource,” are afforded protection under <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> and as such are evaluated. All impacts related to cultural and paleontological resources would be less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.</p>	<p>3.8-1 Avoidance is the preferred treatment for cultural resources. Where feasible, project plans shall be developed to allow avoidance of cultural resources. Where avoidance of construction impacts is possible, covering of the cultural resource site with a layer of chemically stable soil and avoidance planting (e.g., planting of prickly pear cactus) shall be employed to ensure that indirect impacts from increased public availability to the site are avoided. Where avoidance is selected, cultural resource sites shall be deeded into permanent conservation easements or dedicated open space.</p> <p>3.8-2 If avoidance and/or preservation of in place cultural resources is not possible, the following mitigation measures shall be initiated for each impacted site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A participant-observer as determined by the appropriate Indian Band or Tribe shall be used during archaeological testing or excavation in the project site. • Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the project, the project proponent shall develop a test level research design detailing how the cultural resource investigation shall be executed and providing specific research questions that shall be addressed through the excavation program. In particular, the testing program shall characterize the site constituents, horizontal and vertical extent, and, if possible, period of use. The testing program shall also address the California Register and National Register eligibility of the cultural resource and make recommendations as to the suitability of the resource for listing on either Register. The research design shall be submitted to the County of Los Angeles Regional Park and Open-Space District for review and comment. For sites determined, through the Testing Program, to be ineligible for listing on either the California or National Register, execution of the Testing Program will suffice as mitigation of project impacts to this resource. 	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.8 Cultural Resources (continued)		
	<p>3.8-3 In the unlikely event that artifacts are found during grading within the City’s Planning Area or future roadway extensions, an archaeologist will be notified to stabilize, recover, and evaluate such finds.</p> <p>3.8-4 Prior to grading, as part of an inspection testing program, a Los Angeles County Natural History Museum-approved inspector is to be on site to salvage scientifically significant fossil remains. The duration of these inspections depends on the potential for the discovery of fossils, the rate of excavation, and the abundance of fossils. Geological formations (like the Saugus Formation) with a high potential will initially require full time monitoring during grading activities. Geologic formations (like the Quaternary terrace deposits) with a moderate potential will initially require half-time monitoring. If fossil production is lower than expected, the duration of monitoring efforts should be reduced. 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. A report of the inspection testing program shall include an itemized inventory of the fossils, pertinent geologic and stratigraphic data, and field notes of the collectors and include recommendations for future monitoring efforts in the County’s Planning Area. Prior to grading, an agreement shall be reached with a suitable public, non-profit scientific repository, such as the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History or similar institution, regarding acceptance of fossil collections.</p>	

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.8 Cultural Resources (continued)		
	<p>3.8-5 For archeological sites accidentally discovered during future construction, there shall be an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archeologist. If the find is determined to be a historical or unique archeological resource, as defined under CEQA, contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation shall be provided. Construction work may continue on other parts of the construction site while historical/archeological mitigation takes place, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(i).</p> <p>3.8-6 During grading activities, in the unlikely event that artifacts are found during grading within the planning area or future roadway extensions, a paleontologist will be notified to stabilize, recover and evaluate such finds.</p> <p>3.8-7 If human remains are encountered during a public or private construction activity, other than at a cemetery, State Health and Safety Code 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Los Angeles County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The Los Angeles County Coroner must be notified within 24 hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the coroner determines that the burial is not historic, but prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted to determine the most likely descendent (MLD) for this area. The MLD may become involved with the disposition of the burial following scientific analysis. 	

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.9 Geology, Soils, Seismicity		
<p>The proposed Area Plan would provide adequate mitigation for potential fault rupture hazards which has been identified to provide flexibility to the County in requiring site-specific geotechnical investigations in any area falling within identified or yet as unidentified fault zones, including Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones. Adherence to MM 3.9-1 and the proposed Area Plan would reduce potential impacts from rupture of unidentified fault zones to a less than significant level. Implementation and adherence to MM 3.9.2 to MM 3.9.4, and the policies of the Area Plan would reduce potential impacts related to seismically associated ground shaking to less than significant.</p> <p>To ensure that potential impacts associated with the issue of liquefaction are reduced to a less than significant level, the following MM 3.9.5 and MM 3.9.6, have been identified to provide flexibility to the County in requiring site-specific liquefaction assessments. With the implementation of these mitigation measures and the proposed Area Plan policies, potential impacts from liquefaction would be less than significant.</p> <p>To ensure that potential impacts associated with landslide hazards are reduced to a less than significant level, the following MM 3.9-7 has been identified to provide flexibility to the County in requiring site-specific landslide hazard assessments.</p>	<p>3.9.1 Before a project is approved or otherwise permitted within an Alquist-Priolo Zone as identified within the County’s Planning Area, or within 150 feet of any other active or potentially active fault mapped in a published United States Geologic Survey (USGS) or within other potential earthquake hazard area (as determined by the County Geologist), a site-specific geologic investigation shall be prepared to assess potential seismic hazards resulting from development of an individual project site within the County’s Planning Area. Where and when required, the geotechnical investigation shall address the issue(s), hazard(s), and geographic area(s) determined by the County Geologist to be relevant to each individual development project. The site-specific geotechnical investigation shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources.</p> <p>Based on the site-specific geotechnical investigation, no structures intended for human occupancy shall be constructed across active faults. This site-specific evaluation and written report shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the issuance of building occupancy permits. If an active fault is discovered, that has not previously been recorded, any structure intended for human occupancy shall be set back at least 50 feet from the fault. A larger or smaller setback may be established if such a setback is supported by adequate evidence as presented to and accepted by the County Geologist.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.9 Geology, Soils, Seismicity (continued)		
<p>The policies of the proposed Area Plan provide specific requirements to identify, evaluate, and mitigate potential impacts associated with soil erosion and loss of topsoil throughout the County’s Planning Area as buildout occurs. MM 3.9-8 through MM 3.9-10, would provide more direct methods to reduce impacts from erosion and loss of topsoil. Implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies and mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts on soil erosion and loss of topsoil to less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed policies provide specific requirements to identify, evaluate, and mitigate potential impacts associated with subsidence and collapsible soils. Implementation of the policies, in accordance with the ordinances adopted by the County, would reduce impacts from subsidence to less than significant.</p> <p>The aforementioned policy would require any site specific developments within the County’s Planning Area to incorporate County Building Code Standards that would help reduce the risk of expansive soils damaging structures. Implementation of the above policy and incorporation of any ordinances already adopted by the County of Los Angeles would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation measures would be required.</p> <p>The proposed policies would reduce the potential of any septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems being located on soils that cannot support such infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Future developments would be subject to CEQA review and any additional mitigation measures developed on a project-by-project basis.</p>	<p>3.9.2 The design and construction of structures and facilities shall adhere to the standards and requirements detailed in the California Building Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24), Los Angeles County Building Code, Title 26, and/or professional engineering standards appropriate for the seismic zone in which such construction within the County would occur. Conformance with these design standards shall be enforced through building plan review and approval by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division prior to the issuance of building permits for any structure or facility.</p> <p>3.9.3 As determined by the County Geologist, a site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain ground shaking impacts resulting from development. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall incorporate up-to-date data regarding ground shaking probabilities and strengths from government and non-government sources and may be included as part of any site-specific geotechnical investigation as required in MM 3.9-1. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall include specific measures to reduce the significance of potential ground shaking hazards to the individual development. The site-specific ground shaking assessment shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.</p> <p>3.9.4 The standards stated in MM 3.9.2 and MM 3.9.3 shall apply to any structure or facility that undergoes expansion, remodeling, renovation, refurbishment or other modification within the County’s Planning Area.</p>	

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.9 Geology, Soils, Seismicity (continued)		
	<p>3.9.5 As determined by the County Geologist, a site-specific assessment shall be prepared to ascertain potential liquefaction impacts resulting from development. The site-specific liquefaction assessment shall incorporate up-to-date data regarding liquefaction potential of site specific projects from government and non-government sources and may be included as part of any site-specific geotechnical investigation. This site-specific ground shaking assessment shall be prepared by a licensed geologist and shall be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the issuance of building occupancy permits.</p> <p>3.9.6 Where development is proposed within an identified or potential liquefaction hazard area or as defined by the County Geologist, adequate and appropriate measures such as design foundations in a manner that limits the effects of liquefaction, the placement of an engineered fill with low liquefaction potential, and the alternative siting of structures in areas with a lower liquefaction risk, shall be implemented to reduce potential liquefaction hazards. Any and all such measures shall be submitted to the County Geologist and the County Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division for review prior to the approval of the building permits.</p> <p>3.9.7 All engineered slopes shall be designed to reduce seismically induced failure. For lower risk projects, (projects that are not located in areas of seismically induced ground failure), slope design shall be based on pseudo-static stability analysis (a test to determine the strength of horizontal movement of retaining walls during a seismic event) using soil engineering parameters established on a site-specific basis. For higher risk projects (projects located in areas of seismically induced ground failure), the stability analyses that will be required shall factor in the intensity of expected ground shaking, prior to the issuance of building occupancy permits for the proposed developments.</p>	

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.9 Geology, Soils, Seismicity (continued)		
	<p>3.9.8 The County of Los Angeles, where required, and in accordance with issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, shall require the construction and/or grading contractor for individual developments to establish and implement specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) a time of project implementation.</p> <p>3.9.9 Prior to any development within the County’s Planning Area, a Grading Plan shall be submitted to the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division and/or the County Geologist for review and approval. As required by the County of Los Angeles, the grading plan shall include soil erosion and sediment control plans. Measures included in individual erosion control plans may include, but shall not be limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Grading and development plans shall be designed in a manner which minimizes the amount of terrain modification. b. Surface water shall be controlled and diverted around potential landslide areas to prevent erosion and saturation of slopes. c. Structures shall not be sited on or below identified landslides unless slides are stabilized. d. The extent and duration of ground disturbing activities during and immediately following periods of rain shall be limited, to avoid the potential for erosion which may be accelerated by rainfall on exposed soils. e. To the extent possible, the amount of cut and fill shall be balanced. f. The amount of water entering and exiting a graded site shall be limited though the placement of interceptor trenches or other erosion control devices. g. Erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. 	

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.9 Geology, Soils, Seismicity (continued)		
	<p>3.9.10 Where required, drainage design measures shall be incorporated into the final design of individual projects on site. These measures shall include, but will not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Runoff entering developing areas shall be collected into surface and subsurface drains for removal to nearby drainages. b. Runoff generated above steep slopes or poorly vegetated areas shall be captured and conveyed to nearby drainages. c. Runoff generated on paved or covered areas shall be conveyed via swales and drains to natural drainage courses. d. Disturbed areas that have been identified as highly erosive shall be (re)vegetated. e. Irrigation systems shall be designed, installed, and maintained in a manner which minimizes runoff. f. The landscape scheme for projects within the project site shall utilize drought-tolerant plants. g. Erosion control devices such as rip-rap, gabions, small check dams, etc., may be utilized in gullies and active stream channels to reduce erosion. 	

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.10 Mineral Resources		
<p>Implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies related to mineral resources ensures that future development in the County would not have significant adverse impacts on mineral resources nor would future mineral resource extraction create significant adverse impacts on the environment or future development. Avoiding adverse impacts would be achieved by potentially adhering to these policies, reviewing all development proposals adjacent to MRZ-2 designated land or mining activity to safeguard against incompatible land uses, providing buffer zones between urban development mining activity, and requiring that development adhere to state mining policies and regulations.</p> <p>Potential adverse impacts on mineral resources would be less than significant because the policies within the proposed Area Plan state to identify, preserve from encroachment, conserve, and maintain the significant MRZ-2 lands. Implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies related to mineral resources ensure that future development in the County would not have any significant adverse impacts on mineral resources nor would future limited reasonable mineral resource extraction have any significant adverse impacts on the environment or on future development.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.11 Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
<p>The policies of the proposed Area Plan are designed to reduce any significant hazards to residents or the environment within the County’s Planning Area due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Freeways within the County’s Planning Area are protected in regards to hazardous materials transportation through guidelines and policies of CalTrans. Any new development that would be located in an area where businesses would use hazardous materials would be required to go through a review process ensuring that adequate setback and buffer features are established to protect residents and the environment from possible contamination. All new development that includes businesses that use hazardous waste will be required to verify their procedures for storage, use, and disposal of hazardous waste materials to reduce exposure to residents and the environment. Implementation of these policies will therefore, reduce the possibility of exposure of hazardous materials to the public or environment through transportation, use, and disposal. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan policies will help guide future development and provide protection of public safety and property by identifying sites within the County’s Planning Area that may contain hazardous materials, and require their cleanup. They also provide guidance on handling hazardous waste by local citizens and businesses. Implementation of these policies would minimize the potential impacts on the release of hazardous materials into the environment to less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.11 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (continued)		
<p>The proposed policies are designed to provide guidance on adopting any future emergency response plans or evacuation plans that will be complementary to the proposed Area Plan. Since the policies would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, but strengthen these plans and any future adopted plans, potential impacts on emergency or evacuation plans from implementation of the proposed Area Plan would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed policies are designed to guide the County in taking preventive measures against wildland fires. Since the County’s Planning Area contains and is adjacent to high hazard wildland fires areas appropriate measures must be taken to avoid the risk of a conflagration spreading into the OVOV Planning Area. The policies offer ways in which to address the problems associated with the possibility of wildland fires occurring within the County’s Planning Area. With their implementation, potential impacts from wildland fires would be reduced to less than significant.</p>		

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.12 Hydrology and Water Quality		
<p>The policies outlined in the proposed Area Plan provide and promote the use of design and engineering techniques that would promote infiltration, reduce the volume and rate of stormwater runoff, and reduce the pollutants in stormwater runoff. However, the proposed policies would not solely reduce the impacts associated with exceeding the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems or reduce the amount of polluted runoff that would occur from development. Implementation of mitigation measures MM 3.12-1 and 3.12-2 would reduce potential impacts on surface water runoff to less than significant.</p> <p>The policies would be implemented in order to provide protection to residential and commercial units that are proposed for areas within the County’s Planning Area that are within 100-year flood plains. These policies would provide guidance on the measures that should be taken for any residential or commercial units planned for development within the 100-year floodplain. However, these policies do not implement specific requirements to protect residential and housing units that are planned for development within a 100-year flood plain. Therefore, mitigation measures MM 3.12-3 through 3.12-5 are recommended to reduce potentially significant impacts from the 100-year flood hazard to less than significant.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed Area Plan’s policies related to dam inundation hazards would reduce potentially significant adverse impacts from dam inundation hazards to less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.</p>	<p>3.12-1 The County shall prohibit alteration of floodways and channelization unless alternative methods of flood control are found to be technically, economically, and practicably infeasible.</p> <p>3.12-2 The County shall not require all land uses to withstand flooding. These may include land uses such as agricultural, golf courses, and trails. For these land uses, water flows shall not be obstructed, and upstream and downstream properties, shall not be adversely affected by increased velocities, erosion backwater effects, concentration of flows, and adverse impacts to water quality from point and nonpoint sources of pollution.</p> <p>3.12-3 The County shall require that all structures (residential, commercial, and industrial) be flood-proofed from the 100-year storm flows. All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., Flood Zones A, AO, AH, AE and A1 through A30 as delineated on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps for the City of Santa Clarita, Map revised September 29, 1989), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation in accordance with the effective Flood Insurance Rate Map.</p> <p>3.12-4 The County shall require that for agricultural, recreation, or other low-density uses, flows are not obstructed and that upstream and downstream properties are not adversely affected by increased velocities, erosion backwater effects, or concentration of flows.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.12 Hydrology and Water Quality (continued)		
	<p>3.12-5 Any development that is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the Flood Insurance Rate Map for the County's Planning Area must not increase base flood elevations. (Development means any man-made change improved or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings, other structures, mining, dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavation or drilling operations, and storage of equipment or materials). A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis shall be performed prior to the start of development, and must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels and additionally would not allow any rise within regulatory floodways.</p>	
3.13 Water Service		
<p>Water service is analyzed on a regional basis for the OVOV Planning Area based on the proposed buildout of the County's Area Plan and the City's General Plan.</p> <p>For the purposes of buildout under the proposed Area Plan, this analysis emphasizes water use over the next 20 years (2030). The proposed buildout of the OVOV Planning Area would generate a total water demand of 125,400 acre-feet per year (afy) in 2030 with 10 percent water conservation. Water demand would be served by local groundwater and State Water Project (SWP) water supplied by the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA). Locations outside the CLWA service area and within the County's Planning Area would be served by private wells. Non-potable water demand would be supplemented with the use of recycled (reclaimed) water from the existing Valencia water reclamation plant (WRP) and the approved Newhall Ranch WRP.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.13 Water Service (continued)		
<p>Potable water would be supplied from the existing or planned water supplies of CLWA, including imported water from CLWA's SWP supplies. CLWA's water supplies, including imported water from the SWP, and other non-SWP supplies, are assessed in this EIR. Based on the information presented, an adequate supply of water would be available to serve the OVOV Planning Area at its proposed buildout population of 460,000 to 485,000. The water sources within the OVOV Planning Area will rely on local groundwater, SWP water, and recycled water from local WRPs.</p> <p>Impacts on water services from the proposed buildout of the County's Area Plan would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. Cumulative water service impacts from buildout of the OVOV Planning Area would also be less than significant and no cumulative mitigation measures would be required.</p>		
3.14 Community Services		
<p>The potential impacts on senior and youth services found within the County's Planning Area included an analysis on the number of affordable senior housing (150 units). The 2008 senior population (age 65 and over) consisted of 7,800 residents, or 10.4 percent of the 2008 population. As the population of the County's Planning Area reaches buildout, the number of senior citizens would be expected to increase as the existing population ages.</p> <p>The 2007 youth (age 18 and younger) population was 22,058. The County would need to work with childcare facilities and providers to provide adequate services as the County's Planning Area reaches buildout. Greater utilization of park resources would need to meet the future demands of youth programs and youth sports. Impacts on senior and youth services were found to be less than significant with the implementation of the Area Plan policies.</p>	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.14 Community Services (continued)		
<p>This cultural amenities subsection describes the various social, cultural, and arts resources available within the County’s Planning Area. Cultural amenities in the County’s Planning Area include theatres, auditoriums, and recreational facilities. Cultural organizations range from arts organizations, to faith-based organizations. Cultural programs include arts programs run by the County’s Department of Parks, Recreation, and Community Services as well as those sponsored by private organizations. As the build out of the County’s Planning Area increases the demand on different cultural amenities will increase. This increase will require more meeting space to accommodate the increase in population. Impacts on cultural amenities would be less than significant with implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies.</p> <p>The implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies would help to ensure that there are adequate emergency shelters in the case of an emergency. The policies also encourage assistance to homeless persons through social service agencies and suitable shelters. Implementation of the above policies would minimize potentially adverse impacts on homelessness and emergency shelter services. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies.</p>		

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.15 Public Services		
<p>To determine the potential impacts on community facilities from the proposed buildout of the County’s Planning Area, an analysis of the number of library items, such as books, periodicals, videos, CDs and CD-ROM software, audio recordings, audio books, DVDs, and pamphlets; and library space was conducted. Each service level guideline, from the County of Los Angeles Public Library system, consisted of: 2.75 items per 1,000 residents, and 0.5 square foot per 1,000 residents.</p> <p>Currently, there are 595,314 available library items and 48,605 square feet of library space for the five libraries located within the OVOV Planning Area. Based on the service level guidelines, there is a surplus of 389,064 library items and a surplus of 11,105 square feet of library space. At buildout there would need to be 550,000 library items and 100,000 square feet of library space. With the implementation of the planned library expansions and the inclusion of the existing resources there would be a surplus of 45,314 library items and a surplus of 8,605 square feet of library space at buildout. With implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies and mitigation measure MM 3.15-1 provided in this section, the potential impacts on community facilities would be less than significant.</p>	<p>3.15-1 Project developers shall pay the current library fee (\$790.00 per residential unit as of August 2008) to the County of Los Angeles to offset the demand for library items and building square footage generated by the proposed project or whatever fee is established by the County at the time of building permit issuance, whichever is higher. The library mitigation payment shall be made on a building permit by building permit basis by the developer for residential projects.</p> <p>3.15-2 Concurrent with the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall participate in the Developer Fee Program to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department.</p> <p>3.15-3 Adequate water availability shall be provided to service construction activities of any project to the satisfaction of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department.</p> <p>3.15-4 The development applicant(s) to the related projects shall be required to pay the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s established law enforcement facility fees for North Los Angeles County prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy on any structure as they are developed. The fees are for the acquisition and construction of public facilities to provide adequate service to the residents of the Planning Area.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.15 Public Services (continued)		
<p>The County’s Planning Area has a diverse range of age groups requiring adequate medical facilities in order to maintain a healthy life. As of 2007, 10.2 percent of the population consists of the age group 65 or older. At buildout, 30,800 people, or 15.4 percent, of the projected 200,000 residents would be age 65 or older. Every population would require adequate health care within the County’s Planning Area, not just newborns and the elderly. With the implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies, potentially significant impacts on health and social services would be less than significant.</p> <p>The County’s Planning Area currently has six school districts: Acton-Agua Dulce Unified School; Newhall Elementary; Saugus Union Elementary; Castaic Union; Sulphur Springs Union Elementary; William S. Hart Union High School. The school districts, as of 2008, educate 14,299 students from kindergarten to grade 12. The school districts design capacity is 15,702 students. There are no school districts over capacity; however there are five schools over capacity. Implementation of the Area Plan would potentially increase the number of new students within the County’s Planning Area. Implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies, and Senate Bill 50 would reduce impacts on school districts to less than significant.</p>		

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.15 Public Services (continued)		
<p>Fire protection within the County’s Planning Area is supplied by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) with six stations currently located in the County’s Planning Area. The LACoFD has several standards to maintain to adequately meet the fire protection needs of the residents of the County’s Planning Area. The 2008 median response time for the OVOV Planning Area was 5 minutes 42 seconds. To adequately meet the standards for each area, there would need to be an increase in the number of fire stations. Joint cooperation between the County, City, state, and federal agencies would also contribute to maintaining adequate response times. Implementation of the proposed policies, and MM 3.15-2 and MM 3.15-3 would reduce potential impacts on fire protection to less than significant.</p> <p>Law enforcement in the County’s Planning Area is served by the Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department with the California Highway Patrol maintaining jurisdiction over the State highways. The Sheriff’s Department, which contains one station in Valencia and a storefront station in Newhall, standard to maintain effective police protection is one officer per 1,000 people. The current number of sworn officers, within the County’s Planning Area, is 171, which provides one officer per 439 residents. With the projected buildout of the Planning Area, the number of officers required to maintain a standard of one officer per 1,000 residents would need to be 200 for the projected population of 200,000 residents. In order to maintain adequate service the County’s Planning Area would need an additional 29 sworn officers. With the implementation of the proposed Area Plan policies and MM 3.15-4 potential impacts on law enforcement would be less than significant.</p>		

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.16 Parks and Recreation		
<p>Parks and open space are important land use components in an urban environment, providing both visual relief from the built environment and contributing to residents' quality of life through aesthetic, recreational, and social value. The County's Planning Area currently has 1,355 acres of parkland through a combination of neighborhood, community, and regional parks. Additionally, it has 6,395 acres of open space within the County.</p> <p>The Quimby Act, established by State law, requires that every county and city meet the standard of 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. The County's proposed Area Plan requires the County meet a goal of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. The highest standard allowed under the Quimby Act is 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.</p> <p>Currently, the Quimby Act would require the County's Planning Area to meet the goal of 225.0 acres of parkland. The County's Planning Area has 19.8 acres of local parkland per 1,000 residents and is in a surplus of 1,110.6 acres for the goal of meeting 5 acres per 1,000 residents. With buildout of the proposed Area Plan, the County's Planning Area parkland would need a total of 917.7 acres to reach the Quimby Act requirement and would need 600 acres of parkland for the Area Plan criterion. The existing and planned parkland would total 1,517.7 acres at buildout; the amount of parkland would be in a surplus for the Quimby Act standard and the Area Plan Standard.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required if the City reaches the 5 acres per 1,000 standard.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.17 Utilities and Infrastructure		
<p>The utilities and infrastructure section contains three subsections: wastewater treatment, solid waste, and electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications. With implementation of the proposed policies the potential impacts of the Area Plan’s buildout on the wastewater treatment system capacity would be less than significant. As the County reaches its Area Plan buildout population of 200,000 residents, new projects would be evaluated for their potential impact on the capacity and effectiveness of the wastewater treatment system to treat additional sources of wastewater. The need for construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities as buildout occurs would be determined by the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District (SCVSD). The SCVSD provides wastewater conveyance, treatment, and disposal services for residential, commercial, and industrial users in the County and the City of Santa Clarita. The construction of new facilities would be subject to CEQA review. No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>The County’s Planning Area uses three landfills within or near the OVOV Planning Area. They include the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, Antelope Valley Landfill, and the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. Landfills throughout the state have permitted maximum capacities (the amount of waste(s) in tons or cubic yards a permitted facility is allowed to receive, handle, process, store, or dispose of). The County does not have adopted solid waste disposed figures and since the County’s Planning Area is adjacent to and surrounding the City’s Planning Area, it would be reasonable to assume that solid waste disposed figures for the County Area Plan would be similar to those of the City of Santa Clarita. Consequently, solid waste disposed figures used by the City of Santa Clarita are utilized for this analysis.</p>	<p>3.17-1 The County of Los Angeles shall follow state regulations in implementing the goals, policies, and programs identified in the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Plan in order to achieve and maintain a minimum of 50 percent reduction in solid waste disposal through source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting.</p> <p>3.17-2 The County shall require all future commercial, industrial and multifamily residential development to provide adequate areas for the collection and loading of recyclable materials (i.e., paper products, glass, and other recyclables) in compliance with the State Model Ordinance, implemented on September 1, 1994, in accordance with AB 1327, Chapter 18, California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991.</p> <p>3.17-3 The County shall require all development projects to coordinate with appropriate County/City departments and/or agencies to ensure that there is adequate waste disposal capacity to meet the waste disposal requirements of the County’s Planning Area, and the County shall recommend that all development projects incorporate measures to promote waste reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting.</p> <p>3.17-4 All new development in the County’s Planning Area will be required to implement existing and future waste reduction programs in conformance with the County’s Planning Area SRRE program.</p> <p>3.17-5 Any hazardous waste that is generated on-site, or is found on site during demolition, rehabilitation, or new construction activities shall be remediated, stored, handled, and transported in compliance per appropriate local, state, and federal laws, as well as with the County’s SRRE.</p> <p>3.17-6 The County shall review all development proposals prior to the approval of development plans to guarantee that sufficient energy resources and facilities are available to supply adequate energy to the proposed project and associated uses.</p>	<p>Less than significant for wastewater and telecommunication /energy, and natural gas.</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable for solid waste.</p>

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.17 Utilities and Infrastructure (continued)		
<p>In 2007, the amount of waste disposed by the City’s Planning Area was 163,000 tons; the County’s Planning Area waste disposed was 48,512 tons. Waste generated under the proposed Area Plan would be in the amount of 129,210 tons per year. Nearby landfills are approaching full capacity for waste disposal and the projected amount of landfill capacity, for the County’s Planning Area, would be in a shortfall of 22,626 tons per day, six days per week in the year 2021. Therefore, the impacts from buildout on the solid waste system would be significant and unavoidable even with the incorporation of MM 3.17-1 to 3.17-5.</p> <p>The proposed Area Plan includes policies to reduce or minimize the effects of the additional demand and consumption of electricity and natural gas associated with the prospective growth within the County’s Planning Area. Implementation of the policies would reduce the effects of growth and development on energy resources. However, the proposed Area Plan policies do not provide concrete means of implementation and enforcement. Many policies lack performance standards that ensure appropriate actions and parameters would be achieved. Impacts on energy resources due to the additional demand for and consumption of natural gas associated with the prospective growth within the County’s Planning Area can be further minimized through implementation of MM 3.17-6 and MM 3.17-7. With implementation of these mitigation measures, potential impacts on electricity and natural gas would be less than significant.</p>	<p>3.17-7 The County shall review all development plans prior to approval to guarantee that energy conservation and efficiency standards of Title 24 are met and are incorporated into the design of the future proposed projects.</p>	

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.17 Utilities and Infrastructure (continued)		
<p>The existing telecommunications services provided in the County’s Planning Area includes telephone service, television service, and internet services. In order for the County to meet the demand of the residents at buildout, new utility corridors, or at least upgrades to these corridors, would need to be addressed. New facilities would be subject to CEQA. Specific scope, type, and location is unknown at this time and would be defined as technology is defined and continue to evolve.</p>		
3.18 Noise		
<p>The County of Los Angeles retained a noise consultant, Mestre Greve Associates, to conduct a noise study for the County’s proposed Area Plan and the City’s proposed General Plan. This study evaluated existing noise conditions throughout the OVOV Planning Area, and projected future noise levels based upon growth and traffic projections developed through the OVOV planning process. Motor vehicles currently comprise the predominant noise source in the OVOV Planning Area; aircraft, industrial, and commercial activities are not significant noise sources. As development occurs within the OVOV Planning Area, significant construction noise would occasionally occur. There is also potential for significant vibration impacts during pile driving. At buildout of the proposed Area Plan, 12 roadway segments within the County’s Planning Area would experience a cumulative noise increase of 5 decibels (dB) or greater, which would be a significant mobile source noise impact. However, the net increase or decrease in noise levels between the existing and proposed Area Plans would be less than 3 dB and would not be perceptible to the human ear.</p>	<p>3.18-1 To reduce construction vibration impacts, to the extent feasible, cast-in-drilled-hole piles shall be used in lieu of pile driving.</p> <p>Pile drilling is an alternate method of pile installation where a hole is drilled into the ground up to the required elevations and concrete is then cast into it. The estimated noise level of pile drilling at 50 feet is 80 to 95 dB(A) L_{eq} compared to 90 to 105 dB(A) L_{eq} of conventional pile driving.² Therefore, pile drilling generally produces noise levels approximately 10 to 15 dB lower than pile driving.</p> <p>3.18-2 Maintain adequate buffer distances from nearby residences to freeways, high traffic volume roads, railroads, airports, mining centers and other existing processing plants where the public may be affected by noise and particle emissions.</p> <p>3.18-3 The construction of residential developments should be limited to buildings with special filtration units or discouraged at distances of 1,500 feet or less from freeways, depending upon traffic volume.</p> <p>3.18-4 Sound barriers should be required of the owners of the proposed sensitive land uses adjacent to high noise sources, to protect the public from significant noise impacts.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

² US Environmental Protection Agency, *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances*, December 1971.

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.18 Noise (continued)		
<p>Future rail activity in the OVOV Planning Area would result in a moderate increase in the community noise equivalent level (CNEL) level by 2.4 dB and is not considered to be a substantial noise. The anticipated route of a high-speed rail line planned by the California High-Speed Rail Authority through the OVOV Planning Area is not known, and the type of train and corresponding noise levels have not been determined. Nonetheless, there is potential for significant noise and vibration impacts with operations of a high-speed rail system through the Valley.</p> <p>California Noise Insulation Standards require that interior noise levels from exterior sources be reduced to 45 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) (Community Noise Equivalent Level [CNEL] or day/night average noise level [L_{dn}]) or less in any habitable room of a multi-residential use facility with doors and windows closed. However, exteriors of residences in transit-oriented development and in mixed use developments within the OVOV Planning Area would not necessarily meet the acceptable 65 dB(A) CNEL levels under the State Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Noise, and perceptible vibrations from low frequency noise (rail and music), which are difficult to mitigate, could be a source of annoyance for residents. As a result, a significant noise and vibration impact could occur in transit-oriented development and in mixed-use developments within the OVOV Planning Area.</p>	<p>3.18-5 The California Department of Transportation should be contacted when residential projects, schools, hospitals, convalescent homes, and other sensitive land uses are to be built so that appropriate sound barriers or sound walls are constructed along Interstate 5 and State Route 14 regardless of setbacks or other sound attenuation.</p> <p>3.18-6 The placement of telecommunication towers and antennas power boxes should comply with noise ordinances. All related equipment should be rated at 45 dB(A).</p> <p>3.18-7 Consider engineering controls or better alternative fuels for the control of greenhouse gases, particle matter, carbon print, criteria air pollutants and non regulated emissions associated with the construction and operational phases of future projects.</p>	

Project Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
3.18 Noise (continued)		
<p>Policies within the proposed Area Plan would reduce operational noise impacts to less than significant; however, it is not always possible to reduce construction noise impacts to below standards set forth in the County’s Noise Ordinance. Mitigation is recommended to reduce construction vibration impacts during pile driving by using cast-in-drilled-hole piles. Cast-in-place pile driving generally produces noise levels approximately 10 to 15 dB lower than pile driving. Construction noise impacts would, nonetheless, remain significant. Therefore, short-term construction noise impacts would be unavoidably significant for the duration of the construction activities. Short-term noise and vibration impacts from the pile driving would be unavoidably significant for the duration of the pile driving.</p>		
3.19 Population and Housing		
<p>This section summarizes the existing and projected population and housing supply in the County’s Planning Area and analyzes the potential of the proposed Area Plan to induce population growth, displace existing housing, or displace existing populations. Information on population, housing, and employment for the County’s Planning Area was derived from SCAG. Buildout of the County’s proposed Area Plan would increase the population and the number of housing units within the County’s Planning Area. The population at Area Plan buildout would be consistent with SCAG’s long-term growth forecasts for the County’s Planning Area. Additionally, implementation of the proposed Area Plan would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of housing or people since several proposed policies promote growth and development within underutilized and vacant areas of the County’s Planning Area. For these reasons, implementation of the County’s Area Plan on population and housing would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>