

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: TR53653

CASES: RENVT200500107
RCUPT200500088
ROAKT200500039



**** INITIAL STUDY ****

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: May 31, 2005 Staff Member: Hsiao-ching Chen

Thomas Guide: 4640 D-3,4 & E-3,4 USGS Quad: Newhall, Oak Mountain

Location: West of I-5 Freeway in the Pico Canyon Area, south of Stevenson Ranch and Sagecrest Circle, north of Calgrove Blvd.

Description of Project: A Tentative Tract Application to subdivide the subject property into 112 lots consisting of 100 single-family lots, 1 condominium lot (10.25 AC) for 95 senior housing units, 1 fire station lot (1.26 AC), 4 open space lots, 5 derbis basin lots, and 1 active park lot. Both primary and secondary means of access are from the Old Road. The project also includes an Oak Tree Permit to remove/encroach on oak trees and a Conditional Use Permit for development within a SEA and hillside management area and a density bonus request.

Gross Area: Approximately 232 acres

Environmental Setting: The site is located adjacent to the western boundary of the City of Santa Clarita in the western unincorporated Los Angeles County. The site is categorized as hilly along the east-west trending Lyon Canyon drainage. The southerly portion encompasses the northern ridge and canyons of Towsley Canyon. The Simi Fire burned the entire project site in October 2003. Vegetation on-site includes non-native grassland, coastal sage scrub, coast live oak woodland, and chaparral. Majority of the site is vacant but portions of it have been utilized for filming purposes by Warner Ranch Studio. Surrounding land uses within 500 feet radius consist of single families (i.e., the Stevenson Ranch project) to the north, vacant land to the west and south, the Old Road/I-5 Freeway immediately to the east, and commercial uses and a mobilehome park on the other side of the Freeway.

Zoning: A-2-1, A-2-2

General Plan: Non-urban, SEA

Community/Area Wide Plan: HM, S, N2 (Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan)

Major projects in area:

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Description & Status</u>
<u>04-181/TR 061105</u>	<u>The Mission Village Project (pending)</u>
<u>00-210/TR 53295</u>	<u>The Entrada Project (pending)</u>
<u>89-081</u>	<u>Chiquita Canyon Landfill (approved)</u>
<u>87-360</u>	<u>Valencia Market Place (approved)</u>
<u>03-238 /TR60030</u>	<u>21 industrial lots on 110 AC (pending)</u>
<u>87-222/Tr45433</u>	<u>The Westridge Project (05/25/1999 approved)</u>
<u>98-182</u>	<u>Stevenson Ranch Phase V Specific Plan (pending)</u>
<u>00-196/TR 53108</u>	<u>The Landmark Village (pending)</u>
<u>(City of Santa Clarita)</u>	<u>River Park Project</u>

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

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

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

Trustee Agencies

- None
- State Fish and Game
- State Parks
- USFWS
- _____

Special Reviewing Agencies

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- Newhall SD
- William S. Hart SD
- Stevenson Ranch Town Council
- California Dept of Water Resources
- SCOPE, SCAG, CHP
- Valencia Water Company
- Castaic Lake Water Agency
- DTSC; AQMD, Sierra Club
- City of Santa Clarita
- CA Water Network
- SC Historic Society

Regional Significance

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources

County Reviewing Agencies

- Subdivision Committee
- DPW: Land Development, GMED, Env Programs, T&L, Watershed Mgt.
- Health Services: Env Hygiene
- San Districts
- FD, Sheriff
- Parks & Rec., Library

FACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)			
				Less than Significant Impact/No Impact	
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation	
				Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Substantial grading in hillside area, high groundwater
	2. Flood	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100-year flood plain
	3. Fire	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	inadequate access to portion of the project
	4. Noise	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Old Road, I-5 Freeway, senior housing units
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Urban runoff, NPDES, TMDLs, impaired waterbody
	2. Air Quality	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Substantial grading, senior housing next to the Old Road
	3. Biota	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SEAs #20 and #63
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stop-work condition to be imposed.
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I-5 Freeway is scenic
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Circulation plan, vehicle traffic increase
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No wastewater collection system on site.
	3. Education	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Over capacity at the district and school level
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Additional population to serve
	5. Utilities	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Solid waste, water supply
OTHER	1. General	21	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Change in character of the area
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Land Use	23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SEA&hillside development, density control
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Growth inducing potential, demand for recreation facilities
	Mandatory Findings	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biota, traffic, noise, air and water quality

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS) *

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

- Development Policy Map Designation: Nonurban Hillside, SEA
- Yes No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- Yes No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

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

Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

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

Environmental Finding:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reviewed by: Hsiao-ching Chen  Date: _____

Approved by: Daryl Koutnik  Date: 15 JUNE 2005

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

Determination appealed--see attached sheet.

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

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?

<u>Earthquake-induced landslides (per Seismic Hazard Zones map- Oat Mtn Quad), Northridge fault is approximately 1.3 miles southwest of the site.</u> |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?

<u>Earthquake-induced landslides (per Seismic Hazard Zones map- Oat Mtn Quad)</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?

_____ |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?

<u>No liquefaction per Seismic Hazard Zones maps; depths to groundwater varies from 53 to 67 feet below ground surface.</u> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?

_____ |
| f. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?

<u>Hillside management area, grading of 1,900,000 c.y. proposed.</u> |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

<u>Soil expansion potential ranges from low to very low according to site specific soil test.</u> |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size

Project Design

Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

CONCLUSION

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

Potentially significant

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?

<u>Lyon Canyon Creek and an unnamed seasonal drainage that drains to Towsley Cyn.</u> |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?

<u>100-year flood plain (Flood Zone A)</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?

_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?

<u>A few drainage courses on site. Project design includes several debris basins.</u> |
| e. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?

<u>Change of drainage pattern after project development</u> |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? _____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
 Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size Project Design (Debris basins)

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
<i>Fire Zone 4 (LA County GP Safety Element Plate 7)</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
<i>Two access roadways within approximately 1,000 feet on the same street (i.e., The Old Rd)</i> |
| c. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? <i>The development pocket of the 100 single-family lots relies one means of access (i.e., "A" Street) until the intersection of the proposed "A" Street and "T" Street.</i> |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? <i>No water available on-site</i> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

Water Ordinance No. 7834 Fire Ordinance No. 2947 Fire Regulation No. 8

Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Project Design

Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

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

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

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
Site is adjacent to The Old Road and I-5 Freeway
- b. Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? *Project includes a senior housing component which is placed at the portion of the property closest to the Old Road and I-5 Freeway. In addition, the proposed fire station is also adjacent to the senior housing.*
- c. Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
Vehicle traffic associated with the development of the project
- d. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
Construction noise
- e. Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size Project Design Compatible Use

Noise study is required.

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
_____ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
_____ |
| c. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?

<i>NPDES required</i>
_____ |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?

<i>NPDES required</i>
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size Project Design

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?

SEAs #20 (Santa Susana Mountains) and #63(Lyon Canyon)

b. Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?

Site is vacant and largely undisturbed.

c. Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?

Lyon Canyon Creek and an unnamed seasonal draiange that drains from Towsley Cyn.

d. Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)? Oak woodland, Mule fat scrub, willow riparian woodland, Southern CA walnut woodland, chaparral.

e. Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? Coast live oaks, valley oaks, and Southern California black walnut

f. Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? Plummer's mariposa lily, peirson's morning glory, western spadfoot, silvery legless lizard, coastal western whiptail, San Diego horn lizard, white tailed kite, northern harrier, cooper's hawk, American kestrel, loggerhead shrike, Southern CA rufous-crowned sparrow, Bell's sage sparrow, pallid bat, pale big-eared bat.

g. Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? _____

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size Project Design Oak Tree Permit SEATAC Review

Biological Technical Report dated 12/10/04 by BonTerra Consulting on file.

CONCLUSION

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

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

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?
Drainage course, oaks
- b. Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? *Uplifted slopes, ridges, and associated bedrock within the project may contain significant vertebrate fossil remains.*
- c. Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
Site has no structures except some (abandoned) utility infrastructure.
- d. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
- e. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- f. Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size Project Design Phase I Archaeology Report

Stop-work condition to be imposed.

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No imp

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- c. Other factors? _____

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size Project Design

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

<i>Site has agricultural zoning and was used in the past for grazing activities.</i>
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____

_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?

<i>Site is adjacent to I-5 Freeway which is scenic.</i> |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

<i>The proposed Pico Canyon trail is within the vicinity</i> |
| c. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? <i>Site is largely undisturbed and contains two primary ridgelines.</i> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?

<i>The project is surrounded on three sides by vacant land.</i> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? |
| f. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): <i>Landform alteration.</i> |

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size
 Project Design
 Visual Report
 Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant
 Less than significant with project mitigation
 Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)? <i>Project includes a total of 195 residential units (100 SF lots and 1 condominium lot to build 95 senior housing units.)</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?

<i>Parking requirements are to be met.</i> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? <i>The single family component of the project is placed away from the main access (i.e., the Old Road) and relies on single means of access (i.e., "A" Street).</i> |
| e. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?

<i>Project exceeds CMP thresholds.</i> |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Project Design Traffic Report Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division
- _____
- _____

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant? <i>The project will generate additional wastewater to be treated by the Saugus WRP or Valencia WRP.</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? <i>There is no wastewater collection and conveyance system on the property. Closest sewer lines north of the site are located in The Old Road as close as Sagecrest Circle for the Stevenson Ranch development. Another wastewater facilities exist in Calgrove Blvd as close as the intersection with the La Salle Canyon Drive.</i> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____

_____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Sewer Area Study is required.

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
William S. Hart School District is known for its overcapacity problem
- b. Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site? Wiley Canyon Elementary School (0.9 miles east of the project site) or Pico Canyon Elementary School (0.3 miles northwest of the project site) would serve students living in the project area. The Wiley Canyon school is operating close to its design capacity and Pico Canyon school over capacity.
- c. Could the project create student transportation problems? If current schools are unable to accommodate additional students generated from the project, student transportation will become an issue.
- d. Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
Additional demand in library materials
- e. Other factors? _____

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Site Dedication Government Code Section 65995 Library Facilities Mitigation Fee
-

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No ir

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site? <u>The nearest fire station is Fire Station No. 124, which is approximately 3 miles from the project entrance; Closest sheriff station is LA County Sheriff Santa Clarita Station located at 23740 Magic Mountain Parkway near the intersection of Magic Mountain Parkway and Valencia Blvd.; Closest CHP local station is at 28646 The Olad Road, near the interchange of I-5 and State Route 126.</u> |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?

<u>The Simi Fire burned the entire site in October 2003.</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____

_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Fire Mitigation Fees

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?
Adequate public water for the project to be demonstrated
- b. Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? Project is proposing to supply water through a water distribution system consisting of a proposed reservoir, service connection, and associated piping.
- c. Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?

- d. Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? The residential portion of the project alone will generate approximately 1,716 lbs/day of solid waste.
- e. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?

- f. Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size Project Design

CONCLUSION

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

Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No imp.

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
_____ |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
_____ |
| c. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
_____ |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot size Project Design Compatible Use

To be included in the "Land Use" and "Growth Inducing" discussions.

CONCLUSION

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

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

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? _____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materi. sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
_____ |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
_____ |
| i. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
_____ |
| j. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? <u>No known structures other than an abandoned water tank, water wells, and irrigation lines.</u>
_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Toxic Clean up Plan

CONCLUSION

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

Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No imp.

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?

<i>Project proposes urban uses within non-urban hillside areas.</i> |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

<i>Project includes a density bonus request</i> |
| c. | | | | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria: |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Hillside Management Criteria? |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | SEA Conformance Criteria? |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other? |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project physically divide an established community? |
| e. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? |

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Hillside CUP burden of proof and SEA compatibility to be analyzed in the EIR.

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

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

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? <u>Although the project site is immediately south of the developed Stevenson Ranch community and will be conveniently accessed from the Old Road/I-5 Freeway, large area to the west of the site is undeveloped.</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
<u>No existing housing on site.</u> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
_____ |
| e. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents? <u>The project proposes approximately 200 residential units</u> |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

The project includes approximate ten acres of active/passive park land in addition to Quinby fees.

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Biota

- b. Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

Biota, traffic

- c. Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Noise, air quality, water quality

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact