

# **CASTAIC MOUNTAINVIEW APARTMENTS PROJECT**

## **INITIAL STUDY**

---

*Lead Agency:*

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**  
320 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Attention: Richard Claghorn, Principal Regional Planner  
(213) 893-7015

*Consultant:*

**ENVICOM CORPORATION**  
4165 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard., Suite 290  
Westlake Village, California 91362  
Contact: Ms. Laura Kaufman, Vice President, Environmental Services  
(818) 879-4700

June 2020

---

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM (INITIAL STUDY)</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</b>	<b>6</b>
1.    AESTHETICS	7
2.    AGRICULTURE/FOREST	10
3.    AIR QUALITY	12
4.    BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	14
5.    CULTURAL RESOURCES	18
6.    ENERGY	20
7.    GEOLOGY AND SOILS	21
8.    GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	24
9.    HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	25
10.   HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	28
11.   LAND USE AND PLANNING	32
12.   MINERAL RESOURCES	33
13.   NOISE	35
14.   POPULATION AND HOUSING	37
15.   PUBLIC SERVICES	38
16.   RECREATION	40
17.   TRANSPORTATION	41
18.   TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	43
19.   UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	44
20.   WILDFIRE	47
21.   MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	49
<b>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST</b>	<b>50</b>

**Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)**  
 County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



**Project title:** “Castaic Mountainview Apartments”/ Project No. R2014-01512 / Case No(s). Environmental Assessment (“EA”) 201400120; Zone Change (“ZC”) 201400007, Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) 201400061; and Oak Tree Permit (“OTP”) 201400025.

**Lead agency name and address:** Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

**Contact person and phone number:** Richard Claghorn, Principal Regional Planner (213) 893-7015.

**Project sponsor’s name and address:** Castaic Mountainview Apartments, LLC, 31744 Castaic Rd., Suite 201, Castaic, CA 91384.

**Project location:** West side of The Old Road at Romeo Canyon Road.

**APN:** 2865-019-014, 015, 064, 065, 066 and 2865-012-003

**USGS Quad:** Newhall

**Gross Acreage:** Approx. 105.52 acres (AC) (approximately 106 acres cited hereafter).

**General plan designation:** N/A

**Community/Areawide Plan designation:**

<b>Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (One Valley One Vision)</b>	
APNs 2865-019-064 and 065	Residential 18 (H18) (18 DU/AC)
APN 2865-019-066	Residential 5 (H5) (5 DU/AC)
APNs 2865-019-014 and 015	Light Industrial (IL)
APN 2865-012-003	Light Industrial (IL)

**Zoning classifications:** (In addition to the zoning designation, indicate which Community Standards District the property is located within, if applicable.)

<b>Los Angeles County Zoning</b>	
APNs 2865-019-064 (Portion) and 066	Single-Family Residence (R-1)
APNs 2865-019-064 (Portion) and 065	Residential Planned Development 18 DU/AC (RPD-18U)
APNs 2865-019-014, 015 & 2865-012-003	Light Manufacturing (M-1)

The project site is located within the Castaic Area Community Standards District.

**Description of project:** Castaic Mountainview Apartments, LLC, the project proponent (or developer) would develop the 106-acre project site with a total of 648 apartment units, including 354 one-bedroom units,

234 two-bedroom units and 60 three-bedroom units in 24 apartment buildings. The developer also proposes to grade building pads within the 24.69 gross-acre M-1 Zone. The building pad grading would provide approximately 7.92 acres of light industrial/ commercial pad area, which at an FAR of 1.0 (per the IL plan designation) could house an estimated 344,995 square feet (sf) of future industrial/ commercial space.

In total, the project proposes grading of 872,650 cubic yards of cut and 872,650 cubic yards of fill, to be balanced on site. The project includes a request to change the zoning of APN 2865-019-066 from R-1 to RPD-18U, encompassing an area of 21.28 acres. The project proposes removal of 59 oak trees and development encroaching into the protected zones of an additional 48 oak trees of ordinance size.

**Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project site is surrounded by steep undeveloped land on the north, south and west. Light industrial and commercial uses are located to the east of the site, along the frontage of The Old Road. Interstate 5 (I-5, or the Golden State Freeway), is located immediately east of The Old Road. Large residential neighborhoods are located slightly to the south of the site, and the main part of Castaic, including a mix of commercial, industrial and residential land use types are located a short distance to the north of the site. There is no Significant Ecological Area (SEA) on the project parcels. The nearest SEA is the Santa Clara River SEA, which is located on the east side of the Golden State Freeway, approximately 1,100 feet from the east edge of the project site.

**Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1?** Yes, the Fernandeño Tataviam Tribe, also known as the Fernandeño Band of Mission Indians, has requested consultation.

**If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?** Tribal consultation is still ongoing.

**Note:** Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

**Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____

**Major projects in the area:**

<i>Project/ Case No.</i>	<i>Description and Status</i>
Gilmour Outside Storage (Gilmore-Pike), 2017-003865 (CUP RPPL2017006417)*	CUP to legalize existing outside storage facility on APN 2865-019-014, 2865-019-015 & 2865-012-003; includes new screening fencing and signage; project is still pending*

Lake View Estates Mixed Use Project, 03-304 (TR53933)_	Tentative tract map for 79 lots approved (70 SFR, 3 commercial); time extension granted to 2/14/21 to record final map (APN 2865-012-002, -005, -014, & -015)
9-Unit SF Residential Project, R2014-00135 (TR72631)	9 SFR lots; Denied due to inactivity on 7/20/17 (APN 2865-019-008)
Tapia Ranch Project, R2012-02667 (TR72126)	511 SFR lots on 1,167 acres (on 22 existing parcels); Tentative map pending
Drywall Mechanics, Inc., 2017-005929 (CUP RPPL2017009034)	Outside storage facility on APN 2865-020-017 & -023
Parkway Motorcars RV Center, RPPL2019007396	Recreational vehicle center
Old Road Boat & Service, RPPL2017006303	Boat sales and service
* Note: portions of this site are to be graded by the project, upon mutual agreement with the project applicants, thus these parcel numbers are within the Castaic Mountainview project description.	

**Reviewing Agencies:** [*See CEQA Appendix B to help determine which agencies should review your project*]

*Responsible Agencies*

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

*Special Reviewing Agencies*

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Fernandeño Band of Mission Indians

*Regional Significance*

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality-South Coast AQMD
- Water Resources-CA Dept. of Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns. Area

*Trustee Agencies*

- None
- State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- State Lands Commission
- University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

*County Reviewing Agencies*

- DPW
- Fire Department  
(delete those that don't apply)
  - Forestry, Environmental Division
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
  - Health Hazmat
- Sanitation District
- Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)
- Sheriff Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forestry            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils        | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature (Prepared by)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature (Approved by)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.

**1. AESTHETICS**

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>			

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?                       

**Potentially Significant Impact.** While not visible from a state scenic highway or eligible scenic highway, the project site contains oak trees, portions of Significant Ridgelines, and Hillside Management Areas.<sup>12</sup> The closest designated highway is an eligible scenic highway, Henry Mayo Drive, located over 2 miles to the south, from which the site is not visible due to intervening topography. Significant Ridgelines are located within the project site (Castaic Community Standards District)<sup>3</sup> and near the project site to the west and northwest,<sup>4</sup> small portions of which would fall within the proposed area of disturbance (also referred to as the project footprint). The property contains a Significant Ridgeline that is within the Castaic Area Community Standards District (CSD). It is classified as a secondary ridgeline and is located in the eastern half of the south parcel (APN 865-019-64). The project footprint would be several hundred feet east of the mapped Significant Ridgeline and the project will thus not affect a Significant Ridgeline and the related development restrictions of the CSD will not apply.

Nevertheless, grading for the project may significantly change the views of the mountains as seen from surrounding areas, particularly from the east. Views of the project site are blocked from the nearby residential areas to the north and south by the mountains between them, but the view from the east side will be modified by project development and associated grading. Proposed project grading is estimated in the preliminary conceptual mass grading plan to include (all numbers approximate) 872,650 cubic yards of cut and 872,650 cubic yards of fill, which would be balanced on site. The highest point of the property is approximately 1,628 feet in elevation above sea level and is adjacent to the officially designated Significant Ridgeline. The eastern edge of the Significant Ridgeline officially ends at 1,590 feet in elevation, and the lowest part of the Significant Ridgeline on the subject property is at approximately 1,556 feet. The natural contours of the onsite hillsides will be modified by the grading required for internal roadways, building pads and sloped areas to stabilize adjacent hillsides around the development. This may significantly change the views of the mountains, and potentially the Significant Ridgeline, as seen from surrounding areas, particularly from the east, and thus impacts to scenic vistas are potentially significant. The EIR will evaluate potential effects on scenic vistas and whether landscaping or other mitigation measures can potentially reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding, hiking, or multi-use trail?                       

**Potentially Significant Impact.** There are no trails within the three project parcels, according to County maps. However, there are trails nearby. The Castaic Creek Trail runs north to south, approximately 1,370 feet east of the project property, east of the Golden State Freeway and parallel to Castaic Creek. There is another

---

<sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 9-7, Scenic Highways, May 2014.  
<sup>2</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 9-8, Significant Ridgelines, May 2014.  
<sup>3</sup> Los Angeles County, Code, Title 22 Planning and Zoning, Division 10 Community Standards Districts, 22.312 Castaic Area Community Standards District, Accessed January 22, 2020.  
<sup>4</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 9-8, Hillside Management Areas and Ridgeline Management Map, May 2014.

trail that branches off from the Castaic Creek Trail that splits into two other trails, one that parallels Tapia Canyon Road and one that is parallel to Charlie Canyon Road. The project site will be visible from some portions of these trails, although they are all at least a quarter of a mile away. Views of the mountains from these trails will be affected. There are large residential developments to the north and south of the project area that are also visible from these trails. The EIR will evaluate potential effects on views from trails and the extent to which visual impacts may be mitigated by landscaping to reduce visibility of the proposed buildings from off-site hiking trails.

**c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**                       

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section 1.b, the project site is not near any designated scenic highways. There are no known nationally- or state-designated historic resources in the project area.<sup>5</sup> The preliminary analysis Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the Castaic Mountain Apartments Project finds that there are no historically significant buildings on the project site.<sup>6</sup> While not visible from a state scenic highway or eligible scenic highway, the project site contains oak trees, portions of Significant Ridgelines, and Hillside Management Areas (see Section 1.a).<sup>7</sup> Based on the preliminary oak tree data, the property contains 59 oak trees that will be removed as a result of the proposed project. The property also contains rock outcroppings in areas that will undergo major grading activities. The existing scenic resources of the property, in particular the oak trees, will potentially be substantially impacted by the project. The EIR will address potential damage to scenic resources and historic buildings within a state scenic highway, and explore mitigation measures, including oak tree replacement, that can reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

**d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point)**                       

**Potentially Significant Impact.** There is existing residential development in the project vicinity to the north and south and light industrial and commercial land uses exist to the east along The Old Road. The proposed project will modify hillsides visible from The Old Road and the I-5 Freeway. The removal of oak trees may also degrade the existing visual character and quality. The EIR will address the potential to substantially degrade public views and evaluate whether mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

<sup>5</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 9-9, Historic Resources Policy Map, May 2014.

<sup>6</sup> Envicom Corporation, Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the Castaic Mountain Apartments Project, In progress .

<sup>7</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 9-8, Significant Ridgelines, May 2014.

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** While the project would construct streetlights on its internal roadways and outdoor lighting on buildings, walkways and project recreation areas, the project site is not within a Rural Outdoor Lighting District.<sup>8</sup> Shade and shadow impacts from the proposed one and two-story project buildings would not be a concern, given that the nearest project building would be over 600 feet from the nearest existing building. The EIR will address the issue of shadows, light, and glare.

---

<sup>8</sup> County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, GIS-Net. <http://planning.lacounty.gov/gisnet>.

**2. AGRICULTURE / FORESTRY**

*In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**No Impact.** The project site is approximately 106 acres of predominantly undeveloped land, which contains some past and current oil and gas extraction facilities and dirt roadways. To the north and south are vacant hillsides and residential developments. To the east lies a mix of undeveloped land, commercial and industrial buildings, and the I-5 Freeway. Portions of the project site have reportedly been used for grazing in the past, but there is no evidence of any recent grazing activity.

According to the California Department of Conservation, there is no farmland on or neighboring the project site.<sup>9</sup> There are also no agricultural resource areas mapped on or neighboring the project site.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, the project would not have an impact related to converting farmland to non-agricultural use. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.

<b>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Resource Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No Impact.** As part of the Santa Clarita Area Plan, portions of the project site are designation and zoned for industrial and residential uses (i.e., M-1, RPD-18U, R-1). The proposed use is consistent with existing zoning, except for APN 2865-019-066, for which a Zone Change is requested on 21.28 acres from R-1 to RPD-18U. The project site has no agricultural zoning and is not in conflict with a Williamson Act contract. The project site is also not within a designated Agricultural Resource Area.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the project would have no impact to conflicting with existing zoning for agricultural use. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.

<sup>9</sup> California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2016, Map Published July 2017.

<sup>10</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 9.5, Agricultural Resource Areas Policy Map, May 2014.

<sup>11</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 9.5, Agricultural Resource Areas Policy Map, May 2014.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?

**No Impact.** As part of the Santa Clarita Area Plan, the project site is zoned for industrial and residential use, as described earlier (i.e., M-1, RPD-18U, R-1). Based on County GIS resource mapping, there is no zoned forest land or timberland on or adjacent to the project site and no portion of the project site is within a National Forest.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, this project would have no impact to conflicting with existing zoning, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** The project site is currently mostly undeveloped, with vegetation that consists mainly of mixed sage scrub, coast live oak, chaparral, and annual grassland. There are no forest lands on or adjacent to the project site (see Section 2.c). Therefore, this project would have no impact resulting in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** The project site is currently mostly undeveloped, consists of mainly grasses and shrubs, and has been previously disturbed. There is no farmland or forest land on the project site. Therefore, the project would have no impact to involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.

<sup>12</sup> County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, GIS-Net. <http://planning.lacounty.gov/gisnet>

### 3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- |   |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p><b>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?</b></p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project would construct 648 apartment units and provide industrial development pads on an approximately 106-acre site. Portions of the project site are zoned for residential use, and other portions are zoned for industrial use (i.e., M-1, RPD-18U, R-1). The project would require a zone change for one of the project parcels. The proposed project is in the South Coast Air Basin and is subject to the air quality management plan (AQMP) prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in criteria air pollutants from area, stationary, and mobile sources emitted during project construction and operations. The EIR will evaluate the project’s consistency with regional growth forecasts and any impacts the project may have on attainment of regional air quality objectives contained in the AQMP.

- |   |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p><b>b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</b></p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project is in the South Coast Air Basin, which is designated as nonattainment for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), fine inhalable particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), coarse inhalable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and lead (Los Angeles County portion only) under the California and National ambient air quality standards (AAQS). By increasing levels of criteria air pollutants, implementation of the proposed project could contribute to the nonattainment status for these criteria air pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin. In addition, emissions could result during long-term operation of completed development projects. The EIR will include an air quality analysis to determine if the project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria air pollutant.

- |  |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p><b>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</b></p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors are locations and people that are more sensitive to the unhealthful effects of emissions (such as residences, schools and assisted living centers). There are no sensitive receptors proximate to the proposed project site. Project construction and operational traffic could affect area intersections in the project vicinity, which may be proximate to sensitive receptors. The EIR will evaluate the potential for construction and operation of the proposed project to exceed SCAQMD’s localized significance thresholds, in accordance with SCAQMD’s guidance methodology.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project will consist of residential and light industrial/commercial land uses. These uses would not typically result in substantive amounts of other emissions affecting a substantial number of people. The EIR will discuss the types of proposed uses and potential for construction or operational activities to result in significant impacts with regard to this issue.

#### 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p><b>Would the project:</b></p> <p>a) <b>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would occupy portions of a largely undeveloped property that currently contains areas of natural vegetation as well as current and past oil and gas exploration and extraction activities. The project will result in a loss of riparian and oak woodland habitat, potentially adversely affecting special status species. An up to date biological resources assessment for the project site will be provided, including a spring survey. Based on an earlier (2006) search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), 14 special status plant species were known from relatively localized occurrences in the vicinity of the project site. Of these, the project biologist indicated four could potentially occur on the project site, based upon site habitat and species range. The same search showed 26 special status wildlife species occurring in the project region. Of these, the project biologist determined that 14 could potentially occur onsite (with varying degrees of potential), based upon site habitat and species range. On-site habitat may also be used by common and special status raptors and other species that have extensive ranges covering many habitats. These species can be expected as rare to common transients in the study area.

A Biological Constraints Analysis (BCA) prepared by Padre Associates dated August 2015, revised December 2015,<sup>13</sup> identified two special status plant species and four special status wildlife species on the site. An additional eight special status were not observed during biological surveys but were identified in the BCA as having the potential to occur on the site. The special status plants identified on the site are Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) and Slender mariposa lily (*Calochortus clavitis, var. gracilis*). The special status wildlife species observed on the site include coastal western whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri*), Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*), oak titmouse (*Baeolophus inornatus*) and greater roadrunner (*Geococcyx californianus*).

The EIR will further evaluate the project’s potential effect, through on habitat modifications, on special status species, relying upon an up to date biological resources assessment, which will include mitigation measures where warranted.

<sup>13</sup> Padre Associates, Inc., Biological Constraints Analysis for the Castaic Mountainview Apartments. August 2015.

**b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The biological resources assessment efforts currently underway indicate that the project may have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities, such as riparian and oak woodland habitats. When completed, the updated biological resources assessment will identify potential impacts and recommend minimization of impacts through project features and mitigation measures where warranted. The EIR will incorporate the biological resources assessment and evaluate the potential adverse effects on sensitive natural communities.

**c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States or California, as defined by § 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The biological resources assessment efforts currently underway have identified one major drainage and two minor drainages within the project site. A wetland delineation would be required to identify existing conditions and potential impacts wetlands and waters of the U.S. subject to California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) jurisdiction. Grading or fill activity within the drainages and wetlands would require a permit from the ACOE (pursuant to Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act), a water quality certification from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (pursuant to Section 401 of the federal Clean Water Act), and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game (pursuant to California Fish & Game Code Section 1600, et seq.). The EIR will incorporate the jurisdictional delineations and evaluate potential project impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S.

**d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** While the project site is not within a regional habitat linkage,<sup>14,15</sup> an up to date biological resources assessment will analyze general wildlife movement, including the potential for the proposed project to interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, interfere with established corridors for such species, or impede native wildlife nursery sites. The EIR will incorporate the biological resources assessment and evaluate potential project impacts to these issues.

<sup>14</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 9.2, Regional Habitat Linkages, May 2014.

<sup>15</sup> Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County General Plan Update Draft EIR, Figure 5.4-4, Regional Wildlife Linkages, June 2014.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or other unique native woodlands (juniper, Joshua, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** An up to date oak tree report will be provided for the project. Based on a past study (2015), the property may contain close to 300 ordinance-size coast live oaks. Of these trees, 27 were heritage-size. It is anticipated that some oak trees will be impacted by the project, but that impacts will be minimized. Oak impacts must be mitigated in accordance with the County Oak Tree Ordinance, which requires removals to be replaced at a 2:1 rate or in-lieu fees paid. Also, as allowed in the ordinance, the Los Angeles County Forester may require a higher mitigation ratio for heritage oaks, which is currently up to 10:1. The EIR will evaluate this issue, incorporating an updated oak tree report.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.174), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 102), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44)?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is not located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA),<sup>16</sup> or Wildflower Reserve Area,<sup>17</sup> and thus is not expected to have a direct significant impact. The nearest SEA is a portion of the Santa Clara River SEA on the other (east) side of the I-5 Freeway,<sup>18</sup> which is designated for the protection of sensitive habitat for various species of concern, including the unarmored three-spine stickleback (UTS) fish. This fish requires perennial flowing water, which does not exist onsite, based on earlier field investigations by a project biologist (2006). The EIR will evaluate the project's potential to conflict with County policy and ordinance provisions regarding SEAs, if any portion of the site may drain into tributaries of the Santa Clara River and thus potentially indirectly affect the fish. The project's potential oak tree impacts will be evaluated in the EIR, based on County ordinances and policies listed under Section 4.e., above.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Within Los Angeles County, local habitat conservation plans are included as part of the Local Coastal Programs and SEA program. The project is 30 miles from the coast and is not in a Local Coastal Program. The project is not within an SEA. The nearest SEA is a portion of the Santa Clara River SEA, on the other (east) side of the I-5 Freeway,<sup>19</sup> to the east of the project site, which is designated for protection of the UTS and other sensitive species. According to the USFWS's Unarmored Threespine

<sup>16</sup> SERAs are located only in coastal areas. The project site is located 30 miles from the Pacific Ocean.

<sup>17</sup> County of Los Angeles, L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36. Based on the written descriptions in the code there are no Wildflower Areas proximate to the site. The project site is located in and near Township 5 N, Range 17 W.

<sup>18</sup> County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, GIS-Net. <http://planning.lacounty.gov/gisnet>

<sup>19</sup> County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, GIS-Net. <http://planning.lacounty.gov/gisnet>

Stickleback Recovery Plan, within the County, the stickleback is found only in the Santa Clara River drainage.<sup>20</sup> The essential habitat within the County consists of a small portion of San Francisquito Canyon and two disjunct reaches of the Santa Clara River: near Del Valle downstream of the I-5 Freeway and at the head of Soledad Canyon. The project site drains into Castaic Creek, which is tributary to the Santa Clara River and is upstream of the Santa Clara River: near Del Valle downstream of the I-5 Freeway. The project site is not within a Natural Community Conservation Plan.<sup>21</sup> The Los Angeles County Oak Woodlands Conservation Management Plan shows that a portion of the project site contains significant oak woodlands.<sup>22</sup> The EIR will evaluate the extent of oak woodlands on the project site and any potential project impacts, as described in Section 4.e. The EIR will include an analysis of the only conservation plan potentially applicable to the site, the SEA program, as discussed in Section 4.f.

---

<sup>20</sup> US Fish and Wildlife Service, Unarmored Threespine Stickleback Recovery Plan (Revised), 1985.  
<https://ntrl.ntis.gov/NTRL/dashboard/searchResults/titleDetail/PB2006115259.xhtml>

<sup>21</sup> California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Community Conservation Plans, April 2019.  
<https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68626&inline>

<sup>22</sup> County of Los Angeles, Oak Woodlands Conservation Management Plan, May 2011.

## 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Significant historic resources include objects, buildings, structures, sites, areas, places, records, or manuscripts that are historically or archaeologically significant. Buildings and structures 45 years old or older are typically evaluated for historical significance by cultural resources investigation. While portions of the project site have been previously developed for oil and gas extraction, there are no permanent buildings within the area of disturbance. The County of Los Angeles has not designated any historical resources on the project site.<sup>23</sup> A past building foundation has been located on the site and will be studied. A cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the project site which will describe site history and any resources expected or known to exist onsite or in the surrounding area, and address whether any potential project impacts to those resources would occur. The EIR will incorporate the findings and conclusions of the report.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** While portions of the project site have been previously developed for oil and gas extraction, the majority of the project site is undeveloped and substantial grading of previously undisturbed land would occur. Additionally, the previously graded portions of the project site would potentially be graded to greater depths. A cultural resources technical report to be prepared for the site will assess the potential for buried archaeological resources to be present onsite; the findings and conclusions of the report will be described in the EIR.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The majority of the project site is undeveloped and substantial grading of previously undisturbed land would occur. Additionally, the previously graded portions of the project site would potentially be graded to greater depths. Thus, although there it is not currently known whether unmarked burials might exist, burials are sometimes found unexpectedly on development sites. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that in the event that human remains are discovered within the project site, disturbance of the site shall halt and remain halted until the coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American

<sup>23</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 9.9, Historic Resources Sites Policy Map, May 2014.

Heritage Commission. All County development projects would comply with the aforementioned law. Impacts would be less than significant. Nevertheless, the cultural resources technical report will address this issue and the report will be incorporated into the EIR.

**6. ENERGY**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No Impact.** Title 31 of the Los Angeles County Code of Ordinances, the Green Building Standards Code, adopts by reference the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). CALGreen is issued by the California Building Standards Commission on a three-year cycle. The current CALGreen is the 2019 Code, which took effect on January 1, 2020. The project would comply with the Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance and no adverse impact would occur. Further, there are no inherently wasteful land uses proposed on the project site. Analysis of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

b) **Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewal energy or energy efficiency?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would comply with following state standards: Renewables Portfolio Standard, Appliance Efficiency Regulations, Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 6: Energy Efficiency Standards for Buildings. The project would not obstruct these plans or codes, and impacts would be less than significant. Analysis of this issue in the EIR is not necessary.

## 7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A geotechnical report and an updated report have been prepared for the project site, which identified nearby faults. Several active and potentially active faults are capable of producing groundshaking at the project site, including the active San Gabriel, San Andreas, San Fernando, and Santa Susana faults,<sup>24</sup> and the potentially active Simi and Mission Hills faults, among others. Geologists for the project explored three on-site active fault trends and liquefaction potential. A trenching and boring program to determine mitigation requirements was conducted and summarized in the reports. The specifications of the geotechnical reports will be required as conditions of approval for the project. The project geotechnical report, to be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, will specify County-required design features and regulatory compliance to avoid and reduce impacts, as the EIR will discuss.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** See Section 7.a.ii. The project geotechnical report, to be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, will specify County-required design features and regulatory compliance to assure a less than significant impact. The EIR will evaluate potential effects related to strong seismic ground shaking.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** See Section 7.a.ii. Although portions of the project site are within a liquefaction zone,<sup>25</sup> the geotechnical report concluded that development of the property is feasible from a geologic viewpoint after grading and fill. The project geotechnical report, to be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, will specify County-required design features and regulatory compliance to avoid and reduce impacts, as the EIR will discuss.

iv) Landslides?

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

<sup>24</sup> GeoConcepts, Inc., Geologic Feasibility Evaluation Report, November 28, 2006.

<sup>25</sup> California Geological Survey, Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Newhall Quadrangle, 2016.

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Portions of the project site are within Earthquake-Induced Landslide Zones.<sup>26</sup> The 2006 geotechnical study identified existing landslides but concluded that development of the property is feasible from a geologic viewpoint after repair of existing landslides as part of the project. The findings and conclusions of the geotechnical reports will be described in further detail in the EIR. The project geotechnical report, to be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, will specify County-required design features and regulatory compliance to avoid and reduce impacts, as the EIR will discuss.

**b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The majority of the project site is undeveloped and substantial grading of previously undisturbed land would occur. Additionally, the previously graded portions of the project site would potentially be graded to greater depth. The updated geotechnical report will provide erosion control measures that would be incorporated as project features.<sup>27</sup> The project geotechnical report, to be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, will specify County-required design features and regulatory compliance to avoid and reduce impacts, as the EIR will discuss.

**c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The geotechnical reports evaluated on-site soil stability and concluded that instability would be addressed during grading and fill as part of the project. The EIR will describe each type of soil instability and the factors contributing to susceptibility to such instability; and categories of recommendations set forth in geotechnical investigation reports to minimize each type of instability. The project geotechnical report, to be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, will specify County-required design features and regulatory compliance to avoid and reduce impacts, as the EIR will discuss.

**d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The geotechnical reports do not indicate expansive soils on the project site, as the EIR will discuss.

**e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

<sup>26</sup> California Geological Survey, Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Newhall Quadrangle, 2016.

<sup>27</sup> GeoConcepts, Inc., Geologic Feasibility Evaluation Report, April 9, 2015.

**No Impact.** Specific Plan buildout would involve connections to sanitary sewers and would not use onsite wastewater treatment systems, as the EIR will note.

**f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique a paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The majority of the project site is undeveloped, although portions of the site have been subject to past and current oil and gas extraction activities. Development would include grading of previously undisturbed land. Additionally, the previously graded portions of the project site would potentially be graded to greater depths. No unique geologic features are known on the site that would require analysis in the EIR. The small portions of Significant Ridgelines within the proposed development footprint will be evaluated in the Aesthetics Section of the EIR. The potential for buried paleontological resources to be present onsite will be evaluated in the Cultural Resources technical report and incorporated into the EIR. The EIR will evaluate potential impacts to paleontological resources or sites or unique geological features.

**8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**                       

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Global climate change is not confined to a particular project area and is generally accepted as the consequence of global industrialization over the last 200 years. A typical project, even a very large one, does not generate enough greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on its own to influence global climate change significantly; hence, the issue of global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact. The State of California, through its governor and legislature, has established a comprehensive framework for the substantial reduction of GHG emissions over the next 40-plus years. This will occur primarily through the implementation of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), and AB 197, which will address GHG emissions on a statewide, cumulative basis. The construction activities, operation, and increase in vehicle traffic associated with new development have the potential to generate GHG emissions that could significantly impact the environment. The EIR will evaluate the potential for the project to generate a substantial increase in GHG emissions. Mitigation measures will be identified as necessary.

b) **Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**                       

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The California Air Resources Board’s (CARB’s) California’s 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan is California’s GHG reduction strategy to achieve the state’s GHG emissions reduction target, established by SB 32, of 40 percent emissions reductions below 1990 levels by year 2030. In addition, Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375) was adopted by the legislature to reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled and associated GHG emissions from passenger vehicles. The Southern California Association of Government’s (SCAG) 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy identifies the per capita GHG reduction goals for the SCAG region. Furthermore, the Unincorporated Los Angeles County Community Climate Action Plan 2020 has also been prepared and is applicable to the unincorporated areas within the County. The proposed project would generate a net increase of GHG emissions from construction and operational activities within the County of Los Angeles. Because GHG emissions generated by the proposed project may be substantial, the proposed project may conflict with GHG strategies and targets of the aforementioned applicable plans and impacts are potentially significant. The EIR will evaluate consistency with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Mitigation measures will be identified as necessary.

**9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>			

Would the project:

a) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**                       

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Portions of the project site have been used for oil and gas extraction. Development of the site requires that the appropriate closure of unused wells be confirmed, that the site plan will include sufficient shielding or buffering from proposed nearby residential uses, and if necessary, contaminated soil is remediated. One oil well will remain in operation (in the western portion of APN #2865-19-064. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) will be prepared for the project. The EIR will evaluate this issue, incorporating the findings and recommendations of the Phase I ESA.

The remaining construction and operation phases of the proposed residential and light industrial/commercial project would use limited amounts of hazardous materials, potentially including products such as fuels, lubricants, and greases; pesticides and fertilizers; paints and other coatings; and hazardous materials used in various commercial and industrial land uses. Project operations would involve the routine transport, storage, and use of relatively small amounts of ordinary publicly available cleaning and maintenance products, typical of residential and light industrial/commercial land uses. Because the amounts of these materials would be small, the project could have a less than significant impact with regard to creating a significant hazard through the transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, this issue will be further reviewed and evaluated in the EIR.

b) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?**                       

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Beyond the issues to be addressed in the EIR in relation to Section 9.a, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment. This issue does not require evaluation in the EIR.

c) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?**                       

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would be located within one quarter mile of residential land uses. However, beyond the potential soil remediation activities identified in Section 9.a, the amounts of hazardous materials used by the project would be small and subject to manufacturer’s instructions and governmental safe handling and disposal regulations. The project would therefore have a less than significant impact with regard to emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter mile of sensitive land uses. This issue does not require evaluation in the EIR.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** While the project site was not found on the list pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5,<sup>28, 29</sup> portions of the project site have been used for oil and gas extraction and portions of the soil could potentially be contaminated and require remediation. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) will be prepared for the project. The EIR will evaluate this issue, incorporating the findings and recommendations of the Phase I ESA.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

**No Impact.** The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan and would thus have no impact regarding potential safety hazards or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. This issue does not require evaluation in the EIR.

f) Substantially impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project is located near the I-5 Freeway, which provides regional access to the project site and is designated as a Freeway Disaster Route in the County General Plan.<sup>30</sup> The traffic impact analysis for the project will analyze the effects of the project on the level of service (LOS) on nearby roadways and freeway segments, including on- and off-ramps. As the addition of project traffic plus existing and cumulative project traffic, could potentially increase delays in access to and from the I-5 Freeway, and appropriate mitigation measures may be required. The EIR will evaluate this issue.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

a) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?

<sup>28</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control, EnviroStor.

[https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?CMD=search&city=&zip=91384&county=Los+Angeles&case\\_number=&business\\_name=&FEDERAL\\_SUPERFUND=True&STATE\\_RESPONSE=True&VOLUNTARY\\_CLEANUP=True&SCHOOL\\_CLEANUP=True&CORRECTIVE\\_ACTION=True&tiered\\_permit=True&evaluation=True&operating=True&post\\_closure=True&non\\_operating=True&inspections=True](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?CMD=search&city=&zip=91384&county=Los+Angeles&case_number=&business_name=&FEDERAL_SUPERFUND=True&STATE_RESPONSE=True&VOLUNTARY_CLEANUP=True&SCHOOL_CLEANUP=True&CORRECTIVE_ACTION=True&tiered_permit=True&evaluation=True&operating=True&post_closure=True&non_operating=True&inspections=True)

<sup>29</sup> California State Water Resources Control Board, Geotracker.

<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=91384>

<sup>30</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 12.6, Disaster Routes Map, May 2014.

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone.<sup>31</sup> The EIR will analyze the adequacy of emergency access to and from the project site.

**ii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Infrastructure is being studied for the project site to assure adequate fire flow volumes and pressure will be available to serve the project. This potential impact will be discussed in the EIR in the utilities and service systems section.

**iii) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site would be surrounded by undeveloped hillsides, existing residential land uses, and commercial and light industrial land uses within a very high fire hazard severity zone. The undeveloped hillsides surrounding the project site would have the potential for a dangerous fire hazard from wildland fires. Project design will be subject to precautionary design measures, including County fuel modification zones and appropriate building materials and features. The EIR will evaluate the exposure of people or structures to a direct or indirect significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires in the Wildfire Section.

**h) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project land uses are not unusually fire-prone. However, the location of the project site, particularly the area to be devoted to residential uses, will be located adjacent to the urban/wildland interface, where wildfires may occur. In addition, an operating oil well will remain within the project site, which will require appropriate buffering for safety. As described in Section 9.g, the project design will be subject to precautionary design measures, including County fuel modification zones and appropriate building materials and features. The EIR will evaluate potentially dangerous fire hazards of the project.

---

<sup>31</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention (CAL FIRE). 2012, May. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA: Los Angeles County. <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-prevention-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/>

**10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- |   |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) <b>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Proposed development projects can potentially result in water quality issues related to the construction and operational phases. The project grading program would involve earth movement (raw cut and fill) involving 872,650 cubic yards of cut and 872,650 cubic yards of fill, to be balanced on the site. The project would involve connections to sanitary sewers and would not use onsite wastewater treatment systems.

The project size also requires preparation and approval of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce siltation and stormwater pollutants during construction. The BMPs would be designed to avoid potential construction water quality degradation issues, such as erosion and siltation, spills, and leaks from construction equipment. The SWPPP final review and approval occurs in the final Building and Safety plan check process.

Project development would include paved areas exceeding one acre of disturbed area and add over 10,000 sf of impervious area. Based on these size criteria, the project would be required to follow stormwater management practices for “designated projects” under the 2014 Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Low Impact Development (LID) Standards Manual,<sup>32</sup> which is designed to implement the County’s 2012 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit during project operations and to comply with Water Discharge Requirements (WDR). To comply, the proposed project will be required to provide permanent operational features (to be reviewed and finalized in Building and Safety’s plan review process) that properly reduce runoff and control erosion and pollutants in the runoff from the proposed development. Stormwater treatment would be based on and comply with County LID standards. County standards require stormwater design that would utilize operational BMPs to treat, retain and infiltrate: 1) 100 percent of the Storm Water Design Volume (SWQDV),<sup>33</sup> and 2) detain proposed flow rates produced by a 50 year, 24-hour design storm to pre-development flow rates.

As the project would comply with the SWPPP process to avoid significant construction impacts and would comply with the LID and Water Discharge Requirements (WDR) compliance processes to avoid significant operations impacts, it is likely that the project would have a less than significant impact with regard to violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, as appropriate project features and/or mitigation measures are applied. The EIR will evaluate potential violation of water quality standards or wastewater requirements as well as potential impacts to surface or ground water quality to determine the appropriate environmental impact conclusion.

<sup>32</sup> County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Low Impact Development Standards Manual, February 2014. Accessed on January 22, 2020 at <https://dpw.lacounty.gov/ldd/lib/fp/Hydrology/Low%20Impact%20Development%20Standards%20Manual.pdf>). Under the program, three levels of requirements are established for three sizes or types of projects, designated, non-designated and small-scale non-designated projects. The smaller and less impactful projects have fewer requirements.

<sup>33</sup> The LID Manual defines the SWQDV as a) the 0.75, 24-hour rain event, or b) the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile 24-hour rain event as determined by LA County’s precipitation isohyetal map (“isohyetal map” refers to a weather map connecting places having equal amounts of precipitation during a given period of time).

**b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As noted in Section 10.a, the proposed project would add over 10,000 square feet of impervious area, and a SWPPP would be required and would implement BMPs to comply with County LID requirements and the County’s NPDES 2012 MS4 permit.

The project would not be anticipated to deplete groundwater supplies, as it would connect to the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (SCVWA) District’s potable water system. The project applicant has established that the SCVWA will prepare a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) for the project. The EIR will evaluate potential impacts to groundwater supply and recharge from project construction and project operational potable water usage.

**c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:**

**(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or offsite?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project proposes substantial grading, including grading of previously undisturbed land. Additionally, the previously graded portions of the project site would potentially be graded to greater depth. The updated geotechnical report, to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works, will provide erosion control measures that would be incorporated as project features. The Department of Public Works’ grading plan review will examine whether the project plans include appropriate grades, benching, subdrains, planting for slope stability and other design standards for onsite manufactured slopes. The EIR will evaluate potential erosion or siltation and any necessary project features and/or mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts.

**(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The provision of stormwater drainage facilities will be included in the project site plan (CUP “Exhibit A”), in compliance with County requirements based on the County’s stormwater design manual, LID ordinance, and site plan review. The Department of Public Works will examine whether the project has designed appropriately County-compliant facilities. The EIR will evaluate potential substantial increases in surface runoff and associated potential flooding and any necessary project features and/or mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts.

**(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The provision of stormwater drainage facilities will be included in the project site plan (CUP “Exhibit A”), in compliance with County requirements based on the County’s stormwater design manual, LID ordinance, and site plan review. The Department of Public Works will examine whether the project has designed appropriately County-compliant facilities. The EIR will evaluate potential impacts related to runoff water and any necessary project features and/or mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts.

**(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood plain according to the Los Angeles County General Plan Figure 12.2: Flood Hazard Zones Policy Map.<sup>34</sup> The project design will include flood control infrastructure adhering to the latest County design standards and codes, including LID requirements to infiltrate stormwater onsite. Further, the Department of Public Works’ grading plan review will examine whether the project plans include appropriate grades, benching, subdrains, planting for slope stability and other design standards for onsite manufactured slopes. The EIR will evaluate potential impacts related to flood flows and any necessary project features and/or mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts.

**d) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As described in Section 10.a, the project must be designed to comply, with the County’s LID ordinance, as the EIR will discuss.

**e) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?**

**No Impact.** The project would not require onsite wastewater treatment systems. The project would connect to sanitary sewers. Therefore, no impacts related to the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems would occur, as the EIR will explain.

**f) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?**

<sup>34</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 12.2: Flood Hazard Zones Policy Map

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood plain according to the Los Angeles County General Plan Figure 12.2: Flood Hazard Zones Policy Map.<sup>35</sup> The project site is not located near the coast and is approximately 30 miles from the ocean, with intervening high elevations and the Los Angeles County General Plan Figure 12.3: Tsunami Hazard Areas does not depict the project site within a tsunami inundation area.<sup>36</sup>

Castaic Dam is located approximately 2.5 miles from the project site. The project site would not be inundated by a sunny day failure of the dam spillway or outlet, but portions of the project site would be inundated by a sunny day failure of the main dam, according to the Dam Breach Inundation Map provided by the California Department of Water Resources Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD).<sup>37</sup> Such an inundation would potentially result in the release of pollutants associated with residential land uses and industrial/commercial land uses, although similar land uses are already present in the vicinity of the project site and within the main dam failure inundation zone. The California Department of Water Resources conducted a stability analysis of the dam in 2018 and concluded that the structure of the dam will perform safely, even during a major earthquake.<sup>38</sup> Other studies and inspections have indicated potential concerns with the outlet structures and spillway, but the project site is outside their respective inundation zones. The most recent DSOD inspection rated Castaic Dam as “fair” meaning that the dam has no deficiencies during normal operation, but that improvements could be made to address potential effects of extreme weather or earthquakes. While construction of the Castaic Dam was completed in 1974 as part of the State Water project (SWP), the California Department of Water Resources is modernizing its SWP facilities and in the fall of 2019 initiated field work for the Castaic Dam Modernization Program, in which the dam and associated structures will be assessed and construction undertaken if necessary in the coming years. Therefore, impacts associated with the potential release of pollutants due to project inundation would be less than significant. The EIR will evaluate potential release of pollutants due to project inundation.

**g) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**                       

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As described in Sections 4.a through g, the project would comply with applicable federal, state and local wastewater treatment standards and requirements. It is not anticipated that the project would deplete groundwater supplies because it would connect to a water supply system and would therefore not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan. County review of project impacts due to potential conflict or obstruction of implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan would require review. The EIR will evaluate consistency with water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

---

<sup>35</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 12.2: Flood Hazard Zones Policy Map  
<sup>36</sup> Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, General Plan 2035, Figure 12.3: Tsunami Hazard Areas, May 2014.  
<sup>37</sup> California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams, California Dam Breach Inundation Maps. Accessed on January 22, 2020 at <https://fnds.water.ca.gov/maps/damim/>.  
<sup>38</sup> California Department of Water Resources, Castaic Dam Modernization Accessed on January 22, 2020 at <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/State-Water-Project/SWP-Facilities/Southern/Castaic-Dam-Modernization/>.

**11. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Physically divide an established community?**                                                                               

**No Impact.** The surrounding land uses include undeveloped land, single-family homes, and industrial uses. The project would not create barriers within a community or otherwise physically divide an established community. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.

b) **Case a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any County land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**                                                                               

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project will establish a new apartment community, as well as additional light industrial/commercial pads in an area with similar land uses. The project site is currently mostly undeveloped, and requires several approvals, including a County zone change, Hillside Management Area CUP and Oak Tree Permit. As such, the EIR will evaluate the issue of potential significant impacts due to conflicts with a County land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

c) **Conflict with the goals and policies of the General Plan related to Hillside Management Areas or Significant Ecological Areas?**                                                                               

**Potentially Significant Impact.** See Section 11.b. There are no SEAs on the project site and no SEA CUP is required. The EIR will evaluate potential significant impacts due to conflicts with the goals and policy of the General Plan related to Hillside Management Areas.

**12. MINERAL RESOURCES**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- a) **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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact** According to the California Geological Survey Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) Mineral Land Classification Map,<sup>39</sup> the project site is not within an area designated as a Mineral Resources Zone 2 (MRZ-2), which is an area in which there is adequate information indicating the presence of significant mineral deposits or a high likelihood for their presence. The site is within Mineral Resources Zone 3 (MRZ-3), denoting mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data.

Portions of the project site include oil and gas production wells. Some are no longer in production and others remain active. The applicant indicates that over time, production has decreased and several wells are scheduled to be decommissioned, due to lack of productivity and economic viability. One well will remain active through project implementation. The California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) permits and tracks each operating production well and natural gas storage well and ultimately monitors the decommissioning process. The County’s involvement is limited to zoning and land use regulations that protect surrounding communities from oil production impacts. The project site is currently zoned by the County as: M-1, RPD-18DU/AC, and R-1. The project includes a request to change the zoning of APN 2865-019-066 from R-1 to RPD-18U.

As the project site would not remove lands from the MRZ-2 designation, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.

- b) **Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact** The Natural Resource Areas Map in the County General Plan, Figure 9.6, shows that the project site is not within a mineral resource zone, but a portion of the project site is within an area that contains oil and gas resources. This designation reflects the past and existing use for oil and gas production wells,<sup>40</sup> but according to the County’s planning designations (i.e., IL, H19, H5) and zoning classifications (i.e., M-1, RPD-18DU/AC, R-1) for the property, development of industrial and residential uses was anticipated.

<sup>39</sup> California Division of Mines and Geology 1984, Special Report 143: Mineral Land Classification of the Greater Los Angeles Area.

<sup>40</sup> The applicant indicates that over time, the viability of the oil and gas activity has been reduced. Production has decreased, reducing economic viability, and several wells are scheduled to be decommissioned.

As the project site is not located within a locally-important mineral resource recovery site, project impacts would be less than significant. In addition, some of the existing production wells would continue to operate, and the production of the site's mineral resource wells that would cease operation would represent a very small portion of the total oil and gas resources in the state, further supporting that the project impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.



**No Impact.** The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan and would have no impact regarding exposure of people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.

## 14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is currently mostly undeveloped (except for dirt roads and several oil and gas facilities). The project will result in new residences and business, although the parcels that make up the project site are already zoned as residential and light industrial. As such, the development of these areas is assumed to be a part of the County and regional population projections. Although a zone change is requested for an area of 21.28 acres on one of the project parcels (APN 2865-019-066), this does not change the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (Area Plan) or General Plan classification for the project, or total units allowable on the site. The Area Plan encourages density transfers where appropriate to facilitate development in more suitable locations while retaining significant natural slopes and areas of environmental sensitivity (Policy LU-1.3.4). It is not necessary to change the Residential 5 (H5) land use category in the Area Plan, because it allows extra unused density to be transferred from the adjoining Residential 18 (H18) portion of the project site, and the overall allowable density will not be exceeded. The proposed Zone Change will allow for a clustering at densities similar to the surrounding area, to conserve Hillside Management Areas, Significant Ridgelines and oak trees and woodlands. The project would improve Romeo Canyon Road as a public road and improve The Old Road by constructing a southbound deceleration lane and northbound left turn pocket. However, these roadway improvements do not allow access to new areas for new development beyond the proposed project site. Impacts would be less than significant and will not require further analysis in the project EIR.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No impact.** The project site is currently mostly undeveloped and has no existing dwelling units. Therefore, construction of the project will not displace substantial numbers of people or existing dwelling units, and there will be no significant impact and this issue will not require further analysis in the project EIR.

**15. PUBLIC SERVICES**

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	--	---	----------------------

a) **Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

1) **Fire protection?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) provides fire suppression services in unincorporated Los Angeles County. The proposed 648 apartment units and industrial/commercial space uses would increase demand for fire protection and would be served by Los Angeles County Fire Stations 143 and 149. LACoFD will be consulted regarding existing firefighting resources available onsite and demands for such services that would be generated by the project. The EIR will evaluate project-related fire service demands and the extent to which they may result in significant physical impacts on the environment.

2) **Sheriff protection?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LACSD) provides law enforcement and protection services in unincorporated Los Angeles County. The proposed 648 apartment units and industrial/commercial space uses would increase demand for sheriff protection and would be served by LACSD Santa Clarita Valley Station. LACSD will be consulted regarding existing law enforcement resources available onsite, demands for such services that would be generated by the project, and the extent to which project-related service demands may result in significant physical impacts on the environment and the EIR will evaluate project-related law enforcement and protection demands.

3) **Schools?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Castaic Union School District would provide school services to the project and will be consulted regarding existing school resources available to serve the project site and demands for these services that would be generated by the project.<sup>41</sup> Although the state of California (through SB-50, the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998) determined that school fees are to be considered full compensation for school facility impacts under CEQA, it does not remove the requirement to disclose potential school-related impacts. Therefore, the EIR will evaluate this issue for public disclosure purposes.

---

<sup>41</sup> Castaic Union School District, By-Trustee Area Boundary Map: Board Approved Trustee Boundary Map, February 16, 2017. <https://1.cdn.edl.io/PBi25IHAWMAhD8tk8TJFNV7mc8Y5wBgf2x3G0NGRp4ievrQ.pdf>

4) Parks?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation would provide park services to the project and will be consulted regarding existing park resources available to serve the project site and demands for these services that would be generated by the project. The project will provide private recreational amenities onsite (e.g., swimming pools, parks), and will be required to comply with any requirements for park dedication or in-lieu fees at the time of building permit plan check. The project residents would likely also use area parks. The EIR will assess existing park and planned resources available to serve the project and any potentially significant project-related physical impacts to the environment may occur.

5) Libraries?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles County Public Libraries would provide library services to the project. The County requires library fees to offset library impacts. The EIR will summarize existing conditions, planned library expansions if any, and discuss increased demands for these services that would be generated by the project and that could result in significant physical impacts to the environment.

6) Other public facilities?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Significant impacts on other public facilities are not anticipated. This issue will not require further analysis in the EIR.

**16. RECREATION**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) <b>Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would involve construction of 648 apartment units onsite and thus would increase demand for parks on and near the site and could increase physical deterioration of parks in surrounding communities. The project will provide private recreational amenities onsite (e.g., swimming pools, parks) and the project will be required to comply with any requirements for park dedication or in-lieu fees at the time of building permit plan check. Also, there are many regional parks available within the area. The EIR will assess existing parks and planned park and recreational resources available to serve the project and whether any potentially significant project-related physical impacts to the environment may occur.

b) <b>Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would involve construction of on-site recreational areas. The EIR will assess the potential effect of the construction of these facilities on the physical environment as a part of the development as a whole.

c) <b>Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not affect regional open space connectivity, as the project is not adjacent to any regional parks. This impact would be less than significant, but the EIR will discuss regional park and potential impacts in the context of the remaining parks and recreational issues in Sections 15.a.4 and 16.a and b, above.

**17. TRANSPORTATION**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would result in vehicle trips associated with the proposed residential, light industrial and commercial land uses, that have the potential to significantly affect area roadways. A traffic impact analysis for the project will be prepared and will be incorporated in the EIR.

b) **Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The I-5 Freeway is an element of The 2016 – 2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) Congestion Management Plan (CMP) for the Region, adopted by SCAG in April 2016.<sup>42</sup> The next nearest element of the regional transportation system to the project site is the I-5 Freeway about 0.02 miles to the east. Project traffic impacts on CMP roadways would be potentially significant. The traffic impact analysis to be conducted for the proposed project will address impacts on CMP roadways and will be incorporated in the EIR.

c) **Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Roadway improvements and intersections of driveways with public roadways, constructed as part of the project would comply with applicable County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works standards for roadway profiles (street sections). The standard plan check review and approval process will assure that all County safety-related requirements are addressed. This impact would be less than significant, and no additional analysis is required in the EIR.

<sup>42</sup> 2016 – 2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, Appendix: Congestion Management Plan. April 2016.  
[http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS\\_CongestionManagement.pdf](http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS_CongestionManagement.pdf)

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section 17.c, the project design will be reviewed by the County for compliance with appropriate safety-related requirements. The project will add additional traffic on area roadways. The EIR will discuss the potential effect of emergency access on area roadways, to the extent that increased project-related traffic could increase impacts on those routes.



**19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- |  |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) <b>Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water draining, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project would increase demand for water, wastewater treatment, storm water draining, electric power, telecommunication and potentially natural gas services through the construction of 648 apartment units and four industrial/commercial pads that could result in an estimated 206,000 sf of industrial/commercial uses. The increases in demand for these services could potentially contribute to the relocation or construction of new or expanded facilities to meet this demand.

Water and Wastewater

Due to the project size and its location on a mostly undeveloped site, there is a potential for significant impacts relating to the construction of water and wastewater treatment facilities. The project applicant’s preliminary discussions with the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (SCVWA) have established that the agency will prepare a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) for the project. Wastewater treatment would be provided by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD). In dialogue with the project applicant, LACSD indicates that growth in facilities is tied to SCAG growth projections for the area and that the project site will require annexation to the LACSD’s service area.

The EIR will evaluate water supply and infrastructure impacts, including a summary of the WSA for the project. The EIR will also establish the project’s anticipated wastewater generation based upon LACSD generation rates, discuss consistency with SCAG growth projections, and the evaluate the project’s impact on existing and planned wastewater treatment capacity of the applicable treatment plants.

Electricity, Natural Gas, Telecommunications

The project is proximate to existing electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities, in that the community of Castaic (including the subdivisions to the north and south of the project site) is currently served by these services. The project applicant has contacted Southern California Edison (SCE, for electrical service) and Sempra Energy (for natural gas) for information. Both SCE and Sempra Energy indicated the project can be served, and that only a plan-review and fee payment process will be required to obtain service. As noted in the site plan, telephone service would be provided by AT&T Corporation. Cell phone service would be offered by a multitude of privately-owned service providers. Such service is currently available to the Castaic area. As with other urban or suburban areas, cell phone towers are added from time to time. However, the exact need or location depends upon service provider’s responses to reception in the area. Should additional towers be required in the future, they would be subject to CEQA review to determine if additional CEQA documentation would be required. As such, electric power, natural gas and telecommunications are not issues that warrant further analysis in the EIR.



**Less Than Significant Impact.** Solid waste reduction is implemented in the County, compliant with AB 939 and the County of Los Angeles Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), which require implementation of programs to divert, through source reduction, recycling, and composting 25 percent of the solid waste from landfills and incineration to achieve a 50 percent reduction in solid waste by 2000. Further, the project would comply with Chapter 20.87, Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling and Reuse, of the County Zoning Code for 50 percent recycling during construction. The commercial/industrial portions of the project would need to comply with the 2019 CALGreen requirement to either no less than 65 percent diversion or no more than 2 pounds per square foot disposal of construction and demolition waste for non-residential construction. The residential portion of the project would need to comply with CalRecycle's required diversion of no less than 65 percent of construction and demolition waste for residential construction.<sup>44</sup> The project would comply with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, which requires each "development project" to provide an adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials. No additional federal regulations beyond these standards would be required. The project must be designed to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and would not require further analysis in the EIR.

---

<sup>44</sup> Cal Recycle, C and D Model. November 26, 2018. <https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/library/canddmodel/instruction/faq#DiversionOrd>



**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Department of Public Works' grading plan review will examine whether the project plans include appropriate grades, benching, subdrains, planting for slope stability and other design standards for onsite manufactured slopes in order to assure slope stability and reduce erosion, which has the potential to affect wildfire susceptibility. Project design review will examine whether flood control infrastructure adheres to the latest County design standards and codes, including LID requirements to infiltrate stormwater onsite, as opposed to creating increased runoff that may result in fire instability or drainage changes. The EIR will address the issue of post-fire slope stability and drainage changes that could expose people or structures to significant risks, as a result of the project.

**21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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, substantially 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?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project would develop a largely undeveloped property in Castaic. Potential project impacts to biological resources and cultural resources will be evaluated in the EIR. The ability of the project to degrade the quality of the environment with regard to these topics will be evaluated in the Biological Resources and Cultural Resources Sections of the EIR.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project would develop a largely undeveloped property in Castaic. The project's potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals will be addressed in the EIR.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a 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)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts to the environment. Similarly, the potential exists for cumulative projects to result in significant environmental impacts. The EIR will address the issue of cumulatively considerable impacts.

d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Potentially Significant Impact.** All issues in the CEQA Initial Study checklist directly or indirectly affect humans. See Sections 1 – 20 for such potential effects. The issues noted as potentially significant, or otherwise noted as warranting further analysis, will be evaluated in the EIR.

**TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (“AB 52”)**

**Compliance Checklist**

(Initial Study Attachment)

**Note: Prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project, this checklist must be completed and attached to the Initial Study.**

**Procedural Compliance**

- 1. Has a California Native American Tribe (s) requested formal notification of proposed projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe?**

Yes Tribe(s) to notify: Fernandeño Band of Mission Indians, San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians

No (End of process)

- 2. Notification letter (s) informing the California Native American Tribe (s) of the proposed project was mailed on November 21, 2019, which was within 14 days when project application was determined complete or the County decided to undertake a project.**

- 3. Did the County receive a written request for consultation from the California Native American Tribe(s) within 30 days of when formal notification was provided?**

Yes Date: December 9, 2019

No (End of process)

- 4. Consultation process with the California Native American Tribe(s) consisted of the following: meeting with Fernandeño Band of Mission Indians on February 20, 2020, and emails and phone calls**

- 5. Consultation process concluded on \_\_\_\_\_ by either of the following:**

The parties concluded that no mitigation measures are necessary

The parties agreed to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect on a tribal cultural resource (see attached mitigation measures)

The County acted in good faith and after reasonable effort, concluded that mutual agreement cannot be reached.

(consultation is ongoing)