5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

PURPOSE

The purpose of this section is to explain the methodology for the cumulative project analysis presented in this EIR. This section is important because, in many cases, the impact of a single project may not be significant, while when combined with other projects the "cumulative" impact may be greater. Section 15355 of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* defines "cumulative impacts" as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." *State CEQA Guidelines* (Section 15130(b)) states, "the discussion [of cumulative impacts] need not provide as great detail as is provided of the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness."

Substantial cumulative impacts often result from the combined effect of past, present, and future projects that are located in proximity to the project under review. For example, the wastewater demand generated by a proposed project may not be significant when analyzed alone; however, when analyzed in combination with wastewater demand of other approved or proposed projects, the wastewater demands may exceed the resource capabilities of the wastewater agency, resulting in a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, it is important for a cumulative impacts analysis to be viewed over time and in conjunction with other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future developments that may have impacts that might compound or interrelate with those of the project under review. Furthermore, the cumulative impact analysis is an important part of an EIR as it allows the environmental analysis to provide a more complete forecast of the future environmental conditions and by showing the impacts of all known projects.

CUMULATIVE GROWTH FORECASTING METHODOLOGY

In order to analyze the cumulative impacts of the project in combination with other expected future growth, the amount and location of growth expected to occur in addition to that of the proposed project must be predicted. Section 15130(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* allows two methods of prediction as described below: "(A) a list of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including those projects outside the control of the agency, or (B) a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document which is designed to evaluate regional or areawide conditions." In order to analyze a worst-case condition, this EIR uses a combination of both methods to provide a reasonable and comprehensive estimate of cumulative impacts. For this EIR, cumulative impacts are analyzed using the General Plan Cumulative Build-Out Scenario.

The cumulative analysis is based upon the recently approved General Plan buildout. The preparation of the General Plan cumulative impacts analysis included the consideration of City and County land

development projects from the City of Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County, and Caltrans highway projects. For local land development, infrastructure, and highway projects (projects of the type more common to cumulative impacts analyses generally) the approach to cumulative impacts analysis was dictated by the magnitude of the General Plan and the proximity of cumulative projects to the General Plan Planning Area. The planned development of the Santa Clarita Valley is included in the City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model. The City of Santa Clarita General Plan EIR is incorporated by reference and can be found at the City of Santa Clarita, 23920 Valencia Boulevard, Santa Clarita, California 91355.

Listed below is the General Plan cumulative buildout scenario.

Table 5.0-1
City of Santa Clarita Land Use Designations and Areas

	Area in Acres				
Land Use Designation	**City**	**SOI**	**County (without SOI)**	**Total Area (acres)**	**Percent of Planning Area**
Rural Residential/Non-Urban 1	0	137.99	25,493.02	25,631.01	8.25
Rural Residential/Non-Urban 2	0	2,606.38	11,243.23	13,8849.61	4.46
Rural Residential/Non-Urban 3	0	5,182.17	5,177.11	10,359.28	3.33
Rural Residential/Non-Urban 4	1,680.39	2,280.12	13,934.06	17,894.57	5.76
Rural Residential/Non-Urban 5	2,236.78	1,322.25	549.70	4,108.73	1.32
Urban Residential 1	2,873.23	3,073.91	3,543.89	9,491.02	3.06
Urban Residential 2	8,163.53	1,751.04	4,488.92	14,403.84	4.64
Urban Residential 3	2,103.38	0	0	2,103.38	0.68
Urban Residential 4	235.78	333.81	340.75	910.34	0.29
Urban Residential 5	559.58	92.40	252.85	904.83	0.29
Mixed Use – Corridor	324.97	0	0	324.964	0.10
Mixed Use – Neighborhood	236.19	0	0	236.19	0.08
Regional Commercial	510.01	0	1,14057	1,650.59	0.53
Community Commercial	935.23	0	0	935.23	0.30
Neighborhood Commercial	188.17	320.72	219.91	725.80	0.23
Business Park	3,300.75	0	1,900.42	5,201.17	1.67
Industrial	226.05	220.47	1,030.39	1,476.91	0.48
Open Space	5,412.73	883.71	14,712.61	21,009.04	6.76
National Forest	162.26	29.41	149,717.94	149,909.61	48.25
Bureau of Land Management	0	239.33	3,187.86	3,427.19	1.10
Specific Plan	2,527.27	103.19	14,237.81	16,868.27	5.43
Public Institutional	1,330.95	172.05	3,681.06	5,184.06	1.67
Transportation Corridor	706.31	157.84	3,197.82	4,061.97	1.31
TOTAL	**33,713**	**18,9107**	**258,047**	**310,668**	**100.00**

Source: City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles, September 2009.

CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The cumulative impact analysis is based on the anticipated population growth within the Santa Clarita Planning Area and surrounding SCAG region. Population growth is a major factor contributing to direct impacts on habitat, housing, job markets, transportation, and development. Additionally, these direct impacts can cause secondary impacts on biological resources, air quality, density, and the overall quality of life within the Santa Clarita Planning Area. For this reason, using populating growth as a measure to determine cumulative impacts is highly applicable when examining a large project area such as a county. It is important to note that to evaluate impacts, future conditions (without the project) are compared to existing conditions to identify cumulative impacts (i.e., impacts that would occur whether or not the project were implemented). Implementation of the Santa Clarita General Plan (of which the proposed project is a part) would provide a planning framework to channel and direct future population growth and development. Cumulative impacts relevant to specific issues are summarized as follows.

Cumulative Land Use

The General Plan does not physically divide an established community. The land use map defines the areas of land uses and provides for consistency and transition for the City's Planning Area. CEQA does not require analysis of potential cumulative impacts where the General Plan itself does not result in any impacts. Therefore, no further analysis of cumulative impacts is required for potential land-use impacts.

Cumulative Transportation and Circulation Impacts

Projected increases to regional traffic are also incorporated into the traffic forecasts produced by the Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model (SCVCTM). In modeling terms, these regional trips are referred to as external trips since one or both tripends are external to the Santa Clarita Valley. There are two components to the external traffic forecasts, the first being trips generated within the Santa Clarita Valley (i.e., one tripend with the Santa Clarita Valley and the other tripend outside of the Santa Clarita Valley), and the second being external trips that pass through the Santa Clarita Valley (i.e., both tripends outside of the Santa Clarita Valley).

The year 2030 external trips in the baseline version of the SCVCTM represent an increase of approximately 85 percent over existing levels. The component of external trips generated within the Santa Clarita Valley increase by approximately 63 percent and the component of external trips that pass through the Santa Clarita Valley increase by approximately 123 percent (Source: Draft Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model 2004 Update and Validation, June 2004 – note: this is Reference 3 in the General Plan Traffic Study). In other words, the General Plan traffic study includes forecasts of

regional traffic that passes through the Santa Clarita Valley, and which are projected to more than double by 2030.

Buildout of the City's General Plan would reduce traffic on the City's roadways, including those monitored by the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP), and at principal intersections because buildout population of the General Plan would be smaller than that of the existing General Plan and Area Plan. Implementation of the General Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, result in inadequate emergency access, or generate a parking demand that exceeds municipal code–required parking capacity. Furthermore, implementation of the General Plan would promote policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation, and remove hazards and barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists. Therefore, traffic and circulation impacts would be less than significant.

As per CEQA, due to the impacts on transportation and circulation considered less than significant, then any cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the General Plan would be less than significant.

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

Any past, present, or probable project that would individually have a significant air quality impact would also be considered to have a significant cumulative air quality impact. As specified in the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the ratio of a project's vehicle miles traveled (VMT) or average daily trips (ADT) to anticipated VMT or ADT in the city or county in which the project is located is compared to the ratio of the project population to the anticipated population in the same city or county. If the growth of VMT or ADT is less than the population growth, then a project is not considered to have a significant cumulative air quality impact. General Plan EIR Section 3.3 addresses the first significance threshold, whether the policies would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, in an inherently cumulative fashion, because the conformity analysis takes into account all other basin emissions. That section concluded that the General Plan and County of Los Angeles (County) Area Plan would have smaller growth of ADT when compared to population than does the existing General Plan and County Area Plan, which would not result in significant impacts under this threshold. Thus, the implementation of the General Plan also does not contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to implementation of the air quality plan.

The implementation of the General Plan would potentially increase mobile and stationary source emissions of pollutants that currently exceed state and/or federal standards, and for which the project

region is nonattainment. Therefore, air quality emissions would have a potentially significant cumulative impact.

The implementation of the General Plan would be designed to reduce emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and the potential for CO hotspots, as well as reducing potential to exposure to TACs by sensitive receptors, and odor impacts associated with the General Plan, however not to a level of less than significant. As per CEQA, since impacts on project air quality would be significant, any cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the General Plan would be significant.

Cumulative Global Warming and Climate Change

The General Plan policies are designed to reduce GHG emissions during construction, directly and indirectly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and sequester carbon dioxide. Implementation of these policies would reduce potential General Plan air quality impacts under this criterion; however not to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation has been proposed to reduce the projects impacts to less than significant. However, even with mitigation impacts to project and cumulative GHG emissions would remain significant and unavoidable. Nonetheless, it should be noted that as AB 32's mandate is brought to fruition, through the adoption of regulations and additional legislation, additional GHG reduction measures would be implemented, and the General Plan, and the residents and businesses that occupy buildout areas facilitated by the General Plan, would be subject to those reduction measures.

Section 15130, subdivision (c), of the *State CEQA Guidelines* acknowledges that "[w]ith some projects, the only feasible mitigation for cumulative impacts may involve the adoption of ordinances or regulations rather than the imposition of conditions on a project-by-project basis." Global climate change is this type of issue, as the very causes and effects of global climate change are not determined on a local or regional scale. Therefore, given the uncertainties in identifying, let alone quantifying, the impact of any single project on global climate change, and the efforts made to design the General Plan and development facilitated by it with sustainable development principles in mind, any further mitigation is best accomplished through California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations implementing the mandated reduction goals of AB 32.

Cumulative Agricultural Resources

Implementation of the Land Use Policy Map would have a significant impact on agricultural land because it would convert some of the Important Farmland under the California Department of Conservation (CDC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, to urbanized land uses. This potential

conversion of Important Farmlands to urbanized land uses is considered significant under the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts

This section describes those resources that define the visual character and quality of the City's Planning Area. Resources within the City's Planning Area as well as the County's Planning Area include a variety of natural and manmade elements as well as the viewsheds to those elements that serve as visual landmarks and contribute to the unique character of the General Plan Planning Area. Although specific scenic resources in the City's Planning Area are identified in the General Plan EIR Section 3.6, it is not intended to provide an exhaustive inventory, as the nature of these resources is somewhat subjective and not easily quantified. Implementation of the General Plan would increase development within the City's Planning Area, which, if unregulated, would contribute to the obstruction of views, damage scenic resources, and generate substantial levels of light and glare. However, the General Plan includes policies that would ensure the protection of scenic resources and corridors, promote quality construction that enhances the City Planning Area's urban form, increase open space and landscaping, and limit light overspill. For these reasons, implementation of the City's General Plan would result in a less than significant impact on aesthetics and therefore would not have cumulatively cumulative impacts.

Cumulative Biological Resources

The General Plan policies do not provide a mechanism for the compensation of lost habitats when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible, nor do they mitigate for the direct mortality of individuals of listed, proposed, or candidate species. In conjunction with the General Plan policies, MM 3.7-1 through 3.7-3 are proposed to reduce these impacts. However, special-status species are dependent on a variety of habitat types, including non-sensitive annual grassland and various common scrub and chaparral types, and habitat loss of these types would therefore not be compensated for under General Plan MM 3.7-3. Thus, the conversion of all types of currently undeveloped wildlife habitat to Residential, Commercial and Industrial uses permitted under the General Plan would result in impacts on special-status species that will remain significant at the plan level.

In conjunction with the General Plan policies, MM 3.7-1 through 3.7-3 are proposed to reduce impacts on riparian and other sensitive habitats to a level that is less than significant at the plan level. In combination with requirements for Section 404 permitting, the policies would reduce impacts resulting from implementation of the General Plan to a level that is less than significant at the plan level. Thus no significant impacts on jurisdictional wetlands are anticipated and no mitigation is proposed.

The General Plan policies do not provide for the compensation of lost wildlife movement opportunities or nursery sites when avoidance or minimization of impacts is considered to be infeasible. Loss of connectivity between the two units of the Angeles National Forest could not be compensated for since the intervening habitats would be the only ones that could provide the necessary avenues of exchange. Therefore, this potential loss could not be adequately mitigated, and the impact of development would remain significant in the event that avoidance of impacts to habitat linkages arising from said development is considered infeasible. Therefore, cumulative biological impacts would occur.

Cumulative Cultural Resources

The General Plan's contribution to the growth and urbanization of the City's Planning Area would result in the direct and/or indirect loss of historical resources, archeological resources, paleontological resources, and the possible disturbance of human remains. This loss would result from urban redevelopment and conversion of culturally and paleontologically sensitive landscapes to urban uses. The General Plan area is comprised of large portions of undeveloped open land that may contain cultural resources, paleontological resources, and human remains. However, implementation of the General Plan policies MM 3.8-1 to MM 3.8-7, provided on a project-by-project basis, would not cumulatively contribute to the potential loss of cultural resources.

Cumulative Geology, Soils, Seismicity

As described below, individual cumulative projects have the potential to result in significant impacts related to geology and geologic hazards under *State CEQA Guidelines*. Geologic hazard impacts, such as fault rupture, ground shaking, landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, and slope stability tend to be location specific rather than cumulative in regard to project-related effects. Therefore, impacts under these criteria would not be cumulatively significant. Individual development projects are required to adopt site development and construction standards that are intended to minimize the effects of seismic and other geologic conditions that affect a project region. Because development projects must be consistent with Los Angeles County and Ventura County requirements and the California Building Code (CBC) as they pertain to protection against known geologic hazards, the geologic hazard impacts of cumulative development are considered less than significant, and implementation of the General Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to such impacts.

Cumulative projects or groups of projects would result in significant or potentially significant erosion-related impacts prior to mitigation, of which the combined effect has the potential to result in cumulative impacts on regional resources, such as the Santa Clara River. Prior to mitigation, the implementation of the General Plan would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative

erosion impacts due to the potential future development related to buildout of the General Plan, which would be mitigated by implementation of the General Plan MM 3.9-1 to MM 3.9-9.

As discussed above, significant cumulative erosion-related impacts would occur. However, the implementation of the General Plan and all cumulative projects in the City's Planning Area would be required to comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and other regulatory requirements set forth in General Plan EIR Section 3.12. Such compliance ensures that each of the past, current, and probable project's erosion-related impacts are reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level; any cumulative impacts would be less than significant, after mitigation.

Cumulative Mineral Resources

The General Plan's contribution to the growth and urbanization of the City's Planning Area would result in the direct and/or indirect loss of mineral resources. The potential loss of mineral resources would result from urban development, redevelopment, and conversion of open space to urban uses. The City's Planning Area is comprised of large portions of undeveloped, open land containing mineral resource zones and the General Plan provides policies to protect these mineral resources. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan would not have a significant cumulative impact on the loss of these areas and their resources.

Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous materials impacts tend to be site specific and are assessed on a site-by-site basis. As described in the General Plan EIR Section 3.11, Human Made Hazards, the transport of hazardous materials is generally along major transportation routes, which would include Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route 14 (SR 14). Major highways within the City's Planning Area are protected in regards to hazardous materials transportation through guidelines and policies of Caltrans, the agency that is responsible for transportation of hazardous waste on the state's freeway system. Any new development in the City's Planning Area where businesses use hazardous materials will be required to go through a review process to ensure that adequate setback and buffer features reduce possible contamination to residents and the environment. All new development businesses that would use hazardous waste within the City's Planning Area would be required to verify their procedures for storage, use, and disposal of these materials to reduce exposure to residents and the environment. Additionally, the City of Santa Clarita will promote events to provide a correct means of disposing household hazardous waste. Implementation of these policies will therefore, reduce the possibility of exposure of hazardous materials to the public or environment through transportation, use and disposal, and impacts would be less than significant. CEQA does not require analysis of potential cumulative impacts where the General Plan itself does not result in

any impacts. Therefore, no analysis of cumulative impacts is required for potential hazards and hazardous material related impacts.

Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts

Development of the General Plan would increase runoff into the Santa Clara River from upland areas due to increased impervious surface areas (e.g., pavement, roads, and buildings). The drainage improvements associated with cumulative projects in Los Angeles County would be required to conform to the requirements of the Department of Public Works (DPW) to convey the capital flood event from the affected watersheds. In addition, similar flood control requirements exist for Ventura County, as discussed below. Therefore, no significant cumulative flooding impacts are expected to occur within the watershed.

Additionally, the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, which covers the Ventura County areas of the Santa Clara River watershed, has requirements for flood design standards based on a 100-year flood. These regulatory requirements for the Ventura County Watershed Protection District would apply to development in Ventura County areas. Compliance with these regulatory programs by other projects in the watershed would minimize potential cumulative hydrology impacts related to flooding.

The General Plan would not have a significant hydrology impact, even prior to mitigation; nonetheless the General Plan EIR includes additional mitigation measures (MM 3.12-1 to MM 3.12-5) to further ensure that impacts remain less than significant. The General Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative hydrology impacts. Other cumulative projects should be required to comply with regulatory requirements and measures similar to General Plan EIR MM 3.12-1 to MM 3.12-5 that will further ensure that any potential hydrology impacts of those projects are minimized.

Future development within the City's Planning Area will comply with applicable regulatory requirements for both construction and post-development surface runoff water quality, which ensures that project-related development will not result in significant water quality impacts. These regulatory requirements include project design features (PDFs); Los Angeles County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements; Construction General Permit requirements; General Dewatering Permit requirements; and benchmark Basin Plan water quality objectives, California Toxics Rule (CTR) criteria, and total maximum daily load (TMDLs) issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and Los Angeles County. Any future urban development occurring in the Santa Clara River watershed must also comply with these requirements. Therefore, cumulative impacts on surface water quality of receiving waters from

the General Plan and future urban development in the Santa Clara watershed would be addressed through compliance with the applicable regulatory requirements that are intended to be protective of beneficial uses of the receiving waters.

Based on compliance with these regulatory mitigation requirements, cumulative water quality impacts related to stormwater and nonstormwater runoff would be less than significant, and the General Plan's contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable. Other cumulative projects will be required to comply with federal, state, and local water quality regulations, including implementation of best management practices (BMPs) and PDFs to minimize and mitigate each project's potential water quality impacts. In addition, the Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant (WRP), like the existing Saugus and Valencia WRPs, is required to comply with the terms of its NPDES permit and water data reports, which would ensure that the Newhall Ranch WRP's contribution to cumulative impacts is rendered less than cumulatively considerable. Because each cumulative project will be subject to this rigorous regulatory regime, cumulative water quality impacts are considered to be less than significant, following General Plan mitigation measures (MM 3.9-7 to 3.9-9).

Implementation of the General Plan would not increase the risk of dam failure and subsequent inundation hazards. Thus, the General Plan would not contribute to a cumulative impact relating to dam inundation hazards.

Cumulative Water Service Impacts

Because cumulative water supplies exceed demand within the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) service area and the East Subbasin, cumulative development would not result in unavoidable significant cumulative impacts on water resources in this area. This includes potential impacts on groundwater resources related to recharge potential and perchlorate contamination. This is due to the fact that urbanization in the Santa Clarita Valley has been accompanied by long-term stability in pumping and groundwater levels, plus the addition of imported State Water Program (SWP) and non-SWP imported water to the City's Planning Area, which together have not created a reduction in recharge to groundwater, nor depleted the amount of groundwater that is in storage within the General Plan Planning Area. In addition, evidence indicates that the perchlorate treatment and containment program presently being implemented in the Santa Clarita Valley is reducing perchlorate-related impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, cumulative mitigation measures are not required and there would be a less than significant cumulative impact within the CLWA service area and East Subbasin.

Based on the available information, significant water supply impacts would result from County's Area Plan buildout in portions of the Planning Area outside of CLWA's service area boundary and the East

Subbasin. For areas outside of the CLWA service area and East Subbasin, locations that are without access to imported SWP and non-SWP imported water, recycled water, or groundwater from the East Subbasin, groundwater resources are currently strained as private wells are, in some instances, running dry. Despite implementation of the mitigation measures provided in this EIR, cumulative impacts to water resources in this area would remain significant.

Cumulative Community Services Impacts

Discussion of Cumulative Community Service Impacts

Cumulative impacts of development with implementation of the General Plan will be continually monitored through the environmental review process of proposed projects, and additional mitigation measures will be included as appropriate as part of the environmental analysis performed for individual projects as development occurs in the City's Planning Area. The Community Services section below analyzes senior and youth, cultural amenities, and homeless and emergency shelters.

Senior and Youth

The implementation of the General Plan policies would provide the City, on a project-by-project basis, the opportunity to adequately designate areas for senior housing and facilities. The location of the senior housing and facilities should also consider accessibility of public transit. Implementation of the General Plan would reduce the potential cumulative impacts on senior housing and/or activities to less than significant. Implementation of the General Plan would provide the opportunity for youths to be able to participate in activities outside of school and would have a less than significant cumulative impact.

Cultural Amenities

Implementation of the General Plan would enhance the access of cultural amenities to the City's Planning Area and would potentially allow for the joint use of facilities. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Homeless and Emergency Shelters

Implementation of the General Plan would help to ensure that there are adequate emergency shelters in the case of an emergency. The General Plan would also encourage assistance to homeless persons through social service agencies and suitable shelters. Implementation of the General Plan would minimize potentially adverse cumulative impacts on homelessness and emergency shelter services to less than significant.

Cumulative Public Services Impacts

Cumulative impacts of development with implementation of the General Plan will be continually monitored through the environmental review process of proposed projects, and additional mitigation measures will be included as appropriate as part of the environmental analysis performed for individual projects as development occurs in the City's Planning Area. The Public Services section below analyzes library services, health services, education services, fire protection, and sheriff protection.

Cumulative impacts would be contingent upon the level of demand for medical services and facilities. The level of demand would be determined based on the periodic medical needs assessments. The projected increase in the City's population will occur incrementally over approximately 20 years and will proportionally increase the demand for medical facilities and services. This would be a City Planning Area service and facilities impact. Therefore, the increase in future residents resulting from the General Plan would contribute to cumulative impacts that would remain significant. Implementation of the goals, objectives, and policies outlined in the General Plan would reduce impacts on medical services and facilities to less than significant.

As stated in General Plan EIR Section 3.15, the General Plan would not result in significant direct, indirect, or secondary public service impacts with implementation of the previously adopted mitigation measures MM 3.15-1 to MM 3.15-4 and SB 50. General Plan EIR MM 3.15-4 would further ensure that impacts on law enforcement services remain less than significant by requiring payment of the Los Angeles County Law Enforcement Facilities Mitigation Fee for North Los Angeles County prior to issuance of building permits. Aside from General Plan EIR MM 3.15-4, however, no additional public services mitigation measures are recommended or required by this EIR.

Based on state and local regulatory requirements, cumulative projects can and should be required to include mitigation (SB 50) to set aside land for school facilities and contribute their fair share to school funding programs with the appropriate district mitigation similar to General Plan EIR MM 3.15-2 and MM 3.15-3 to reduce fire protection impacts, mitigation similar to MM 3.15-4 to minimize impacts on police services by designing projects to minimize response times by optimizing access and paying into the Los Angeles County Law Enforcement Facilities Mitigation Fee for North Los Angeles County, and General Plan EIR mitigation similar to MM 3.15-1 to fund or contribute to funding of additional libraries. Because state and local regulatory requirements will require implementation of this mitigation for cumulative projects, cumulative impacts to public services are considered to be less than significant after mitigation.

Cumulative Recreation Impacts

The General Plan would not contribute to cumulative recreational facility impacts because it would dedicate parkland that would exceed what is required by the City pursuant to the Quimby Act. Additional recreation facilities would include trails consistent with City policies. Thus, the impacts of the General Plan on cumulative parks and recreation resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

Cumulative Utilities and Infrastructure

Discussion of Utilities and Infrastructure

Cumulative impacts of development with implementation of the General Plan will be continually monitored through the environmental review process of proposed projects, and additional mitigation measures will be included as appropriate as part of the environmental analysis performed for individual projects as development occurs in the General Plan Planning Area. The Utilities and Infrastructure section below analyzes wastewater, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication demands.

Wastewater

Implementation of the General Plan policies related to wastewater would ensure adequate wastewater facilities as development occurs, thereby, reducing the effects of future development and avoiding exceedances of wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. The need for construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities as buildout occurs would be determined by the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District. If new facilities were to be constructed, the project(s) would be required to undergo an environmental review per CEQA. Implementation of the General Plan policies related to wastewater and the implementation of the objectives of the Final 2015 Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System Facilities would ensure adequate wastewater capacity to serve the buildout of the City's Planning Area and would not be cumulatively considerable.

Solid Waste

The City's Planning Area uses three landfills within or near the General Plan Planning Area. They include the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, Antelope Valley Landfill, and the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. Landfills throughout the state have permitted maximum capacities (the amount of waste(s) in tons or cubic yards a permitted facility is allowed to receive, handle, process, store, or dispose of). In 2007, the amount of waste disposed by the City's Planning Area was 163,000 tons. The projected buildout amount of waste, generated by the City's Planning Area, would be 254,450 tons per year. Nearby landfills are approaching full capacity for waste disposal and the projected amount of landfill capacity, for the City's Planning Area, would be in a shortfall of 22,626 tons per day, six days per week in the year 2021. Therefore, the impacts from buildout to the solid waste system would be significant and unavoidable even with the incorporation of General Plan EIR MM 3.17-1 to MM 3.17-6.

Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications

Future growth anticipated with build out of the General Plan would include new development that will increase the demand for electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications and substantially contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the availability of all three resources before mitigation. Implementation of General Plan EIR MM 3.17-7 and MM 3.17-8 would reduce impacts on the three resources to less than significant. Thus, the impacts of the General Plan on cumulative electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

Cumulative Noise Impacts

Buildout of the General Plan would result in potential cumulative noise level increases along major roadways and near industrial/commercial zones. Each of these noise impacts would be dealt with separately when new noise sensitive or noise generating developments are proposed. However, it is not always possible to reduce construction noise impacts to below standards set forth in the City's Noise Ordinance; therefore, short-term construction noise impacts are unavoidably significant for the duration of the construction activities. Short-term noise and vibration impacts from the pile driving would be unavoidably significant for the duration of the pile driving. Operational noise impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable. Implementation of the General Plan would result in significant cumulative noise impacts that could not be mitigated with the implementation of the General Plan policies and mitigation measures. Thus, the General Plan will substantially contribute to cumulative noise impacts.

Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts

Upon buildout of the General Plan, the population of the City's Planning Area is estimated to be approximately 275,000 persons residing in approximately 88,803 residential dwelling units. SCAG estimates that the 2030 population of the City would consist of 229,023 residents, of which 41 percent of the projected growth is expected to be within the County's Planning Area. While future increases in population and housing would occur primarily within the City's SOI, the rate of growth is consistent with annual SCAG rates of growth. Development on a scale and intensity permitted under the General Plan would result in consistent cumulative significant population increases within the City's Planning Area. CEQA does not require analysis of cumulative impacts where the General Plan itself does not result in any impacts.