As discussed above for the Proposed Action, the Soledad Canyon Road/Antelope Valley Freeway northbound and southbound ramp intersections will be significantly affected with or without the Proposed Action if the other cumulative projects are developed. Both northbound and southbound ramps intersections meet signal warrants for Phases 1 and 2 with cumulative projects. This would also apply under this Reduced Quantity Mining Concept Alternative.

Traffic safety concerns would remain similar to the Proposed Action under this alternative.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures would remain similar to that described for the Proposed Action (measures T1, T2 and T3). Traffic conditions warranting a traffic signal may be reduced and the Project's contribution of fair share costs of intersection improvements and roadway pavement may also be reduced. With incorporation of the measures, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

3.2.12 Land Use

3.2.12.1 No Action Alternative

Impacts

The site is classified by the CDMG as MRZ-2 (Mineral Resource Zone-2) and is designated as a Regionally Significant Construction Aggregate Resource Area. Under County zoning, the site is zoned for Heavy Manufacturing use, which allows mining pursuant to a surface mining permit. Under the No Action Alternative, the site would remain vacant, and no impacts on land use would occur.

However, under the No Action Alternative, a state-designated significant source of construction minerals would remain undeveloped. This could result in an indirect impact because a significant reduction in processing of regional reserves could have long-term regional economic implications in the failure to supply necessary aggregate products to meet the needs of the Los Angeles region.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation would be required under this alternative. The indirect impact and long-term implications of not providing aggregate products to the Los Angeles region would remain.

3.2.12.2 Reduced North Fines Storage Area Alternative Analysis

Impacts

This alternative neither reduces nor increases the impacts as identified for this resource analysis compared to the Proposed Action's Concept Plan. The impacts associated with this alternative relative to land use are the same as identified for the Proposed Action.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required as no impacts would occur, however the standard condition of approval as identified for the Proposed Action (measure LU1), also would apply to this alternative.

3.2.12.3 Batch Plant Location Alternative Analysis

Impacts

The location of the batch plant near Lang Station contains uses including industrial activity, and mining including batch plants. A batch plant placed in this location should be consistent with the County manufacturing zoning and land use designations, as well as consistent with existing uses. No impacts would result.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation would be required. The measure presenting the condition of approval of the Proposed Action (measure LU1) would also apply under this alternative. No residual impacts would result.

3.2.12.4 Addition of Water/Reclaimed Water Alternative Analysis

Impacts

Under this alternative water would be brought to the site by pipeline or by trucks. A pipeline could necessitate alignment through almost any land use and zoning designation. Pipeline approval would entail the gathering of easements through which the line would travel. As long as easements are granted, no significant impacts on land use and zoning would result. Construction of the pipeline would result in a temporary, significant impact on the construction area such as impeding access to driveways, park usage, etc. No impacts would be associated with the trucking of water to the site.

Mitigation Measures

Standard construction measures would lessen temporary impacts of pipeline construction to land users. The measure presenting the condition of approval of the Proposed Action (measure LU1) would also apply under this alternative. No residual impacts would result.

3.2.12.5 Product Transportation Alternative Analysis

Impacts

The Project would either have to acquire the land or acquire easements necessary to provide a rail spur and loading facility. The spur would be adjacent to the Santa Clara River and adjacent to SEA No. 23. The spur would be north of the river and SEA and north of the existing rail line in areas designated as M-2, (Heavy Manufacturing) and A-2-1 (Heavy Agriculture). A small portion would also go through National Forest land which accommodates a portion of the existing rail line. No land use conflicts are foreseen under this alternative. The spur would be buffered from the river and SEA by the existing rail line. Easements could be attained for the new rail spur. The other land use issues associated with the Proposed Action would also apply to this alternative.

Mitigation Measures

The measure presenting the condition of approval of the Proposed Action (measure LU1) would apply under this alternative. No residual impacts would result.

3.2.12.6 Alternative North Fines Storage Area Analysis

Impacts

The land use designation for the alternative NFSA is open space for Areas A and B, and a portion of Area C. The parcels are privately owned. The other portion of Area C is within TMC's contract area, which is designated as HM. Zoning designations for the alternative NFSA are M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) for Area C and a portion of Area B, and A-2-1 (Heavy Agriculture) for a portion of Area B and all of Area A. The Proposed Action's NFSA is contained all within the M-2 designation.

For this alternative, adjacent land use conflicts would remain the same in relation to the Bee Canyon project as those presented for the Proposed Action. Areas B and C are especially affected. According to the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (December 1990), the open space designation (Areas A and B) is considered to be lands that are primarily managed for recreation purposes and the protection of natural resources. Use of this area would require consideration by the County as to whether fines storage constitutes reasonable use.

Mitigation Measures

The measure presenting the condition of approval of the Proposed Action (measure LU1) would apply under this alternative. No residual impacts would result.

3.2.12.7 Reduced Quantity Mining Concept Alternative Analysis

Impacts

Because the Project boundary is not changed under this alternative, land use issues remain the same as those for the Proposed Action.

Mitigation Measures

The measure presenting the condition of approval of the Proposed Action (measure LU1) would apply under this alternative. No residual impacts would result.

3.2.13 Public Health and Safety

3.2.13.1 No Action Alternative

Impacts

Under the No Action Alternative, potential hazards to public health and safety associated with active mining onsite would not occur. However, potential hazards associated with the lack of fencing at the site and steep slopes of the existing quarry would remain. Impacts could be adverse but not significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation would be provided through this alternative and the adverse impacts associated with fencing would remain.

3.2.13.2 Reduced North Fines Storage Area Alternative Analysis

Impacts

This alternative neither reduces nor increases the impacts as identified for this resource analysis compared to the Proposed Action. The impacts for this alternative relative to public health and safety are the same as identified for the Proposed Action.