

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
Volume I of III	
I. SUMMARY.....	I-1
A. Introduction.....	I-1
B. Brief Summary of the Proposed Action.....	I-1
C. Location and Boundaries.....	I-2
D. Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved.....	I-2
E. Summary of Environmental Impacts.....	I-5
1. Earth.....	I-5
2. Air.....	I-15
3. Water.....	I-17
4. Plant Life.....	I-18
5. Animal Life.....	I-27
6. Jurisdictional Resources.....	I-31
7. Noise.....	I-31
8. Transportation and Circulation.....	I-34
9. Public Services.....	I-35
10. Utilities.....	I-47
11. Safety.....	I-51
12. Aesthetic Resources/View.....	I-52
13. Cultural Resources.....	I-54
F. Description of Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....	I-56
1. Alternative 1 – No Project/No Build Alternative.....	I-57
2. Alternative 2 – Alternative Site Discussion.....	I-57
3. Alternative 3 – Stoney Hill Ridge Development Only Alternative.....	I-58
4. Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	I-58
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	II-1
A. Statement of Objectives.....	II-1
B. Location and Boundaries.....	II-2
C. Project History and Background.....	II-2
D. Project Characteristics.....	II-6
III. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.....	III-1
A. Overview of Environmental Setting.....	III-1
1. Project Site and Surrounding Areas.....	III-1
2. Plans and Policies.....	III-2
B. Related Projects.....	III-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Section	Page
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS.....	IV-1
A. Earth.....	IV.A-1
B. Air Quality.....	IV.B-1
C. Water.....	IV.C-1
D. Plant Life.....	IV.D-1
E. Animal Life.....	IV.E-1
F. Noise.....	IV.F-1
G. Light*.....	IV.G-1
H. Land Use.....	IV.H-1
I. Natural Resources*.....	IV.I-1
J. Risk of Upset*.....	IV.J-1
K. Population*.....	IV.K-1
L. Housing*.....	IV.L-1
M. Right-of-Way and Access*.....	IV.M-1
N. Transportation and Circulation.....	IV.N-1
O. Public Services.....	IV.O-1
1. Fire.....	IV.O-2
2. Police.....	IV.O-21
3. Schools.....	IV.O-28
4. Park and Recreation.....	IV.O-35
5. Libraries.....	IV.O-46
P. Energy Conservation.....	IV.P-1
Q. Utilities.....	IV.Q-1
1. Power.....	IV.Q-2
2. Natural Gas.....	IV.Q-6
3. Water Distribution.....	IV.Q-10
4. Sanitary Sewers.....	IV.Q-20
5. Storm Water Drainage.....	IV.Q-28
6. Solid Waste*.....	IV.Q-29
R. Safety.....	IV.R-1
S. Aesthetic Resources/View.....	IV.S-1
T. Cultural Resources.....	IV.T-1
V. GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS.....	V-1
VI. ALTERNATIVES.....	VI-1
VII. IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE INSIGNIFICANT.....	VII-1
VIII. ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONTACTED, REFERENCES.....	VIII-1
IX. ESAC ACTION, NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND RESPONSES.....	IX-1

*Impacts determined not to be significant are addressed in this EIR under **Section VII, Impacts Determined to be Insignificant**, and have been omitted from the Impact Section of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Section

X. APPENDICES

Volume II of III

- A. Geotechnical Assessment (through Appendix E)

Volume III of III

- A. Geotechnical Assessment (from Appendix F)
- B. Air Quality Assessment Data
- C. Psomas Report
 - 1. Sewer Study
 - 2. Water Study
 - 3. Hydrology Study
- D. Biota
- E. Noise Data
- F. Traffic Analysis Report
- G. Phase I Archaeological Survey/Paleontological Records Search Results
- H. Initial Study and NOP Comment Letters

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
I-1	Project Location and Boundaries.....	I-3
II-1	Regional Location.....	II-3
II-2	Site Vicinity.....	II-4
II-3	Originally Approved Mountaingate Master Plan.....	II-7
II-4	Currently Developed Areas of the Mountaingate Community.....	II-8
II-5	Currently Developed Areas of the Mountaingate Community (with the 1990 Development Proposal).....	II-9
II-6	Second Revised VTTM 53072.....	(Map Pocket) II-10
II-7	Staging Areas for Construction Equipment.....	II-15
III-1	Location of Related Projects.....	III-5
IV.A-1	On-Site Geotechnical and Soil Information.....	IV.A-3
IV.A-2	Soil Placement Locations.....	IV.A-8
IV.A-3	Regional Fault Locations.....	IV.A-19
IV.C-1	Existing Bundy Canyon Hydrology.....	IV.C-3
IV.C-2	Proposed Hydrology and Storm Drain System.....	IV.C-10
IV.D-1	Locations of Plant Communities, Coast Live Oaks and Western Sycamores.....	IV.D-5
IV.F-1	Noise Attenuation by Barriers.....	IV.F-5
IV.F-2	Staging Areas for Construction Equipment.....	IV.F-12
IV.F-3	Noise Levels of Typical Construction Equipment	IV.F-13
IV.H-1	Plan Amendment and Zone Change Map.....	IV.H-11
IV.N-1	Location of Study Intersections.....	IV.N-5
IV.O.1-1	Location of Fire and Secondary Access Road on Landfill.....	IV.O-10
IV.O.4-1	Park and Recreation Facilities.....	IV.O-37
IV.O.4-2	Proposed Open Space.....	IV.O-44
IV.Q.3-1	Proposed Water Line System.....	IV.Q-16
IV.Q.4-1	Proposed Sanitary Sewer System.....	IV.Q-26
IV.S-1	Existing View 1: Sepulveda Pass Area.....	IV.S-7
IV.S-2	Existing View 2: Mandeville Canyon Area.....	IV.S-8

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
II-1	Land Use Characteristics.....II-11
IV.A-1	Local Fault Distance and Maximum Earthquake Magnitude.....IV.A-18
IV.B-1	Ambient Pollutant Concentrations Registered in the Northwest Coast of LA County Area.....IV.B-9
IV.B-2	Existing Carbon Monoxide Concentrations.....IV.B-10
IV.B-3	Estimated Construction Emissions.....IV.B-14
IV.B-4	Estimated Day to Day Project Emissions.....IV.B-15
IV.B-5	Predicted Future Carbon Monoxide Concentrations.....IV.B-17
IV.C-1	Existing Site Development Area Hydrology.....IV.C-2
IV.C-2	Comparison of Pre- and Post-Development Site Hydrology.....IV.C-12
IV.D-1	Plant Communities and Acreage Within the Project Site.....IV.D-3
IV.D-2	Oak Trees on the Project Site.....IV.D-12
IV.D-3	Direct Impacts to Vegetation on the Project Site.....IV.D-15
IV.F-1	Outside to Inside Noise Attenuation.....IV.F-4
IV.F-2	Los Angeles Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Exterior Noise Levels.....IV.F-6
IV.F-3	Existing Off-Site Roadway Noise Levels.....IV.F-8
IV.F-4	With Project Off-Site Roadway Noise Levels.....IV.F-11
IV.N-1	Level of Service as a Function of CMA Values.....IV.N-6
IV.N-2	Critical Movement Analysis (2000) Summary.....IV.N-6
IV.N-3	Daily Trip Generation Adjustment Factors - Residential Developments.....IV.N-9
IV.N-4	Directional Trip Distribution.....IV.N-10
IV.N-5	Related Projects Trip Generation.....IV.N-12
IV.N-6	Summary of Critical Movement Analysis - Future (2005) Traffic Conditions Without and With Project.....IV.N-14
IV.N-7	Project Freeway Volumes on San Diego Freeway.....IV.N-15
IV.N-8	Summary of Critical Movement Analysis - Future (2001) Traffic Conditions With Project Plus Mitigation.....IV.N-16
IV.O.3-1	Schools Serving the Proposed Project Area.....IV.O-28
IV.O.3-2	Increase in Student Enrollment Due to Additional Residential Units.....IV.O-32
IV.O.3-3	Cumulative Increase in Student Enrollment Due to Additional Residential Units.....IV.O-33
IV.O.4-1	Parks and Recreational Facilities Located Within a Two-Mile Radius of the Proposed Project Site.....IV.O-36
IV.O.4-2	Parkland Standards.....IV.O-40
IV.Q.1-1	Projected Electricity Consumption for the Proposed Project.....IV.Q-3
IV.Q.1-2	Projected Electricity Consumption for Cumulative Projects.....IV.Q-4
IV.Q.2-1	Projected Natural Gas Consumption for the Proposed Project.....IV.Q-7
IV.Q.2-2	Projected Natural Gas Consumption for Cumulative Projects.....IV.Q-8
IV.Q.3-1	Project-Related Water Demand.....IV.Q-17
IV.Q.3-2	Cumulative Water Demand.....IV.Q-18
IV.Q.4-1	Project-Related Wastewater Generation.....IV.Q-23
IV.Q.4-2	Cumulative Wastewater Generation.....IV.Q-25

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Draft EIR addresses education and the location of public schools and their student capacities. Where impacts are identified, mitigation measures are recommended to reduce such impacts to acceptable levels.

SCHOOLS

Environmental Setting

The proposed project site is located within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), which provides educational services for kindergarten through twelfth (K-12) grades. There are no schools within the immediate vicinity of the project site. However, the LAUSD has identified five schools within the general area that could serve the project site and the existing Mountaingate Community. **Table IV.O.3-1** lists these five schools, their capacities and their enrollment. Out of the five, three are elementary schools. These three elementary schools are Brentwood Elementary, Kenter Canyon Elementary, and Pacific Palisades Elementary. Brentwood Elementary would only be available to project residents for kindergarten level, unless students generated by the project were in the magnet program for grades 1 through 5. In addition, kindergarten through fifth grade students residing in the Mountaingate project area could attend either Kenter Canyon Elementary or Pacific Palisades Elementary. The remaining two schools are a middle school and a high school, Revere Middle School and Palisades Charter High School, respectively.

**Table IV.O.3-1
Schools Serving the Proposed Project Area**

School	Grade Level	Year-Round	Capacity	Enrollment	Percent
Kenter Canyon	K-5	YES	503	399	79
Brentwood	K-5	YES	1,190	1,211	101
Pacific Palisades	K-5	YES	510	418	82
Revere	6-8	YES	2,174	1,446	67
Palisades Charter	9-12	YES	2,246	2,083	93

Source: Los Angeles Unified School District, March 2000.

In order to relieve overcrowding problems and increase enrollment capacity, some schools in LAUSD have adopted a year-round calendar. All five schools serving the project area have adopted a year-round calendar program.

Table IV.O.3-1 presents the current capacity and 1999/2000 academic year enrollment figures for each school. Enrollment is based on “R-3” enrollment, rather than the “actual” enrollment. R-3 enrollment represents the number of students residing within the attendance area of a district school, including students who travel out of the attendance area for any reason, with the exception of the magnet program and self-contained Special Education Centers. Unlike actual enrollment, R-3 enrollment accounts for students that cannot be accommodated at local schools due to overcrowding. As shown, schools serving the project area have capacity, except Brentwood, to accommodate increased student enrollment. The elementary schools serving the project area (i.e., Kenter Canyon, Brentwood and Pacific Palisades) are operating at 79, 101 and 89 percent capacity respectively, with enrollment space for 175 additional students. The middle school serving the area is operating at 67 percent capacity with enrollment space for 728 additional students. In addition, the high school serving the project area is operating at 93 percent capacity with enrollment space for 163 additional students. Overall, there is a total availability of approximately 1066 enrollment spaces for additional students in all schools, except Brentwood Science Magnet (elementary), which is currently operating at capacity.

School Facilities and Funding

In August 1998, the Governor signed into law the Leroy F. Green School Facilities Act of 1998, Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), which imposed the most significant school facilities finance and developer fee reform since the adoption of the 1986 School Facilities Act. On November 3, 1998, voters approved Proposition 1A bond, which provides \$9.2 billion funding for SB 50. The passage of Proposition 1A has triggered a substantial change in the way local agencies can mitigate school impacts.

SB 50 provides that real estate developers can be required to pay part or all of the cost of school facilities construction. SB 50 includes funding for K-12 facilities, modernization of older schools, additional funding for districts in hardship situations, and funding for class size reduction. The basic structure of the new law entails a 50/50 state and local school facilities funding match, hardship funds for school districts that cannot achieve 50 percent locally, the ability for school districts to collect up to 50 percent from developers if the district can meet the 50 percent match threshold, and the ability of school districts to collect up to 100 percent from the developers if the state fails to provide their 50 percent bond funding match.

With regard to developer mitigation fee obligations, SB 50 allows school districts to impose a base maximum fee of \$1.93 per square foot of new residential construction and \$0.31 per square foot of new commercial/industrial construction. SB 50 makes additional provisions to agreements existing under current law setting forth the types of development to which it will apply. SB 50 fee limitations are inapplicable to contracts or agreements entered into between a subdivider or builder and a school district executed on or before January 1, 1987.

A school district may, however, impose an alternative fee under SB 50 if: it adopts a school facilities needs analysis; applies to the State Allocation Board (SAB) and is eligible to take part in the school financing program; and prior to January 1, 2000 meets at least one of four requirements, or after January 1, 2000 meets at least two of four requirements. The four requirements are: (a) a substantial enrollment of district pupils in a multi-track year-round schedule; (b) during the prior four years placement of local general obligation bond for school facilities on the ballot which receives at least 50 percent plus one of the votes cast; (c) issuance of debt or incurring obligations in an amount equivalent to 15 percent of the district's local bonding capacity (30 percent if landowner initiated a Mello-Roos Community Facility Districts established after November 4, 1998 are included); and (d) use of at least 20 percent of the teaching spaces in relocatable classrooms.

The amount of such alternative fees would provide the 50 percent of the cost of funding of school facilities construction not provided by the state, less the amount of any local funds that are contributed. The alternative fee may be increased and supplemental fee charged if, in the future, state funds for new construction are not available. In addition, SB 50 suspends the rulings in the Mira, Hart and Murrietta court cases for an initial period of eight years, and limitations on developer exactions for school mitigation purposes. This means that local agencies are prohibited from denying land use approvals on the basis of school adequacy as of November 4, 1998.

The Los Angeles Unified School District prepared a School Facilities Fee Plan in February 1998, documenting the justification for School Impact Fees charged by the District. According to calculations within the LAUSD School Facilities Fee Plan, the unfunded cost per student within the District is \$22,844.¹

¹ Los Angeles Unified School District, School Facilities Fee Plan, Documentation of Justification for School Impact Fees, p. 6-4, prepared by Schoolhouse Services, San Mateo, CA, February 24, 1998.

Environmental Impact Analysis

Thresholds of Significance

The L.A. CEQA *Thresholds Guide* indicates that the determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors:²

- The population increase resulting from the proposed project, based on the increase in residential units or square footage of non-residential floor area;
- The demand for school services anticipated at the time of project buildout compared to the expected level of service available. Consider as applicable, scheduled improvements to LAUSD services (facilities, equipment and personnel) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand;
- Whether (and the degree to which) accommodation of the increased demand would require construction of new facilities, a major re-organization of students or classrooms, major revisions to the school calendar (such as year round sessions), or other actions which would create a temporary or permanent impact on the school (s); and
- Whether the project includes features that would reduce the demand for school services (e.g., on-site school facilities or direct support to LAUSD).

Based on the above, and for the purposes of this analysis, the proposed project would result in a significant impact upon school services if any of the following situations occurs:

- 1) The project would put additional demand on a school district which is currently overcrowded and for which monetary mitigation measures, as allowed by state law, would not reduce the impacts to below a level of significance, and/or
- 2) The project would substantially interfere with operations of an existing school facility.

Project Impacts

The project consists of a proposal to develop 29 homes. Numerical estimates of the students generated by the proposed project were calculated using LAUSD Student Generation Factors that give the number of new students per new residential unit. Student generation rates used for this analysis were conservative, and included 0.4, 0.2 and 0.27, respectively, for elementary, middle and high school children from the 29 single-family residences.

² L.A. CEQA *Thresholds Guide*, City of Los Angeles, Environmental Affairs Department, May 14, 1998. p. J.3-3.

Table IV.O.3-2 shows the estimated increase in student enrollment as a result of the addition of new residents. As presented in the table, the 29 single-family homes would increase enrollment by 12 students at the elementary school level, six at the middle school level and eight at the high school level, for a total of 26 students.

**Table IV.O.3-2
Increase in Student Enrollment Due to Additional Residential Units**

Residential Development	No. of Units	No. of Elementary Students	No. of Middle School Students	No. of High School Students	Total No. of Students
Estate Lots	29	12	6	8	26
Total Development	29	12	6	8	26

Source: LAUSD Student Generation Factors

Overall, the 12 students generated at the elementary school level could be accommodated by Kenter Canyon and Pacific Palisades Elementary Schools, which have a combined 175 enrollment spaces available. However, additional enrollment spaces at the kindergarten level, and the magnet program, would not be available at Brentwood Elementary. The six students generated at the middle school level would be accommodated by Revere, which has 728 enrollment spaces available, while the eight students generated at the high school would be accommodated by Palisades Charter, which has 163 enrollment spaces available. All the schools in the project area, except Brentwood Science Magnet (elementary), have sufficient capacity to accommodate project-generated students. In addition, the proposed project will be required to comply with the LAUSD's School Facilities Fee Plan. As such, impacts to schools as a result of the development of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The related project listed in **Section III** includes 286 single-family homes located east of the intersection of Bel Air Crest and Sepulveda Boulevard. Currently, 35 units out of the 286 units are not occupied. An additional 412 units are planned to the south of the project along the I-405 corridor. Implementation of the proposed project and other projects in the general vicinity would cumulatively increase student enrollment in the schools within the project area. **Table IV.O.3-3** shows the cumulative increase in student enrollment as a result of the implementation of the proposed project along with other known approved and related projects.

**Table IV.O.3-3
Cumulative Increase in Student Enrollment Due to Additional Residential Units**

Residential Development	No. of Units	No. of Elementary Students	No. of Middle School Students	No. of High School Students	Total No. of Students
Mountaingate	29	12	6	8	26
Bel Air Crest	35	14	7	10	31
Other Known Development	412	165	82	111	358
Cumulative Enrollment	476	191	95	129	415

Source: LAUSD Student Generation Factors

As shown in the table, the total number of new students as a result of implementation of related projects would be 415. As previously stated, most of the schools in the project's vicinity are operating below capacity, and there is a total availability of approximately 175 enrollment spaces at the elementary, 728 enrollment spaces at the middle, and 163 enrollment spaces at the high school level available to accommodate additional students. As shown in the table, there is sufficient capacity to handle students generated by cumulative development only at the middle and high school level. Insufficient capacity exists at the elementary school level.

However, all cumulative projects are required to comply with the LAUSD's School Facilities Fee Plan. Moreover, funding is currently available from statewide school bonds as a result of the passage of Proposition 1A on November 4, 1998. The current bond provides 9.2 billion dollars, over the next four years, to help fund public school facility needs. Specifically, the bond funds are to provide 2.9 million dollars for new construction and 2.1 million dollars for reconstruction/modernization needs. With the passage of Proposition 1A, payment of school impact fees consistent with the LAUSD School Facilities Fee Plan represents full and complete mitigation for the cumulative impact on schools according to California Government Code Section 65996. As such, impacts to local public schools by the related project would not be cumulatively considerable and so would not be significant.

Mitigation Measures

The preceding analysis indicates that the proposed project's impact on LAUSD schools would be less than significant. However, the project would be subject to the provisions of the LAUSD's Facilities Fee Plan, per the provisions of the Leroy F. Green School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB 50). As previously discussed, the applicant shall pay the necessary school impact fees.

Adverse Impacts

With compliance with LAUSD's School Facilities Fee Plan, implementation of the proposed project would not result in an impact to schools nor result in a cumulatively considerable impact to LAUSD schools. Therefore, no unmitigated significant impacts would result from the proposed project.