

# 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

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
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
<a href="#">IV.Q.3-1</a>	<a href="#">Project-Related Water Demand.....</a>	<a href="#">IV.Q-17</a>
<a href="#">IV.Q.3-2</a>	<a href="#">Cumulative Water Demand.....</a>	<a href="#">IV.Q-18</a>
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 discusses water distribution within the project area. This section analyzes the proposed project's impact on the ability of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) to meet project demands.

### WATER DISTRIBUTION

#### Environmental Setting

##### *Regional Water Supply*

Delivery of adequate water supplies to the desert and semi-desert environments of Southern California has been a central issue to the area for more than 200 years. Over that time, increasingly sophisticated water delivery systems have been developed, together with the wholesale, retail and regulatory agencies necessary to ensure reliable supplies of quality water to accommodate the demands of a growing region. The population of the City of Los Angeles, for instance, has grown substantially during this period, along with the City's demand for water. In 1900, the population of the City's population was 100,000 and water use amounted to 30,000 acre-feet per year (AF/yr). By 1920, the population of Los Angeles had grown to 600,000, and the average water use was 160,000 AF/yr. Population growth continued at a moderate rate until the end of World War II, when population began to increase rapidly. By 1970, the population of the City had grown to 2.8 million, demanding 570,000 AF/yr of water. In the year 2000, the population was approximately 3.7 million and the City's average annual total water use was approximately 622,600 AF/yr.<sup>1</sup>

In 1990, a total of approximately eight million acre-feet (MAF) of water was distributed by water agencies to meet demand in the Southern California region (with the exception of San Diego County). The City of Los Angeles received approximately 87 percent of this regional water total.

Local sources of water, consisting of surface water, groundwater, and reclaimed water accounted for 23 percent of the total regional water supply in 1990. Local water sources are fully developed and are

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power 1999-2000 Annual Report.

expected to remain relatively stable in future, with the exception of reclaimed water use which will probably be more heavily utilized. The remaining 77 percent of the regional water supply was imported from outside the region and consisted of water from the State Water Project (SWP), the Colorado River, and the Los Angeles Aqueduct. The continued availability of these sources is uncertain at current levels. The planned enlargement of the East Branch of the California Aqueduct will facilitate an eight percent increase in maximum yield from the SWP system. However, dependable yield from the SWP is expected to decrease slightly over time due to growing environmental concerns with the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Delta, increased water use in areas of origin in northern California, and increases in Central Valley project contractual obligations. Additionally, the amount of water that California imports from the Colorado River, through annual over-appointment, is expected to decline substantially in the near future, with increasing demand for water from Arizona and Nevada. Also, the quality of the local water supply (e.g., contamination of surface and overdraft water, and increasing salinity and levels of nitrates and fertilizer residues) is of concern.

### ***Local Water Supply and Demand***

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) has complete charge and control of its distribution system inside the City of Los Angeles under the provisions of the City Charter. The DWP's Water Operating Division, under authority extended by the Board of Water and Power Commissioners, owns, operates and maintains all water facilities within the City. The DWP is responsible for supplying water to the proposed project site. The DWP is also responsible for ensuring that the delivered water meets all applicable state quality standards.

According to the DWP, the total gross supply of water is 218.9 billion gallons. Of this total, 95.5 billion gallons comes from the aqueduct, 80.3 billion gallons comes from the MWD and 43.1 billion gallons comes from groundwater sources.<sup>2</sup>

According to DWP, there are adequate supplies available to serve City needs over the next two decades. Imported water is forecasted to remain as the City's primary water resource that would account for over 75 percent of the City's water supply in 2020. When compared to the forecasted water demand for the year 2020 of 233± billion gallons (715,000 acre-feet), adequate water supplies exist to meet the forecasted demand for water.

---

<sup>2</sup> Taken from the DWP website, [www.ladwp.com](http://www.ladwp.com)

**Local Water Conservation**

In recent years, conservation has become an important element of the water supply system. In order to reduce the impact of potential supply deficiencies, the Los Angeles City Council has enacted ordinances mandating measures to reduce water consumption. Ordinance Nos. 163,532 and 164,093, enacted in 1988, require new buildings to install all low-flush toilets and urinals (1.5 gallons per flush) in order to obtain building permits. In addition, Title 20 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 1604 (g) establishes efficiency standards (i.e., maximum flow rates) for all new showerheads, lavatory faucets and sink faucets, and Section 1606 (a) prohibits the sale of fixtures that do not comply with the regulations. Ordinance No. 170,978 also contains provisions requiring xerophytic or low water consumption landscaping.

The DWP distributes reclaimed water, when and where available, within the City. However, there is no reclaimed water available in the vicinity of the proposed tract development, and there is no plan for future distribution in the area. Reclaimed water is available near its sources: the Sepulveda Basin Sewage Treatment Plant and the Hyperion Sewage Treatment Plant. These sources are too distant to be useful for this tract development.

**Local Water Distribution**

The water distribution system within the City is divided into service zones. The various service zones are established to distribute water to as large an area as possible at pressures that range from 45 pounds per square inch (psi) to 80 psi. Pressures less than 45 psi require special agreements and hydropneumatic pumps and tank systems for each lot. Pressure regulators are required for each lot when pressures exceed 80 psi. The various service zones are supplied by gravity, reservoir or hilltop tanks, and supply pumps.

Water services to the proposed development will be provided by the City’s 1636 service zone. The 1636 service zone consists of two pump stations, two storage tanks, connecting trunk mains, and an assortment of distribution mains. Immediately adjacent to the south end of the proposed development area is one of the storage tanks. This tank, the Mountaingate Tank, can be described as follows:

High Water	Elevation 1629
Outlet	Elevation 1601
Capacity	3.3 Million Gallons
Type	Welded Steel
Put in Service	September 1983



Important operational features of the 1636 service zone can be summarized as follows:

Maximum Water Elevation	1,700 feet
Minimum Water Elevation	1,610 feet

The maximum water elevation is based on the pumps supplying water to the tanks, and it dictates the use of pressure regulators on individual lots. The minimum water elevations allow for fire storage in the tank. Fire storage is normally the bottom one-third of mountain storage tanks. With a capacity of 3.3 million gallons, the Mountaingate Tank provides 1.1 million gallons of water to be used only for fire fighting purposes.

Water is supplied to and distributed from the Mountaingate Tank by a 24-inch diameter steel trunk line. This trunk main connects the pump stations and the second storage tank in the service zone providing a loop system.

### **Regulatory Setting**

In 1995, the State legislature passed, and Governor Wilson signed into law SB 901 now codified as Part 2.10 of the California Water Code. This bill requires that environmental impact reports for certain development projects address the availability of water for the project. SB 901 is applicable when a Notice of Preparation is filed after January 1, 1996 for projects which require the adoption of a specific plan and/or “an amendment to, or revision of, the land use element of a general plan, or a specific plan, that will result in a net increase in the stated population density or building intensity to provide for additional development.” A Notice of Preparation for the proposed project was filed with the State of California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research on March 20, 2000. The project would result in a net increase in population density and an amendment to Brentwood Pacific-Palisades Community Plan (a part of the City of Los Angeles *General Plan*). Therefore, this project is subject to the requirements of SB 901. As a result, the analysis contained in this EIR is based on the requirements of SB 901 as a means of analyzing the impact of this project on local and regional water supplies.

## Environmental Impact Analysis

### *Threshold of Significance*

The L.A. CEQA *Thresholds Guide* indicates that the determination of a project's significance to water resources shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering:

- The total estimated water demand for the proposed project.
- Whether sufficient capacity exists in the water infrastructure that would serve the project, taking into account the anticipated conditions at project build-out.
- The amount by which the project would cause the projected growth in population, housing or employment for the Community Plan area to be exceeded in the year of the project completion; and
- The degree to which scheduled water infrastructure improvements or project design features would reduce or offset service impacts.<sup>3</sup>

As proposed, the implementation of the proposed project would require water service for construction, operation of the proposed uses, and for fire protection of these uses. For purposes of this EIR, the proposed project would have a significant impact on water resources if it results in any of the following situations:

- Inadequate water supplies to meet domestic and/or fire flow requirements;
- Inadequate capacity in water system, thereby requiring the need for major alterations to the existing system.

### *Project Impacts*

Project-related water demand can be estimated by applying consumption factors to the proposed land uses. Residential use consumption factors are derived from and based on data prepared by Psomas in September 2002 in a Water Study for the proposed project, as well as information taken from the DWP website.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> L.A. CEQA *Thresholds Guide*, City of Los Angeles, Environmental Affairs Department, May 14, 1998, p. K.1-3.

<sup>4</sup> Water Study for the Mountaingate Project, prepared by Psomas, September 2002 found in **Appendix C1**.

### **Planned Improvements**

The project site is currently undeveloped, and no on-site water service exists. As part of project implementation, the 24-inch steel trunk main connecting the Mountaingate Tank would be relocated to the continuation of Canyonback Road within the project site. At this time, the DWP has not indicated an allowable down time for this trunk main. The adjacent Mountaingate tract homes and golf courses would continue to be served by the second 1636 service zone tank during the planned relocation. Water would be distributed through the existing water system to a point of connection at the south end of Stoney Hill Road. It is anticipated that an eight-inch steel main would be installed in Stoney Hill Road. This installation will create a long dead-end main. These improvements are illustrated in **Figure IV.Q.3-1**, and would be implemented subject to the review and approval of the DWP. While the LAFD has not conditioned the Tentative Map at this time, it is certain that there is enough fire flow capacity to meet City requirements.

In a correspondence dated September 19, 2000 the DWP sets the conditions under which water can be provided to the project site. The letter states that all lots above elevation 1490 feet would require individually installed hydropneumatic pump and tank systems. Also, all lots above elevation 1506 feet would require oversized plumbing in accordance with the Los Angeles Plumbing Code. The letter goes on to define the location of individual pressure regulators, fire hydrants and easements. When adequate drawings are prepared for the above-mentioned main relocations, main installations, fire hydrants and services, a financial agreement can be completed with the project applicant. Included in the financial agreement will be an acreage supply charge so the project can pay its share of the existing service zone facilities. Upon conclusion of all financial arrangements, the final Tract Map will be released for recordation.

### **Project Construction**

Construction of the proposed project is estimated to result in the consumption of approximately 250,000 gallons per day (gpd) of water, as shown in **Table IV.Q.3-1**. This water will be used as a dust palliative and used to moisten the fill dirt to achieve the required compaction during the extent of all grading and excavation activities.<sup>5</sup> Construction activity is temporary in nature, and water consumption would cease after the project construction phase. During construction, the existing pipelines within the pressure zone would be tapped into for use after consultation with DWP. This would not adversely affect the existing DWP service pipelines. As previously mentioned, there is adequate water supply (218.9 billion gallons or

---

<sup>5</sup> Bill Bates, Mesa Contracting Corporation, December 2001.

**Figure IV.Q.3-1**  
**Proposed Water Line System**

669,260 acre-feet) to meet current and future growth in the City of Los Angeles. The existing water distribution network is capable of supplying all water needed for construction. Based on the above, construction water consumption is not a significant impact.

### Project Operation

Operation of the proposed project would consume a total of 11,484 GPD, as shown in **Table IV.Q.3-1**. In addition, irrigation of common areas, fill slopes and cut slopes, comprising approximately five acres, would require approximately 3,650 gallons per day per acre. It is anticipated that the project will consume a total of 18,250 gpd for landscape irrigation. In summary, the project would consume 29,734 gpd.

**Table IV.Q.3-1  
Project-Related Water Demand**

Land Use	Number of Units	Demand Factor (Gallons Per Day)	Gallons Per Day
Residential	29	396	11,484
Construction	-	250,000	250,000
Irrigation	5 Acres	3,650	18,250

Source: Psomas Water Study for the Mountaingate Project, September 2002.

The DWP has indicated that, in terms of the City's overall water supply condition, the water requirement for any project that is consistent with the City's *General Plan* has been taken into account in the growth of the City's water system. The project's water demand would, therefore, be met by the planned growth of the water system. This project's future daily water consumption would be approximately 29,734 gpd and is a small part of the water demand by the general population of the City of Los Angeles. The City of Los Angeles has adequate water supply (i.e., 218.9 billion gallons) to meet an estimated demand of approximately 29,734 gpd (33.72 AF/yr). The project-generated water demand of 29,734 gpd would be approximately 0.00001 percent of the available water supply. Therefore, there is adequate water to meet the project's water demand and fire-flow requirements, and no significant impacts to water supply are expected.

## Cumulative Impacts

Development of the proposed project, along with other related projects within the project area, would increase development intensity and water demand. As shown in Table IV.Q.3-2, build-out of these cumulative projects would increase water demand by an estimated 220,731 gallons per day.

**Table IV.Q.3-2  
Cumulative Water Demand**

Use	Amount	Consumption Rate (gallons/unit/day)	Demand (gallons/day)
Residential	476 du	396	188,496
Office	48,000 sq.ft.	150 (sq.ft.)	7,200
Restaurant	26,544 sq.ft.	800 (sq.ft)	21,235
Commercial/Retail	47,499 sq.ft.	80 (sq.ft.)	3,800
<b>TOTAL</b>	NA	NA	<b>220,731</b>

*Source: Psomas Water Study for the Mountaingate Project, September 2002.*

According to growth projections in the Los Angeles General Plan Framework, the existing supply of water will be adequate to accommodate growth based on the theoretical capacity of the existing general plan, including the Brentwood-Pacific-Palisades Plan Area, to the year 2010. The DWP is equipped to provide water service to meet the cumulative demand for water. This growth in consumption is less than significant since the demand has been incorporated into DWP's long-range plans for regional growth. Furthermore, in meeting the City's water conservation requirements, cumulative impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. As such, impacts to water by the proposed project and the related project would not result in a significant impact.

## Mitigation Measures

Although, the proposed project would not result in significant water supply or service impacts under water, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

1. The proposed project shall comply with the City-mandated water conservation program. Water used for landscaping purposes shall be reduced through implementation of Landscape Ordinance No. 170,978.

2. Water distribution system improvements shall be provided to the satisfaction of the DWP and the Advisory Agency in accordance with a City-approved and signed street improvement plan.
3. Installation of water softening or conditioning appliances shall be provided in accordance with City of Los Angeles Health and Safety Code Section 116785, which requires such appliances be accompanied by water conservation devices.
4. Water pressure greater than 80 psi shall be reduced to 80 psi or less by means of a pressure-reducing valve. This affects all lots below elevation 1,515 feet.
5. Plumbing on lots above elevation 1,506 feet must be sized for a minimum pressure range of 30 to 45 psi in accordance with the L.A. City Plumbing Code.
6. Lawn areas, including dichondra, shall be required to be separated from planting areas in the irrigation system for commonly owned areas.
7. Mulch shall be utilized in commonly owned areas wherever possible.
8. A manual shall be provided each home, upon initial occupancy to advise the residents as to the appropriate use of water resources in the area, and appropriate types of landscaping.

### **Adverse Effects**

The proposed project would not create additional water service demand in the Mountaingate area. Therefore, no adverse impacts would result.