

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 discusses sanitary sewers within the project area. This section analyzes the proposed project's impact on the ability of the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works to meet project demands.

SANITARY SEWERS

Environmental Setting

Treatment Facilities

Wastewater from the project area is treated at the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) located in the Playa del Rey section of the City of Los Angeles, southwest of the Los Angeles International Airport. The HTP treats wastewater from almost all of the City of Los Angeles as well as seven contract cities (Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, Burbank, Culver City, El Segundo, Glendale, San Fernando) unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County, and 29 contract agencies. These neighboring cities and agencies are under contract with the City of Los Angeles to participate in the cost of having their wastewater treated at the City's facilities.

The HTP became fully operational in 1950, with an initial design volume of approximately 320 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater. The HTP presently treats more than 430 MGD of effluent flow to primary treatment standards and has a design capacity to treat approximately 480 MGD under current operating conditions. Approximately 190 MGD of the wastewater receives secondary treatment. Although the HTP has three ocean outfalls, only one is used on a regular basis. Primary and secondary effluents are mixed and discharged through the HTP's one-mile outfall. The HTP's one-mile outfall is maintained on a stand-by basis and used only during emergency conditions. Until 1987, a seven-mile outfall was also used for sludge disposal. Solids generated by the HTP are currently managed in the following manner: Hyperion Energy Recovery System – 20 percent; land application – 40 percent; chemical fixation – 40 percent. Methane gas is collected and treated within the HTP and used as a fuel source within the solids and handling process.

The HTP service area also encompasses two inland reclamation plants, the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant (LAGWRP) and the Tilman Water Reclamation Plant (TWRP). Both plants were constructed to treat wastewater, which otherwise will not reach the HTP without the construction of additional outfall relief sewers. LAGWRP was completed in 1976, and is capable of processing 20 MGD of wastewater. TWRP became operational in 1985, and was designed to process 40 MGD of wastewater. An expansion of TWRP was completed in October 1991, which increased its current capacity to 80 MGD.¹ Currently, the Hyperion Treatment System (including LAGWRP and TWRP) has the capacity to treat 520 MGD.

There are about 6,500 linear miles of mainline sewers in the HTP Service Area. Five major sewers collect and convey wastewater to the HTP. The majority of the wastewater system is completely separate from the stormwater collection system. However, flows from selected storm drains are being diverted to HTP for treatment in order to keep beaches and the Santa Monica Bay as clean as possible. Most of the daily flow receiving secondary treatment is discharged deep into Santa Monica Bay through a five-mile long submerged pipeline. Approximately 10 percent of the effluent is recycled for process and irrigation uses within HTP. Another 60 mgd is planned for dumping to the West Basin Municipal Water District recycled water treatment plant in El Segundo, where it will be marketed for various reuse projects throughout the South Bay region.

Recent sewage spills in the Ballona Creek area near the HTP can be attributed to a lack of backup power at pumping stations. These spills have contributed to pollution problems in the Santa Monica Bay. With completion of improvements at the Hyperion Treatment System, it is anticipated that the system will have adequate treatment capacity to handle planned growth through the year 2010. The improvements would provide a significant improvement in the quality of discharges into the Santa Monica Bay. These improvements include additions, repairs and replacements of sewer lines and pumping stations that make up a large part of the collection system. The improvements were implemented to prevent overflows and to ensure the reliable transport of wastewater to the treatment plants.

Collection Facilities

The project site is undeveloped and so there is no sewer infrastructure on site. The local sewer infrastructure currently existing within the immediate vicinity of the project site includes an 18-inch trunk main in Sepulveda Boulevard. There are eight-inch lines existing in Canyonback Road and Stoney Hill Road, which are part of the existing Mountaingate Community. These lines connect to an existing

¹ Personal Communication with Bob Birk, Division Manager of Tillman Water Reclamation Plan, December 18, 2001.

18-inch main in Sepulveda Boulevard. According to the Infrastructure Study,² the trunk sewer capacity in the area is adequate, and there are no sewer capacity problems.

The Department of Public Works requires that new development sewer systems connect to the City's existing sewer system. Any developer constructing a new sewer line would have to coordinate the construction and dedication of any such sewer with the Department of Public Works for future operation and maintenance. It would then be the responsibility of the Department of Public Works to upgrade the wastewater collection and treatment systems by providing relief for existing trunk lines nearing capacity and expanding treatment facilities.

Environmental Impact Analysis

Threshold of Significance

The L.A. CEQA *Thresholds Guide* indicates that a project would normally have a wastewater impact if:

- The project would cause measurable increase in wastewater flows at a point where, and at a time when, a sewer's capacity is already constrained or that would cause a sewer's capacity to become constrained; or
- The project's additional wastewater flows would substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in the Wastewater Facilities Plan or *General Plan* and its elements.³

Project implementation would generate wastewater from the proposed uses. The wastewater generated from the proposed project would be collected by the City's existing and proposed collection system, and treated by the Hyperion Treatment System. For purposes of this EIR, the proposed project would have a significant impact on wastewater disposal if it results in any of the following situations:

- Existing sewer lines that do not have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project; and/or
- Existing public or private sewage treatment facilities do not have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project.

² Mountaingate *Hydrology Study*, **Appendix C3**, November 2002.

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

Project Impacts

Project Construction

Construction contractors for the project would provide portable, on-site sanitation facilities that would be serviced at approved disposal facilities and/or treatment plants. The amount of construction-related wastewater that would be generated is not anticipated to have a significant impact on wastewater disposal and treatment facilities due to the temporary nature of construction and expected low volumes of wastes. Construction of the proposed project would not impact sewer services to any off-site or adjacent uses, since the site is vacant. As a result, construction impacts are considered less than significant.

Project Operation

Wastewater Treatment

Upon construction and occupancy of the proposed 29 new homes, the project site would generate approximately 9,570 gallons per day (gpd) of sewage, as shown in **Table IV.Q.4-1**. Recent studies by the Department of Public Work's Bureau of Sanitation have found that there has been a successful use of residential water conservation devices. Over the past five to 10 years, the residential generation factor has been reduced. Project sewer generation calculations are conservative and do not reflect the latest water conservation measures such as low-flush toilets, which would be incorporated into the design of the proposed project, thereby reducing sewer generated by the proposed project.

**Table IV.Q.4-1
Project-Related Wastewater Generation**

Land Use	Number of Units	Generation Factor (Gallons Per Day)	Gallons Per Day
Residential	29	330	9,570

Source: Psomas Sewer Study for the Mountaingate Project (Appendix C1), September 2002.

The 9,570 gpd that the proposed project would generate would represent approximately 0.002 percent increase in the 430 MGD that is currently treated by the HTP. This minimal increase would not adversely

affect HTP treatment capacity, given the completion of recent improvements to the system. As such impacts by the proposed project to the wastewater treatment facilities are not significant.

Collection Facilities

The project's sewer system would connect to the existing sewer mains in the Mountaingate area, as shown in **Figure IV.Q.4-1**. Based on the infrastructure study prepared for this project, these facilities have adequate capacity to service the proposed project. As part of project implementation, the project applicant will be required by the City to pay sewage connection fees, based on the number of plumbing fixtures associated with the proposed project. The sewers, laterals and pump stations required to collect wastewater within the tract will be developer-installed. When detailed drawings are prepared for the tracts, lots, roadways, sewers, services and pump station, financial agreements can be completed between the City and the Developer. Included in the financial agreement will be sewage facility charges that allow the project to pay its share of the cost of treatment facilities.

According to the Hydrology Study, the project's wastewater would require two separate connections to the existing sewage system as shown in **Figure IV.Q.4-1**. Canyonback Road would gravity-flow through an six-inch main to an existing main. Stoney Hill Road would require a gravity collection main that flows to a pump station. The pump station would then pump the wastewater northerly to the existing sewer main in Stoney Hill Road. The wastewater would then flow along with a portion of the existing Mountaingate sewage in an eight-inch main to the 18-inch trunk main in Sepulveda Boulevard. All local collector sewer lines within the project boundaries would be constructed to the standards set forth by the Department of Public Works, and will be sized to accommodate sewage flows generated at project build-out. With construction of these connection lines, and payment of required connection fees, no significant impact to the wastewater collection system will occur as a result of the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts

Development of the proposed project, along with other related approved and pending projects within the project area, would increase development intensity and wastewater generation. As shown below in **Table IV.Q.4-2**, build-out of these cumulative projects would increase wastewater generation by an estimated 189,315 gallons per day.

Several improvements to the HTP system have recently been completed, that have allowed the system to treat increased wastewater flows. In addition, each new development within the City of Los Angeles is required to comply with the City's water conservation ordinances and other regulations pertaining to

sewer collection and disposal. As such, impacts by the proposed project and the identified related project in Section III, General Description of Environmental Setting, of this EIR are not expected to be cumulatively considerable and so are not to be significant by this EIR.

**Table IV.Q.4-2
Cumulative Wastewater Generation**

Use	Amount	Generation Rate (gallons/day/unit)	Total (gallons/day)
Residential	476 du	330/unit	157,080
Office	48,000 sq.ft.	150/1000 sq.ft.	7,200
Restaurant	26,544 sq.ft.	800/1000 sq.ft.	21,235
Commercial/Retail	47,499 sq.ft.	80/1000 sq.ft.	3,7800
TOTAL	NA	NA	189,315

Source: Psomas Sewer Study for the Mountaingate Project (*Appendix C1*), September 2002.

Mitigation Measures

Although no significant impacts to sewer is anticipated to result with implementation of the proposed project, the following standard mitigation measures are recommended to further reduce the projects contribution to sewage flow.

1. The installation of low-flush toilets, low-flow showers and faucets, designed to reduce water consumption, is now required by Los Angeles Municipal Codes. Project applicant compliance with Los Angeles Municipal Code requirements shall serve to reduce sewage impacts on HTP.
2. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the City's Water Conservation Ordinance No. 163532.
3. The applicant shall comply with Section 64.11.2 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, which requires the payment of a Sewer Facilities Charge deposit prior to the recordation of the Final Tract Map.

Figure IV.Q.4-1
Proposed Sanitary Sewer System

Adverse Effects

Adequate trunk-sewer capacity is available for the proposed project. Following implementation of all recommended mitigation measures and standard code requirements, no significant adverse environmental impacts would result for sewage. The treatment facility at HTP would adequately process the anticipated cumulative wastewater generated by the Mountaingate project.