

# 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

## VII. IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE INSIGNIFICANT

---

### INTRODUCTION

This section of the EIR provides information regarding impacts that were determined to be insignificant by the Environmental Staff Advisory Committee (ESAC), during the project scoping review process, pursuant to Section 15128 of the State CEQA *Guidelines*, as amended. According to the *Guidelines*, “an EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR....”

The following presents a brief summary of the effects found not to be significant, including the reasons why they would not be significant.

### LIGHT AND GLARE

The project site is currently vacant with no light sources emanating from the property. Development of the project would introduce new sources of light and glare from the project site and add to the nighttime lighting in the project vicinity. Specific sources of light and glare from the project site upon project completion would be generated from outdoor lighting from homes to improve security, street lighting, and from the interior light sources of buildings occupied at night. Other sources of light and glare would be from headlights of vehicles on Stoney Hill Road and Canyon Back Road, vehicles that turn into and out of the project site, and vehicles as they move within the site. The proposed project would be contiguous with the existing Mountaingate Community, which has internal and external night and day illumination already in place. The proposed project’s lighting system would be designed to blend with the system already in place within the existing Mountaingate Community, and would comply with all applicable City codes and regulations pertaining to illumination.

It should however, be noted that nighttime illumination is known to adversely impact animals in natural areas. The proposed project’s impacts to animals including nighttime illumination, has been addressed in this **Section IV.E, Animal Life**, of this Draft EIR, which includes mitigation measures that would reduce such impacts to less than significant levels. Based on the above information, impacts under this category are considered less than significant and no further study is required.

## NATURAL RESOURCES

Project implementation would involve the use of non-renewable natural resources such as petroleum resources, for gasoline/diesel fuel, and electricity, during and after construction. At the present time, and in the foreseeable future, petroleum resources are readily available commercially and the project is not anticipated to result in a significant impact on these resources. Further, the Uniform Building Code (UBC) requires all new buildings to meet energy efficiency standards. The proposed project would comply with all applicable City codes and regulations regarding energy conservation, including the requirements of the UBC. Consequently, impacts under this category are considered less than significant.

## RISK OF UPSET

The proposed project, as a residential development, does not have the potential to create health hazards, because it does not include uses that would require the use, storage and transport of hazardous material, waste or similar material. No manufacturing or industrial processes which utilize or produce dangerous substances are associated with the project. Surrounding land uses consist primarily of open space, a golf course, residential uses, and a closed landfill known as the Mission Canyon 8 Landfill. Potential environmental impacts associated with the proximity of the closed landfill to the proposed project have been analyzed under **Section IV.R, Safety**, of this Draft EIR, which concluded that there would be no adverse impacts relating to safety. Therefore, neither the proposed project nor any of the surrounding land uses to the project site is considered to represent a potential health hazard. Further, impacts associated with the proposed project's location in a designated mountain fire district have been addressed under **Section IV.O.1, Fire**, of this Draft EIR, which includes mitigation measures that would reduce any impacts relating to fire hazards to less than significant levels. As a result, impacts under this category are considered to be less than significant.

## POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT

The proposed project entails the construction and operation of 29 single-family homes. According to 2000 data from the United States Census Bureau, the City of Los Angeles currently averages 2.83 persons per household. Using this data, the proposed project would result in the generation of approximately 82 persons.

According to the General Plan Update program estimates there were 54,880 persons residing in the area comprising the Brentwood-Pacific Palisades Community Plan District in 1990. Buildout of the existing Community Plan would result in 161,358 persons residing in the area. Under the Community Plan

Update, theoretical capacity would be 97,467 persons with approximately 64,619 persons actually expected in the area by 2010. Also, the total number of dwelling units in the Brentwood-Pacific Palisades Community Plan District in 1990 was approximately 25,987. Buildout of the existing plan would result in 63,525 dwelling units in the area. Under the Community Plan Update, theoretical capacity would be 41,272 dwelling units with approximately 30,051 dwelling units actually expected in the year 2010. The project's addition of 29 dwelling units and approximately 82 persons would be consistent with these forecasts and planned growth for the area. The proposed project's housing and population generation would, therefore, not result in an increase in population over expected levels, or that which has been officially planned for the Brentwood-Pacific Palisades Community Plan area. The project is, therefore consistent with the officially planned demographic estimates for the Community Plan area.

As the proposed project is not a non-residential, there would be no direct impacts to employment. It should be noted, however, that the proposed project would result in a temporary increase in construction-related job opportunities in the local area. Potential employees are expected to be pooled from the existing labor force in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Based on the above, potential impacts to population, housing, and employment resulting from the proposed project are considered to be less than significant.

## **RIGHT-OF-WAY AND ACCESS**

Local access to the project site is along the southern extensions of Canyonback Road and Stoney Hill Road, via Mountaingate Road. Regional access to the site vicinity is provided by the San Diego Freeway, located east of the site and running north-south in the project locale. The Ventura Freeway (US-101) also is located nearby within the project vicinity, north of the site and running east-west in the San Fernando Valley. Another major access route is Sepulveda Boulevard, which is a major north-south roadway.

As part of project implementation, access to the 29 single-family homes would be from Canyonback and Stoney Hill Roads. The development would involve the continuation of Stoney Hill Road from its current terminus with 22 residential lots along the Stoney Hill Ridge joining a fire road at the southern end. The remaining seven residential lots would be located on Canyonback Road along Canyonback Ridge. The proposed project would include a gate at the entrance to the seven residential lots on Canyonback Road. A secondary emergency and fire access road would be accessible from Stoney Hill Road. This secondary emergency access road leads from the end of the existing Stoney Hill Road and connects to an existing roadway on top of Mission Canyon 8. As part of the project, this roadway would be widened and improved in coordination with LAFD's emergency roadway access requirements of 20 feet minimum roadway width and 15 percent grade. This roadway leads down the mountain and connects to Sepulveda Boulevard. Based on the proposed access improvements as part of the project, no adverse impacts to right-of-way and access are anticipated to result from the proposed project. Further,



additional analysis, which include mitigation measures relating to access and right of way, have been addressed under **Section IV.N, Transportation and Circulation**, and **Section IV.O.1, Fire**, of this EIR. Based on the above information, impacts under this category are considered to be less than significant.

## **SOLID WASTE**

Solid waste disposal is an issue of regional and statewide significance. California generates over 40 million tons of municipal solid waste each year. While the number of California residents is growing each year, available landfill capacity is declining. The traditional method of landfill disposal is becoming increasingly problematic, as landfills approach or reach their capacity and the ability to find and develop new landfill sites is problematic. To respond to these concerns, Assembly Bill (AB 939) was enacted by the state legislature to add Section 40050 et seq. to the State Public Resources Code. This legislation, otherwise known as California Integrated Waste Management Act, mandates that all local and county governments adopt a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SREE) to identify means of reducing the amount of solid waste reaching landfills. The law requires that landfill disposal be reduced 25 percent by the year 1995 and 50 percent by the year 2000. Subsequent to the Integrated Waste Management Act, additional legislation was passed to assist local jurisdictions in accomplishing the goals of AB 939. The California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (Sections 42900-42911 of the Public Resources Code) directs the CIWMB to draft a “model ordinance” that requires adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials in development projects. The model ordinance requires that any new development project<sup>1</sup> for which an application is submitted on or after September 1, 1994 to include “adequate, accessible, and convenient areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials.”

The City of Los Angeles currently generates approximately 1.5 million tons per year of residential solid waste. Of this amount, approximately 46 – 49 percent of the solid waste is diverted, which is below the mandated 50 percent.<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that these percentages are preliminary and have not yet been board approved. Based on the residential solid waste generation rate provided in the City’s initial study, the proposed 29 single-family residences could be expected to generate approximately 355 pounds per day or 2,483 pounds per week. When compared to the City’s threshold of five tons per week or 10,000 pounds per week, the proposed project would fall short of resulting in a significant impact. In order to ensure that the 50 percent solid waste diversion rate is attained, standard city solid waste reduction regulations would be imposed on the project that mandates the residences to recycle solid waste.

---

<sup>1</sup> The ordinance defines a development project as “a project for which a building permit is required for a commercial, industrial, or institutional building, marina, or residential building having five or more living units, where solid waste is collected and loaded and any residential project where solid waste is collected and loaded in a location serving five or more living units.”

<sup>2</sup> Taken from the California Integrated Waste Management Board website at: [www.ciwmb.ca.gov](http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov)