
I. SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR”) is to inform decision-makers and the general public of the potential environmental impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed Verdugo Hills Golf Course project (“proposed project”). The project applicant is MWH Development, 22440 Clarendon Street, 2nd Floor, Woodland Hills, California 91367. A detailed description of the proposed project is contained in Section II (Project Description) of this Draft EIR.

The proposed project will require approval of certain discretionary actions by the City of Los Angeles (the “City”) and other governmental agencies. Therefore, the proposed project is subject to environmental review requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).¹ For purposes of complying with CEQA, the Los Angeles Department of City Planning is identified as the Lead Agency for the proposed project.

As described in Section 15121(a) and 15362 of the Guidelines for California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA Guidelines”),² an EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize any significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. Therefore, the purpose of this Draft EIR is to focus the discussion on those potential effects on the environment of the proposed project which the lead agency has determined are or may be significant. In addition, feasible mitigation measures are recommended, when applicable, that could reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts.

This Draft EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15151 of the CEQA Guidelines, which defines the standards for EIR adequacy:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decisionmakers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR would summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

¹ Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21178.

² California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387.

Notice of Preparation

In compliance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared by the Department of City Planning and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies and other interested parties on November 28, 2007. The NOP for the Draft EIR was circulated for 30 days, until December 28, 2007. Appendix A and Appendix B to this Draft EIR contain a copy of the NOP and written responses to the NOP, respectively.

Environmental Issues to be Analyzed in the Draft EIR

Based on a review of environmental issues by the Department of City Planning, this Draft EIR analyzes the following environmental issues:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources (Historic Resources, Archaeological Resources, Paleontological Resources)
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services (Fire Protection, Police Protection, Schools, Libraries)
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems (Wastewater, Water Supply, Solid Waste)

Through the Initial Study the Department of City Planning determined that the Proposed Project would not have the potential to cause environmental impacts on agricultural resources and mineral resources. Therefore, these issues are not examined in detail in this EIR (see Section IV.A, Impacts Found To Be Less Than Significant).

Environmental Review Process

This Draft EIR will be circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies and organizations for 60 days, which is 15 days longer than the public comment period required under CEQA. Public hearings on the proposed project will be held after the review period and the

preparation of the Final EIR. Notice of the time and location will be published prior to the public hearing date. All comments or questions about the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

David Sommers, Environmental Review Coordinator
City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street, Room 750
Los Angeles, California 90012

Following public circulation of the Draft EIR, a Final EIR will be prepared in response to comments received during the public circulation period. The Final EIR will be available for public review prior to its certification by the City. Notice of the availability of the Final EIR will be sent to all commenters who respond to the NOP and Draft EIR and owners and occupants within a 500-foot radius of the project site.

Organization of the Draft EIR

This Draft EIR is organized into nine sections.

Section I (Summary): This section provides a summary of the project description, alternatives to the proposed project, environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

Section II (General Description of Environmental Setting): This section provides an overview of the project site and surrounding area, including a description of existing and surrounding land uses and a list of related projects proposed or under construction in the project area.

Section III (Project Description): This section includes a detailed description of the proposed project, including project location, project characteristics, project objectives and required discretionary actions.

Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis): This section presents an analysis of each environmental impact issue. Each environmental issue contains a discussion of existing conditions in the project area, an assessment and discussion of the significance of impacts resulting from the proposed project, recommended mitigation measures, cumulative impacts and level of significance after mitigation.

Section V (General Impact Categories): This section provides a summary of significant unavoidable impacts and a discussion of potential growth inducing impacts resulting from the proposed project.

Section VI (Alternatives to the Proposed Project): This section includes an analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project.

Section VII (Preparers of the EIR and Persons Consulted): This section includes a list of City and other agencies and consultants that contributed to the preparation of this Draft EIR.

Section VIII (References): This section includes a list of written materials used in the preparation of this Draft EIR.

Section IX (List of Acronyms and Abbreviations): This section provides definitions for all of the acronyms and abbreviations used in this Draft EIR.

B. PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project includes the development of 229 single-family homes and the preservation of open space within a gated community on a 58.32-acre lot. The proposed single-family homes would be clustered on approximately 25-acres of the 58.32-acre project site. The majority of the units (211) would be built in the southeast corner of the project site on the portion of the site currently occupied by the Verdugo Hills Golf Course. The remaining 18 homes will be located farther to the north, between the Verdugo Wash right-of-way on the west and Tujunga Canyon Road on the east. This smaller enclave would be accessed via a northerly extension of one of the private roads as identified in the Site Plan (Figure II-1, Section II). The remaining portions of the project site, including those portions with greater than 15% slopes, will be retained as open space.

C. AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Concerns raised at the public scoping meeting (held on January 17, 2008) and in letters submitted to the Department of City Planning in response to the NOP include the following:

- **Aesthetics** - Concerns regarding the views of the project site from Interstate 210, views from surrounding homes, as the potential change in the rural character, the loss of landscaping and of open space resulting from the proposed project. These issues are addressed in Section IV.B (Aesthetics)
- **Air Quality** - Concerns were raised regarding potential air pollutants that may be generated during the construction and operation of the proposed project. This issue is addressed in Section IV.C (Air Quality).
- **Biological Resources** - Concerns were raised regarding loss of trees and impacts on plant life and wildlife are addressed in Section IV.D (Biological Resources).
- **Land Use** - Concerns were raised regarding consistency with the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan (“Specific Plan”), loss of open space, conversion of the golf course to residential uses and density of uses proposed for the site. Land use consistency with the Specific Plan, as well as other applicable plans and policies, are discussed in Section IV.J (Land Use).
- **Noise** - Concerns were raised regarding potential noise from project-related traffic on adjacent homes. This issue is addressed in Section IV.E (Noise).
- **Recreation** - Concerns were raised regarding the loss of the golf course as a result of development of the project. This issue is addressed in Section IV.O (Recreation). Additionally, in response, alternatives that include retaining the golf course without the driving range were developed and are analyzed in the Alternatives Section (Section VII. Alternatives).

- **Hydrology** - Concerns were raised regarding potential stormwater run off impacts as a result of the increase in impervious surfaces associated with building 229 single family homes and associated streets.
- **Hazards** - Concerns were raised regarding potential increased risk from wildfires associated with building 229 single family homes in a Very High Fire Severity Zone.
- **Traffic** - Concerns were raised regarding potential increases in traffic on the roadways in close proximity to the project site during construction and operation of the proposed project. Safety concerns were also expressed in association with traffic along La Tuna Canyon Road and Tujunga Canyon Boulevard. These issues are addressed in Section IV.P (Transportation/Traffic).
- **Utilities and Service Systems** - Concerns were raised regarding increased water usage.

The letters submitted in response to the NOP and comments provided at the scoping meeting are contained in Appendix B to this EIR.

D. ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Issues to be resolved include whether or how to mitigate potentially significant environmental impacts from the proposed project, and whether one of the alternatives should be approved rather than the proposed project.

E. ALTERNATIVES

This Draft EIR considers a range of alternatives to the proposed project to provide informed decision-making in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. The alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIR include: (1) No Project Alternative; (2) All Residential Townhomes Alternative; (3) Mixed Use Residential and Retail Alternative; and (4) Mixed Use Residential/Retail/Office Alternative..

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Under Alternative 1, it is assumed that no development of the project site would occur and the existing golf course operations would continue for the foreseeable future.

Alternative 2: All Residential Townhomes

Alternative 2 would consist of the development of 336 townhome units (apartments). The townhomes would be developed in 14 stand-alone buildings of 24 units each. Each building would have a gross area of 36,000 square feet. In total, there would be 504,000 gross square feet of residential space. The buildings would be clustered in the eastern portion of the project site, primarily on that area currently occupied by the driving range and on the northeastern strip of land located between Tujunga Canyon Road and the Verdugo Wash Channel.

The existing golf course would be retained and would continue to be available to the community. A new club house would be constructed and a new parking lot for the golf course would be provided along La Tuna Canyon Road to the west of the new club house.

A large green commons area and/or community center would be provided in the southern portion of the residential area

Alternative 3: Mixed Use Residential and Retail

Alternative 3 is a mixed use residential and neighborhood serving commercial development. In total, there would be 106,525 square feet of commercial uses and 334 residential units (408,800 square feet of residential space). All residential units would be apartments. The development area would be located in the southeastern corner of the project site, largely on that portion currently occupied by the driving range. Commercial uses would occupy the ground floor level. Residential uses (305 units) would be on the second and third levels above the commercial spaces. In addition, 18 row townhomes would be provided on the northeastern strip of land located between Tujunga Canyon Road and the Verdugo Wash Channel; 11 residential units would also be provided at the ground floor level in the western portion of the development area. Total leaseable space would be 515,325 square feet (gross).

The remaining portion of the existing golf course (11.9 acres) would be made over into a community serving park. The park would be dedicated to the City of Los Angeles, which would be responsible for its planning and maintenance. No active recreational facilities are envisioned by this alternative; although such facilities may ultimately be provided by the City.

Alternative 4: Mixed Use Residential/Retail/Office

Alternative 4 is a variation on Alternative 3, and as such would occupy the same development footprint. However, whereas Alternative 3 would provide residential uses on the second and third levels above the ground floor retail, Alternative 4 would provide 150,600 square feet of commercial office space. Similar to Alternative 3, Alternative 4 would provide second and third level residential uses above the large parking structure (partially subterranean) located north of the commercial space, as well as the row of 18 townhomes in the northern portion of the project site and the 11 ground floor residential units in the western portion of the development area.

Also, similar to Alternative 3, Alternative 4 would make over the remaining portion of the existing golf course (11.9 acres) into a community serving park. The park would be dedicated to the City of Los Angeles, which would be responsible for its planning and maintenance. No active recreational facilities are envisioned by this alternative; although such facilities may ultimately be provided by the City.

F. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following pages summarize the various environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project. Mitigation measures are recommended for significant environmental impacts, and the level of impact significance after mitigation is also identified.

**Table I-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| SECTION IV.B AESTHETICS | | |
| <p><u>Scenic Vistas, Scenic Resources, and Visual Character and Quality of the Site and Surrounding Area</u></p> <p>The proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The existing golf course facility is prominently visible within the scenic vistas afforded by the two adjacent scenic highways: La Tuna Canyon Road and the Interstate 210 Freeway. The foreground of the scenic vistas would be changed from a landscaped, park-like setting to an urban housing development of parallel rows of large homes on small lots. The removal of existing dense landscaping and native vegetation along the north side of La Tuna Canyon Road would open up views into the western portion of the project site. Uninterrupted vistas of urban housing would replace the current intermittent glimpses of the golf course. Due to the relatively small lot sizes, there would be a minimal amount of landscaping to soften the views from the scenic highways. Additionally, in some areas the proposed homes on the driving range portion of the project site would partially eliminate existing views of the highly scenic oak woodlands on the project site.</p> <p>The proposed project would substantially damage protected oak and sycamore trees, which are major scenic resources on the project site. Of the 303 oak and 18 western sycamores included in the Tree Survey, 85 oaks (28 percent of the total number on the site) and 11 western sycamores (61 percent of the total number on the site) would be removed. The aesthetic values of the majority of these trees are rated average to outstanding. Additionally, 103 of the 120 mature landscape trees not protected by ordinance would also be removed. Although the protected</p> | <p>Implementation of the following mitigation measures would help to reduce impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources and visual character and quality of the site and surrounding area. However, in the absence of a project redesign, these measures would not be sufficient to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>B-1 All structures on the project site shall comply with the applicable requirements of the Draft San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan.</p> <p>B-2 All fences, gates and walls visible from Interstate 210 or La Tuna Canyon Road shall be constructed of one or more of the following materials: rough-cut, unfinished wood; native-type stone; split-face concrete bloc; textured plaster surface walls; black or dark green chain link; wrought-iron in combination with small-gauge tubular steel posts (tubing posts not to exceed 1½” square in dimension).</p> <p>B-3 The project developer shall prepare and implement a landscape plan that provides planting and maintenance guidance for common landscaped areas and manufactured slopes. The project developer shall be responsible for the plan's implementation until such time as a homeowners’ association assumes responsibility for landscape maintenance. The landscape plan shall be subject to the review and approval by the Department of City Planning prior to issuance of any grading permit. To ensure its implementation, the landscape plan shall be incorporated into the project’s CC&Rs. Major features of the landscape plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A listing of plant species appropriate for use for both temporary slope stabilization purposes and long-term landscaping designs for | <p>Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>tree mitigation measures presented in Section IV.F (Biological Resources) would be sufficient to mitigate the biological impacts caused by the loss of these trees, because of the very slow growth of oak trees (requiring many decades to replace mature trees), these measures would not mitigate the aesthetic impacts of the tree removals. Other than the redesign of the project, no further mitigation measures to reduce aesthetic impacts to protected trees are available. Therefore, in the absence of a project redesign, aesthetic impacts to protected trees would be significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>The project site's open space is a scenic resource for the community which would be substantially damaged by the proposed project including the elimination of the landscaped golf course and replacement with rows of densely situated housing. Additionally, although hillsides with gradients steeper than 15 percent would not be graded, a 13.9-acre swath of native habitat on the hillsides surrounding the development area would be subject to the Fire Department's fuel modification requirements, which would substantially degrade the aesthetic character of the remaining open space. Other than the redesign of the project, no further mitigation measures to reduce aesthetic impacts associated with the loss of open space as a scenic resource are available. Therefore, in the absence of a project redesign, the aesthetic impact due to the loss of open space as a scenic resource would be significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>The introduction of an urban development adjacent to a rural community, the loss of a major scenic open space resource in combination with the loss of native trees and mature landscape trees would substantially degrade the</p> | <p>common areas. The plan shall emphasize the use of drought-tolerant, fire retardant, native plant species. Only non-invasive non-native plant species shall be included in the listing of acceptable planting materials. In addition, wherever practical, plants which are relatively pest resistant and which require a minimum of added nutrients shall be utilized in landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of a landscape contractor thoroughly familiar with the provisions of the landscape plan, by the project's homeowners' association, for ongoing implementation of the Landscape Plan. <p>B-4 All utilities installed in connection with the development of the new subdivision shall be placed underground.</p> <p>B-5 All roofs visible from Interstate 210 and La Tuna Canyon Road shall be surfaced with non-glare materials and no equipment shall be placed thereon. This provision shall not apply to solar energy devices and satellite dishes.</p> <p>B-6 Where feasible, drainage devices (terrace drains, benches and intervening terraces) visible from surrounding areas shall be bermed and placed in swales.</p> <p>B-7 Concrete drains and all other drainage devices shall be tinted with an appropriate earth tone to effectively conceal them from surrounding views.</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>existing visual character of the site and would compromise the rural character of La Tuna Canyon Road. This would be a significant impact.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Night Lighting</u> Although the proposed project would result in the removal of the existing nighttime lighting and glare, the project would introduce numerous sources of new lighting, including street lights, landscape and security lighting, window glow and vehicle headlights. Thus, the project has the potential to create new light trespass, light pollution and glare</p> | <p>B-8 All outdoor light fixtures shall limit light trespass and glare through the use of shielding and directional lighting methods, including, but not limited to, fixture location and height.</p> <p>B-9 In general, exterior lighting pole heights shall not exceed approximately fifteen (15) feet in height.</p> <p>B-10 Outdoor light fixtures used to illuminate landscaping, flags, statues, or any other objects mounted on a pole, pedestal, or platform shall use a very narrow cone of light for the purpose of confining the light to the object of interest and minimize spill-light and glare.</p> <p>B-11 All exterior lights and illuminated signs shall be designed, located, installed and directed in such a manner as to prevent unwanted light at the property lines and glare at any location on or off the property. No permanently installed lighting shall blink or flash. All lighting fixtures shall be appropriate in scale, intensity, and height to the architectural design values and building uses proposed.</p> <p>B-12 Landscaping shall be provided in areas where plantings can reduce visible glare and enhance natural surroundings.</p> <p>B-13 Lighting fixtures located along La Tuna Canyon Road and Tujunga Canyon Road and all interior project streets shall be fitted with glare shields or be cut-off type fixtures.</p> <p>B-14 Lighting fixtures intended for security purposes shall be equipped with</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| | <p align="center">motion sensors.</p> <p>B-15 There shall be no night illumination of open space proposed to be preserved by conservation easements.</p> | |
| SECTION IV.C AIR QUALITY | | |
| <p><u>Consistency with Applicable Plans</u></p> <p>AQMP: The proposed project would be consistent with the regional populations forecasts for the City of Los Angeles, and it would not jeopardize attainment of State and national ambient air quality standards in the Basin and the Los Angeles County portion of the Basin. Additionally, the proposed project would not jeopardize attainment of air quality standards in the 2007 AQMP for the Basin and the Los Angeles County portion of the Basin, and this impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>City of Los Angeles Air Quality Element: The proposed project would be consistent with goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the City's General Plan Air Quality Element, as it would be generally consistent with the applicable air quality policies. Therefore, no impact would occur with respect to consistency with the applicable air quality policies in the General Plan</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p><u>Construction Impacts</u></p> <p>Grading and excavation, dirt moving activities, construction equipment emissions, truck emissions and employee vehicles were considered in the calculation of emissions associated with the construction of the proposed project. The results of the calculations indicate that localized construction</p> | <p>Although not considered mitigation measures, the project developer will implement measures in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403 (fugitive dust) and Rule 1113 (architectural coatings)</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>emissions of NO_x and PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} would exceed thresholds and thus be significant on the peak day without mitigation.</p> | <p>C-1 The project Developer shall include in construction contracts the control measures required and recommended by the SCAQMD at the time of development. Examples of the types of measures currently required and recommended include the following:</p> <p>Rule 403 - Fugitive Dust Rule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use watering to control dust generation during demolition of structures or break-up of pavement. • Water active grading/excavation sites and unpaved surfaces at least three times daily. • Cover stockpiles with tarps or apply non-toxic chemical soil binders. • Limit vehicle speed on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour. • Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved construction parking areas and staging areas. • Provide daily clean-up of mud and dirt carried onto paved streets from the site. • Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site. • Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 15 miles per hour over a 30-minute period or more. • An information sign shall be posted at the entrance to each construction site that identifies the permitted construction hours and | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| | <p>provides a telephone number to call and receive information about the construction project or to report complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation. Any reasonable complaints shall be rectified within 24 hours of their receipt.</p> <p>Rule 1113 - Architectural Coatings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply rust-preventative coating below the VOC limit based on coating categories as specified in the Table of Standards VOC Limits table in Rule 1113. • Ensure that all architectural coating containers (including drums, buckets, cans, pails, and trays) be closed when not in use. • Add up to 10% by volume of VOC to a lacquer to avoid blushing of the finish if on the day of application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◊ Relative humidity is greater than 70% and temperature is below 65°F, ◊ The coating is not applied from April 1 to October 31, and, ◊ The coating contains acetone and no more than 550 g of VOC per liter of coating (less water and exempt compounds) prior to addition of the VOC. <p>The following mitigation measures are recommended in addition to the required SCAQMD rules above to reduce construction emissions associated with the proposed project:</p> <p>C-2 All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities shall be</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| | <p>discontinued during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 15 miles per hour [mph]), so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.</p> <p>C-3 The Project Developer shall require by contract specifications that construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for an extended period of time (i.e., 5 minutes or longer).</p> <p>C-4 The Project Developer shall require by contract specifications that construction operations rely on the electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction site rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines to the extent feasible.</p> <p>C-5 The maximum amount of soil imported to the project site during the grading phase shall not exceed 1,114 cubic yards on any given day. In order to fulfill the projected total amount of soil to be imported (96,900 cubic yards), the grading phase period will be approximately 87 days.</p> <p>C-6 The Project Developer shall require by contract specifications that all heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operating and refueling at the project site as well as haul trucks would use low- NO_x diesel fuel.</p> <p>C-7 The Project Developer shall require by contract specifications that alternative fuel construction equipment (i.e., electric, compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline) would be utilized to the extent that it is economically feasible and the equipment is readily available in the South Coast Air Basin. Specifically, all concrete/industrial saws used during construction shall be electric.</p> <p>C-8 The Project Developer shall limit the use of scrapers to four per day during</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>grading activities.</p> <p>C-9 The Project Developer shall require all scrapers, excavators, crawlers, forklifts, water trucks, pavers, and tractors used in the construction phases will be equipped with diesel oxidation catalyst systems CARB recognizes a 80% reduction of NOx emissions and 50% reduction of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} from approved systems.</p> <p>C-10 The Project Developer shall revise the construction schedule to limit emissions by ensuring the demolition, site preparation, grading, construction, paving, and coating phases are all conducted sequentially (i.e., the various phases do not overlap).</p> | |
| <p>Operational Impacts</p> <p>Localized Operational Emissions: The proposed project would generate a net increase in average daily emissions that does not exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD. This is a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Localized CO Concentrations: Future CO concentrations near the study intersections would not exceed the national and State ambient air quality standards for CO. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project and cumulative development would not expose any possible sensitive receptors (such as residential uses, schools, hospitals) located in close proximity to these intersections to substantial localized pollutant concentrations. This would be a less-than-significant impact regarding the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p> <p>Toxic Air Contaminants Toxic or carcinogenic air pollutants are not</p> | <p>To reduce impacts upon future occupants from existing ambient air pollution levels associated with vehicle travel along I-210 in the project vicinity, the following mitigation measures are recommended:</p> <p>C-11 For all residential dwelling units within or partially within 500 feet of I-210, an air filtration system shall be installed and maintained with filters meeting or exceeding the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Standard 52.2 Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) of 13, to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety.</p> <p>C-12 For all residential dwelling units further than 500 feet from I-210, an air filtration system shall be installed and maintained with filters meeting or exceeding the ASHRAE Standard 52.2 MERV of 11, to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| <p>expected to occur in any meaningful amounts in conjunction with operation of the proposed land uses at the project site. Only small quantities of common forms of hazardous or toxic substances, such as cleaning agents, which are typically used or stored in conjunction with residential uses, would be present. Most uses of such substances would occur indoors. Based on the common uses expected on the site, any emission would be minor. This would be a less-than-significant impact regarding the exposure sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p> <p>Airborne Odors: Any odors associated with the proposed project would be minimal, if noticeable at all; would be similar to existing residential and commercial uses in the local vicinity; and would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the new buildings. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This is a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Greenhouse Gas Emissions: The proposed project would be consistent with all feasible and applicable strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in California. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.</p> | | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| SECTION IV.D BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES | | |
| <p><i>Special Status Plants</i></p> <p>Removal of scrub and woodland vegetation during fuel modification activities (vegetation “thinning” and “limbing up”) within the fuel modification zone which is 200 feet around the proposed lots could impact special status plants that may be present in these areas. The following special status plant species have the potential to be present within the woodland and/or scrub areas that will be subject to fuel modification activities around the proposed development area: Catalina mariposa lily, golden-rayed pentachaeta, chaparral rein orchid, Fish’s milkwort, ocellated Humboldt lily, Plummer’s mariposa lily, slender mariposa lily, Coulter’s Matilija poppy and white rabbit-tobacco. The removal of special status plants from these activities, if present, would be considered a potentially significant impact.</p> | <p>D.1-1 – Sensitive Plant Mitigation</p> <p>To avoid impacting sensitive plant species during fuel modification activities, the following shall be implemented:</p> <p>A qualified biologist shall conduct focused surveys for sensitive plant species within the fuel modification zone according to CDFG guidelines^{3,4} prior to initiation of the first fuel modification activity on-site. The surveys shall be conducted at the proper time of year when the sensitive plants with potential to occur on-site are both evident and identifiable. If no sensitive plants are found, no further mitigation would be required. However, if any sensitive plant species are located, the survey will determine the number of individuals present and the limits of the area occupied by the population, and one of the following additional mitigation measures shall be implemented:</p> <p align="center">(a) avoidance and permanent protection of the onsite population; or</p> <p align="center">(b) transplant the individuals to permanently preserved habitat on-site not subject to fuel modification.</p> <p>Each mitigation option above (a – c) shall include the preparation of a Preservation Plan (under a) or a Mitigation Plan (under b) by a qualified biologist to be</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

³ California Department of Fish and Game. 1983. Guidelines for conducting and reporting botanical inventories for federally listed, proposed and candidate plants. Unpublished information sheet, revised 2000.

⁴ California Department of Fish and Game. 2000. Guidelines for assessing effects of proposed developments on rare and endangered plants and plant communities. Unpublished information sheet.

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| | submitted to and approved by the City. The Plan shall include the location and extent of the preserved or transplanted individuals, and measures to ensure protection of the population during fuel modification activities (in perpetuity). The Plan shall also include methods to transplant the individuals (if applicable), measures to maintain the population (i.e. weed control), and methods to monitor the population for a minimum of five years following preservation or transplantation, including performance criteria and contingency measures in case of failure to meet performance criteria. | |
| <p><i>Special Status Wildlife</i></p> <p>Although the removal of scrub and woodland vegetation during fuel modification activities (vegetation “thinning” and “limbing up”) within the fuel modification zone around the proposed development will not remove habitat for these species (as they prefer open areas for foraging and basking), such activities have the potential to harm or kill individuals. These impacts from the project may be considered potentially significant</p> | <p>D.1-2 - Avoidance of Sensitive Reptiles.</p> <p>To avoid impacting sensitive reptile species during fuel modification activities, the following shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct fuel modification activities (i.e. mowing, brush thinning or removal) from October 1st to January 31st, outside of the primary activity season for reptiles (and nesting birds; refer to Mitigation Measure D.1-3), which is generally from early March through mid-August. Vegetation modification activities should also occur during the peak heat of the day, approximately between 12 noon and 5 pm, which is the time after most reptiles have basked in the morning sun and foraged for food, and is during the time when most reptiles have retreated to shady areas or underground refuges to avoid the most intense heat. • Fuel modification activities will be limited to hand-held equipment only (i.e. weed whackers, chainsaws, lawn mower); no small motorized equipment (such as those requiring wheels or a driver) shall be used for fuel modification activities. | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>trees on the project site. Although most likely roost within the nearly three acres of woodland habitat outside of the proposed development area which will be preserved, some may roost in trees on the golf course or within the disturbed or developed areas. Tree removal during grading may directly impact these species during the breeding season, and additional construction noise, vibration, and crew activities may result in disturbances to breeding activities within the preserved area. In addition, fuel modification activities within the fuel modification zone around the proposed development may also disturb breeding activities.</p> | <p>access allows). In addition, a qualified bat specialist will conduct a pre-construction survey to identify those trees proposed for disturbance that support or could potentially provide nursery colony roosting habitat for bats. The last bird and bat surveys should be conducted no more than three days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work. If active nests or roosting colonies are encountered, clearing and construction in the vicinity of the nest/roost shall be deferred until the young have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. A minimum exclusion buffer of 300 feet (500 feet for raptor nests) or as determined by a qualified biologist, shall be maintained during construction depending on the species and location. The perimeter of the nest-setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with staked flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel and activities restricted from the area. Construction personnel should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. A survey report by the qualified biologist documenting and verifying compliance with the mitigation and with applicable state and federal regulations protecting birds shall be submitted to the City. The qualified biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities would occur near active nest/roost areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts would occur.</p> <p><u>Fuel Modification</u></p> <p>To avoid impacting nesting birds during fuel modification activities, <u>one</u> of the following must be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct fuel modification activities from October 1st through January 31st, when birds are not nesting. Initiate grading activities prior to the breeding season (which is generally February 1st through September 30th) and keep | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| | <p>disturbance activities constant throughout the breeding season to prevent birds from establishing nests in surrounding habitat (in order to avoid possible nest abandonment); if there is a lapse in activities of more than five days, pre-activity surveys shall be necessary as described in the bullet below.</p> <p>- OR -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct pre-activity surveys for nesting birds if fuel modification activities must occur during the period of February 1st through September 30th. A qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct a pre-activity bird survey within areas proposed for modification and within 300 feet. Surveys shall be conducted no more than three days prior to fuel modification activities. If active nests are encountered, clearing and construction in the vicinity of the nest shall be deferred until the young have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. A minimum exclusion buffer of 300 feet (500 feet for raptor nests) or as determined by a qualified biologist, shall be maintained during fuel modification activities depending on the species and location. The perimeter of the nest-setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with staked flagging at 20-foot intervals, and personnel and activities restricted from the area. Personnel should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. A survey report by the qualified biologist documenting and verifying compliance with the mitigation and with applicable state and federal regulations protecting birds shall be submitted to the City. | |
| <p><i>San Diego desert woodrat</i>, a federal and state species of concern, has the potential to occur on-site in the numerous stick nests observed throughout the woodland and scrub habitats on the project site. No potential nests were observed within the proposed development area. In addition, the</p> | <p>D.1-4 – San Diego Woodrat Avoidance</p> <p>The following measures shall be implemented to avoid and minimize potential impacts to San Diego desert woodrat which has the potential to occur on-site along</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>proposed project would preserve virtually all of the native scrub and woodland habitats on-site, approximately 30 acres, which would continue to provide suitable habitat for these species. However, noise, vibration and incidental disturbance from crew activities due to project construction would be substantially greater than the existing level of noise on the project site and may disrupt breeding activities of individuals located adjacent to the development area. Also, fuel modification activities within the fuel modification zone around the proposed development may remove or disturb occupied nests.</p> | <p>the edges of the proposed development and/or within the fuel modification zone:</p> <p><u>Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to protect the existing woodrat nests and to prevent impacts to breeding activities from construction-related disturbances such as noise and vibration, vegetation and grading activities within 100 feet of the existing nests shall be initiated prior to the breeding season for the San Diego desert woodrat (breeding season is generally October through mid-July) and shall continue regularly throughout the breeding season; this will prevent woodrats from breeding during construction activities for that year, which will eliminate the possibility of abandonment of young if construction is initiated once breeding has already begun. In addition, the existing nests on-site shall be identified on all construction maps and flagged to aid in identification and avoidance by construction crews; if avoidance is not feasible, see below. A qualified biological monitor shall periodically evaluate the nests to ensure that they are not physically impacted during construction activities. • If woodrat nests within the construction zone will require removal, that nest should be dismantled by hand by a qualified biologist prior to grading and vegetation removal activities. The nest dismantling shall occur outside the breeding/weaning season (breeding occurs from October through mid-July) and shall be conducted so that the nest material is removed beginning on the construction side of the nest, which will allow for any woodrats in the nest to escape into the adjacent remaining habitat. Care shall be taken during nest dismantling to ensure that any special status reptiles which may be cohabitating in the nest are not harmed. | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| | <p><u>Fuel Modification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All woodrat nests within the fuel modification zone shall be flagged and avoided during fuel modification activities to the maximum extent feasible. Fuel modification activities should be conducted outside of the breeding season (breeding season is generally October through mid-July) to the extent feasible. Fuel modification activities will be limited to hand-held equipment only (i.e. weed whackers, chainsaws, lawn mower); no small motorized equipment (such as those requiring wheels or a driver) shall be used for fuel modification activities. If nests must be removed, the nest should be dismantled by hand by a qualified biologist prior to grading and vegetation removal activities. The nest dismantling shall occur outside the breeding/weaning season (breeding occurs from October through mid-July) and shall be conducted so that the nest material is removed beginning on the construction side of the nest, which will allow for any woodrats in the nest to escape into the adjacent remaining habitat. Care shall be taken during nest dismantling to ensure that any special status reptiles which may be cohabitating in the nest are not harmed. | |
| <p>Indirect Wildlife Impact Minimization -Although a portion of the site will remain as open space following project construction, the quality of this habitat may be compromised from “edge effects” due to increased human activity in the adjacent proposed development. Currently, night lighting on the golf course from floodlights already illuminates the majority of the natural habitat areas on the project site, but these lights are off when the course is closed, from 10:30 p.m. to 6:30 a.m. The proposed development may have reduced lighting intensity and extent as compared to the current</p> | <p>D.1-5 – Indirect Wildlife Impact Minimization</p> <p>To reduce indirect impacts to native wildlife in the adjacent preserved habitat area, the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building lighting in areas adjacent to natural areas will be directed away from the preserved native habitat and shielded downward, and shall consist of low-intensity lamps on low elevation lighting poles. The homeowners association shall be responsible for regular collection of | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>golf course floodlights, but the project may result in additional lighting during the late evening and early morning hours which are currently absent on-site. In addition, although natural habitat areas currently adjacent to the golf course and major roads exhibit trash and debris from unauthorized dumping over the years (particularly in some of the drainages), the project may also result in additional trash and debris in the preserved natural habitat from the proposed development on-site. Finally, although domestic pets already likely have access to the natural habitat areas on-site from the surrounding residential communities, the proposed development may result in an increase in disturbance to on-site wildlife from unattended domestic pets (particularly outdoor cats) which are known to predate upon reptiles and small birds. These indirect impacts to wildlife, and particularly sensitive wildlife that are or may be present, in the preserved natural habitat on-site from the project may be considered potentially significant</p> | <p>trash and debris from the edge of the development area and within the preserved open space area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic pets belonging to residents or visitors shall be prohibited from entering the adjacent undeveloped lands or open space areas off-leash. Signage shall be posted and maintained along the boundaries of the development area indicating such prohibitions and educating the community about domestic pets as a conservation threat to birds and other wildlife. • Pet housecats shall be strongly encouraged to be kept indoors at all times. Educational brochures shall be distributed to residents discussing the significant danger that outdoor cats pose to native bird, reptile and small mammal populations as well as the dangers to cats from predation, disease and/or injury from the numerous resident coyotes, bobcats, hawks, and raccoons. | |
| <p>Wetlands</p> <p>No wetlands are present on the Project site. However, there are eleven (11) potentially jurisdictional drainage features present on the Project Site. The proposed project will impact four (4) of these drainages due to project construction, resulting in the excavation and/or placement of fill material within all or a portion of these features. See Table IV.D.1-3 below for a summary of impacts per drainage and drainage segment with respect to potential Corps, RWQCB and CDFG jurisdictional areas.</p> <p>These proposed impacts to approximately 352 linear feet (0.017 acre) of</p> | <p>D.1-6 – Waters and Streambed Mitigation</p> <p>Prior to issuance of grading permit that may result in the placement of fill material into the potentially jurisdictional drainages, prepare and submit a “Preliminary Delineation Report for Waters of the U.S.” to the Corps for verification and a Streambed Alteration Notification package to CDFG. If these agencies determine that the feature is not regulated under their jurisdiction, then no further mitigation is necessary. Regardless, a water quality certification application will be submitted to the Los Angeles RWQCB for these impacts. However, if the Corps considers</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>potentially jurisdictional “waters of the U.S.” and approximately 529 linear feet (0.089 acre) of streambed would be considered significant. Although these drainages are ephemeral, support no aquatic habitat, and have only minimal habitat value given their level of disturbance and lack of continuity with high-quality drainages, these features may be regulated by state and federal law.</p> | <p>the features to be jurisdictional through a “significant nexus” test per recent Corps and EPA guidance,⁵ then a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit shall be obtained from the Corps, and any permit conditions shall be agreed to, prior to the start of construction activities in the affected area. If CDFG determines that the drainages are regulated “streambeds”, then a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be entered into with CDFG and any associated conditions shall be agreed to prior to the start of construction in the affected area. At a minimum, or as required by the applicable permits, compensation for impacts to these drainages shall be accomplished at a 1:1 acreage ratio through one or more of the following: (a) the restoration of riparian habitat on-site or in the vicinity; (b) purchase of mitigation credits through a mitigation bank; or (c) payment of an in-lieu fee through an established in-lieu fee program. Copies of any permit conditions issued by the Corps, the CDFG, or the Los Angeles RWQCB shall be submitted to the Department of Building and Safety prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> | |
| <p>Protected Species and Mature Tree Impacts</p> <p>There are approximately 303 coast live oaks, 18 western sycamores and 120 mature ornamental trees on the project site. Of these, 31 oaks and three mature ornamental trees would be potentially encroached upon during the construction phase of the proposed project, and up to 85 oaks, 11 sycamores and 103 mature ornamental trees would be removed by the proposed project. The 34 trees that could potentially be encroached on</p> | <p>The following mitigation measures are required to reduce potential significant impacts on protected tree species and mature ornamental trees to less-than-significant levels. The proposed project’s mitigation effort includes avoidance, minimization and compensation for the removal of protected species and mature ornamental trees. These aspects of the proposed mitigation are described below.</p> | <p>Significant for first 10 years, Less than Significant thereafter</p> |

⁵ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Department of the Army. 2007. *Clean Water Act Jurisdiction Following the U.S. Supreme Court’s Decision in Rapanos v. United States & Carabell v. United States*. June 5, 2007.

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>during grading operations might be subject to indirect or direct impacts causing their decline and ultimate demise; this would constitute a potentially significant impact. The removal of 96 protected species trees and 106 mature ornamental trees would also constitute a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>There are 31 coast live oaks and three mature ornamental trees within 50 feet of the project construction areas that may be subject to encroachment due to grading operations. Without implementation of mitigation measures, these trees might be subject to indirect impacts or even direct impacts causing their decline and ultimate demise. However, the ultimate decision to implement any or all mitigation measures described below will be made by the project arborist in consultation with the project engineer and the City’s Urban Forestry Division.</p> | <p>Relocation</p> <p>While the transplanting of mature, naturalized coast live oaks and western sycamores has been successful in limited instances, relocation of large, mature oak trees is generally fraught with problems and low success rates.⁶ For this reason, it is not believed that the transplantation of mature coast live oaks or sycamores is a viable means of mitigating project impacts. Nevertheless, should relocation be considered, it is recommended that healthy trees with DBHs of less than 12 inches, located on level terrain be considered as prime candidates. Trees located on steep slopes or on rocky outcrops are generally not suitable for relocation due to practical problems associated with boxing these trees when slopes hinder access or rocks hinder excavation. The identification of trees suitable for relocation should be done by a qualified arborist in consultation with the City’s Urban Forestry Division in coordination with the rough grading activities at the project site. While the relocation of healthy candidate trees rather than their outright removal is encouraged, any existing trees relocated before or during project construction would not be counted toward the mitigation of project impacts.</p> <p>Avoidance and Minimization of Impacts</p> <p>The following mitigation measures are recommended to avoid or minimize impacts to trees whose driplines are determined to overlap or closely approach the outer</p> | |

⁶ Dagit, Rosi and Jim Downer. 1998. “Transplanted Coast Live Oaks (*Quercus agrifolia*) in Southern California.” *Western Arborist*. Vol. 24, No. 4. Pages 36-41.

⁷ Matheny, Nelda and James R. Clark. 1998. “Trees and Development.” *International Society of Arboriculture*, Champaign, Illinois.

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>edge of the Project Grading Area:</p> <p>D.2-1 The project arborist shall follow or accompany the survey crews prior to the commencement of grading in order to confirm impacts to trees scheduled to be removed and to confirm avoidance of trees scheduled for preservation. Should any adjustments to the total impact figures be necessary, the project arborist shall notify the project proponent and the project developer, which shall notify the City of the revision.</p> <p>D.2-2 The project’s arborist shall identify the tree’s dripline in the field and shall stake this zone in a half-circle adjacent to the development edge.</p> <p>D.2-3 The project’s arborist shall ensure that protective fencing is installed around the perimeter of the tree’s dripline. The fence shall be a chain link fence with posts placed no greater than 10 feet on center. The project arborist shall identify all trees requiring temporary fencing and shall verify that the fences are in place prior to commencement of grading operations within 20 feet of the dripline of any tree not scheduled for removal in the permit issued by the City. Exceptions to the fencing requirement may be made where preserved tree locations make unintended impacts sufficiently unlikely due to the presence of steep terrain or other physical barrier.</p> <p><i>This fencing shall remain intact until the City of Los Angeles’ Planning Department or the Urban Forestry Division allows it to be removed or relocated</i></p> <p>D.2-4 Construction contract specifications shall require that no stockpiled soils, building material, parked equipment or vehicles shall be stored</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>within the fenced dripline areas.</p> <p>D.2-5 Construction contract specifications shall include provision for temporary irrigation/watering and feeding of these trees, as recommended by a qualified arborist.</p> <p>D.2-6 The project’s arborist shall ensure the placement of four-inches of wood-chip mulch over the ground surface within the dripline where that zone extends beyond the protective fencing and into the Project Grading Area. This measure may be necessary to limit the compacting effect of heavy equipment on topsoil within the root zone of protected trees.⁷ Where appropriate, the four-inch mulch layer shall be placed under the supervision of the project arborist and shall be placed upon first encroachment of grading equipment into the dripline. Exceptions to the mulching requirement may be made where preserved tree locations make unintended impacts sufficiently unlikely due to the presence of steep terrain or other physical barrier.</p> <p>D.2-7 Should any protected tree’s branches overlap the outer edge of the Project Grading Area and require pruning in order to allow grading to proceed, the pruning shall be performed or supervised by the project arborist or a certified arborist.</p> <p>D.2-8 All utility line and/or footing excavations within the driplines shall be dug by hand work only, to a maximum depth of 5 feet (or to a depth that CAL_OSHA, OSHA or local codes allow). Any excavation below the “approved” depth may be done with acceptable machinery. All footings within the saved tree driplines shall be of “post type” rather than of “continuous type” to lessen potential root damage.</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>D.2-9 No other onsite trees to be preserved shall be encroached upon within their driplines other than what is being described in the Tree Report (see Appendix F-2) unless approved by the City of Los Angeles’ Planning Department or the Urban Forestry Division, Bureau of Street Maintenance.</p> <p>D.2-10 No “over-excavation” outside of any cut and/or fill slopes (“tops” or “toes”) for the proposed construction shall occur within the dripline of any onsite trees to be preserved., unless required by the project’s structural engineer and approved by the City of Los Angeles’ Planning Department or the Urban Forestry Division, Bureau of Street Maintenance. Should any protected trees fail as a result of excavation required by the project’s structural engineer they shall be replaced per the Mitigation Planting Program.</p> <p>D.2-11 No landscape, irrigation lines, utility lines and/or grade changes shall be designed and/or installed within the dripline of any trees to be preserved, unless approved by the City of Los Angeles’ Planning Department or the Urban Forestry Division, Bureau of Street Maintenance.</p> <p>D.2-12 Weed Control – the use of soil sterilizers shall be prohibited under and around any trees to be preserved. Sterilizers may leach into the root system and kill the tree. Use of pre-emergent weed killers shall be prohibited within 100 feet of any individual trees to be preserved or within a natural drainage that seasonally irrigates protected species trees.</p> <p>D.2-13 All work to this project’s protected species trees shall be in accordance with the City of Los Angeles’ Protected Tree Ordinance and other applicable tree policies.</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| | <p>D.2-14 Examination of the trees to be preserved shall be performed monthly by a qualified arborist to insure that they are being adequately protected and maintained. Prior to the completion of the proposed project, a qualified arborist shall certify in a “letter of compliance” that all concerned tree policies have been adhered to.</p> <p>D.2-15 Copies of the proposed project’s Tree Report and the City’s Protected Tree Ordinance shall be maintained onsite during all project construction.</p> <p>It should be noted that 13 of the trees (tree numbers 271-274, 283, 285, 287, 289, 290, 309, 311, 312, and 317) are located along a portion of the northern right-of-way of La Tuna Canyon Road which may potentially be widened and have therefore been categorized as encroached upon. However, minimization of impacts to these trees may be possible depending on the final determination of the road width and precise method of road construction, which has not yet been agreed on by the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering and Department of Public Works.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Planting Program</u></p> <p>The planting program provides for planting of 810 coast live oak trees, 99 western sycamores from container stock; in addition the planting program would require the planting of 103 ornamentals from 15 gallon size container stock. These plantings would serve to compensate for the losses of 85 coast live oaks, 11 western sycamores and 103 mature non-protected trees. These replacement plants represent 9.5:1 replacement of coast live oaks, 9:1 replacement of western sycamores and a 1:1 replacement of mature non-protected species. The plantings would occur within entry points, common areas, road right of-ways, perimeters of</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| | <p>detention basins, common slopes, flood control facilities, fuel modification managed slopes, and private residential lots.</p> <p>D.2-16 The project developer shall implement the conceptual Mitigation Planting Program summarized in Table IV.D-9. These plantings would compensate for the loss of 85 coast live oaks, 11 western sycamores and 103 mature ornamental trees. These replacement plants represent a 9.5:1 replacement of coast live oaks, a 9:1 replacement of western sycamores and a 1:1 replacement of mature non-protected species. The plantings would occur within entry points, common areas, road right-of-ways, perimeters of detention basins, common slopes, flood control facilities, fuel modification managed slopes, and private residential lots.</p> <p>It is estimated that the proposed planting program would provide approximately \$441,500 of tree stock, ranging from 15 gallon to 48-inch boxes. As stated above, the canopy coverage of the trees to be replaced is approximately 103,401.3 square feet (86,330.1 sf of oak canopy and 17,071.2 sf of sycamore canopy), or 2.37 acres under the Canopy Replacement Method. The Mitigation Planting Program would provide for a replacement canopy of 104,044 sf (86,730 sf of oak canopy and 17,314 sf of sycamore canopy) or 2.38 acres of canopy within a 10 year growth horizon. This tree planting would be only a part of the overall landscape palette, which would also include plantings of native plant material and other climate-adapted plantings.</p> <p>D.2-17 The project applicant shall post a cash bond or other assurances acceptable to the Bureau of Engineering in consultation with the Urban Forestry Division and the Advisory Agency guaranteeing the survival of trees</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>required to be maintained, replaced or relocated in such a fashion as to assure the existence of continuously living trees for a minimum of three (3) years from the date that the bond is posted or from the date such trees are replaced or relocated, whichever is longer. Any change of ownership shall require that the new owner post a new tree bond to the satisfaction of the Bureau of Engineering. Subsequently the original owner’s bond may be exonerated.</p> <p>D.2-18 The City Engineer shall use the provisions of Section 17.08 as its procedural guide in satisfaction of said bond requirements and processing. Any bond required shall be in a sum estimated by the City Engineer to be equal to the dollar value of the replacement tree or of the tree which is to be relocated. In determining value for these purposes, the City Engineer shall consult with the Advisory Agency and shall also consult the evaluation of trees guidelines approved and adopted for professional plantsmen by the International Society of Arboriculture, the American Society of Consulting Arborists, the National Arborists Association and the American Association of Nurserymen, and other available, local information, or guidelines.</p> <p>D.2-19 Prior to the exoneration of the bond, the owner of the project site shall provide evidence satisfactory to the City Engineer and Urban Forestry Division that the trees were properly replaced, the date of the replacement and the survival of the replacement trees for a period of three years.</p> <p>D.2-20 The project applicant shall provide a pamphlet regarding proper procedures for protected species tree maintenance to the homeowners’ association and to purchasers of individual homes within the proposed project whose parcels contain protected species trees. The project CC&Rs shall require</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>the homeowners' association to provide the protected species tree pamphlet to subsequent home buyers of those parcels.</p> <p>D.2-21 The project applicant shall provide information regarding the location of, and proper procedures to safeguard both existing and newly planted protected species trees, to the homeowners association and/or landscape maintenance contractor servicing the project site during fuel modification activities. As per MM D.1-2 these activities will be limited to hand-held equipment only (i.e. weed whackers, chainsaws, lawn mower); no motorized equipment requiring wheels or a driver (e.g., Bobcat). Should any protected trees fail as a result of fuel modification activities they shall be replaced per the Mitigation Planting Program.</p> | |
| SECTION IV.E CULTURAL RESOURCES | | |
| <p>1. HISTORIC RESOURCES</p> <p>Under the four Criteria for the National Register of Historic Places (A–D) and related Criteria for the California Register of Historical Resources (1–4), the property is best evaluated under Criterion A/1: association with New Deal's Civilian Conservation Corps and national policy for forest conservation on private lands, and with World War II national immigration and security policies and their impacts on Japanese Americans and deportee aliens, and Criterion D/4: potential to yield information on events and actions of the World War II Home Front that were little recorded and covertly performed, through U.S. policy and employees and through detainees held at Tuna Canyon Detention Station. The prime surviving resource at Tuna Canyon from the 1933–1946 period is the general landscape, retaining strong integrity of location and setting, somewhat lesser of feeling and association. However, all associated buildings and</p> | <p>E.1-1 Because of the significance of events associated with the property, commemoration of the site through designation as a California Historical Landmark (CHL) in the thematic landmark group "Temporary Detention Camps for Japanese Americans," is recommended. Such an additional designation is not intended to preserve the present resources at Verdugo Hills Golf Course, but to commemorate associated events through interpretation at the site, to encourage sensitive development of the overall landscape, and to accommodate visitors to the site through ease of parking, observation, and meditation.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>improvements have been removed, causing loss of integrity of materials, workmanship, and design, thus rendering the property ineligible for designation under national or California historical registers.</p> | | |
| <p>2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p> <p>This project parcel was described in the 1947 <i>Montrose Ledger's</i> article as being the site of a former "Indian Camp". Additionally, ethnographic studies indicate that the Verdugo Hills area contained Native American villages. Because of the potential for buried archaeological material, both historic and prehistoric, to be located within the project area, it is recommended that a qualified archaeologist monitor future ground-disturbing activities in native soil. It is possible that in-place native soil is still present in the oak grove remnant on the south side of La Tuna Canyon Road, the flat grass and oak covered lot in the northeast along Tujunga Canyon Road, along the drainages on the hillside, and within the current driving range. In the event that archaeological resources are discovered during construction, the monitor must be empowered to temporarily halt or divert construction in the immediate vicinity of the discovery while it is evaluated for significance. Construction activities could continue in other areas. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional investigation, such as evaluation and data recovery excavation, may be warranted.</p> <p>There are no known archaeological resources on the project site; therefore, the development of the proposed project would not be expected to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any unique or non-unique archaeological resource. Notwithstanding the above, there remains the</p> | <p>The following measures are recommended to provide direction in the event such resources are discovered:</p> <p>E.2-1 If buried cultural materials are exposed during construction, work shall be halted in the immediate vicinity of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess their significance.</p> <p>E.2-2 If the finds are termed significant (i.e., a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist and a Native American Observer shall be permitted to remove the items in a professional manner for further laboratory evaluation.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>potential for unknown/buried cultural resources to be present on the site which could be adversely affected by the proposed project. This is considered a potentially significant.</p> <p>There are no known human remains on the project site; therefore, the development of the proposed project would not be expected to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Notwithstanding the above, there remains the potential for unknown burials to be present on the site which could be adversely affected by the proposed project. This is considered a potentially significant.</p> | <p>E.2-3 If human remains are unearthed during construction, no further disturbance shall occur until the Los Angeles County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the remains are determined to be those of a Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento shall be contacted before the remains are removed in accordance with Section 21083.2 of the California Public Resources Code.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p>3. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p> <p>There are two geologic units underlying the Verdugo Hills Golf Course project area 1) Mesozoic gneissoid quartz diorite and 2) Quaternary alluvial fan deposits. There were no fossils discovered during the field survey; however, Quaternary alluvial fan deposits underlying much of the project area are considered to have a high paleontological sensitivity rating. Ground disturbing activities related to the proposed development of the project site is likely to result in adverse impacts to significant paleontological resources unless proper mitigation measures are implemented.</p> | <p>E.3-1 All project-related ground disturbance occurring in Quaternary older alluvial fan deposits shall be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor on a full-time basis, as these geologic units are determined to have a high paleontological sensitivity rating. Ground disturbance occurring in Cretaceous gneissoid quartz diorite shall be monitored on a part-time basis to ensure that surrounding paleontologically sensitive material is not impacted.</p> <p>E.3-2 A Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained to supervise construction monitoring and to implement appropriate mitigation measures throughout the course of the project. Paleontological monitoring shall include inspection of exposed rock units during active excavations. The monitor shall have authority to temporarily divert grading away from exposed fossils in order to professionally and efficiently recover the fossil</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|
| <p>as it would be for large parts of the City and the region. The proposed homes and infrastructure that comprise the project would be designed in accordance with the Municipal Code, the requirements of the Department of Building and Safety, and the recommendations of the consulting geotechnical engineers. Compliance with these requirements would reduce seismic risks to an acceptable level. Therefore the impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p><u>Seismic-related ground failure and liquefaction</u></p> <p>The project site is not within an area considered subject to liquefaction or seismic settlement as delineated by the State of California Seismic Hazard Maps, or the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element; nor were soils prone to seismically induced settlement observed within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not be expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving liquefaction or other seismic-related ground failure. Therefore the impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p><u>Landslides</u></p> <p>The project site does not show evidence of ancient or recent bedrock landslides. Also, no recent surficial slope failures or slumps were observed by the consulting geotechnical engineers within the proposed project area on the property. A slope stability analysis was performed for the ascending slopes. Gross stability analysis indicates that the bedrock slopes are stable. Therefore construction of the proposed project would not be expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. Impacts</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| <p>would be less than significant.</p> <p><u>Soil erosion/the loss of topsoil</u></p> <p>The graded and natural areas of the proposed project would be subject to erosion, sedimentation during, and following the stripping of existing vegetation and grading. The Grading Code, as well as the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act regulations, requires that erosion be controlled and minimized through the use of Best Management Practices, and appropriate flood and storm drainage control systems. Compliance with those codes and regulations will reduce soil erosion and loss of topsoil to acceptable levels. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil and impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p><u>Landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse</u></p> <p>According to the Preliminary Geologic and Soils Engineering Investigation, some surficial erosion/surficial slope failures may occur during inclement weather at the project site. In order to mitigate this possible occurrence, the Preliminary Geologic and Soils Engineering Investigation recommends that all slopes should be planted and maintained. In particular, the report recommends deep-rooted shrubs should be planted in staggered rows that do not exceed 10 feet on center over the slope face.</p> <p>Land subsidence is the gradual sinking or downward warping of the earth's surface due to a variety of possible circumstances and or activities that include mining, and the removal of oil or groundwater. No potential land subsidence-related circumstances and or activities are suspected to occur on</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>the project site, nor have they in the past. No potential for land subsidence exists and, as such, no impact is expected to occur.</p> <p><u>Expansive Soils</u></p> <p>According to the project’s Preliminary Geologic and Soils Engineering Investigation, expansive soils were not encountered on the project site. Therefore, no impact from expansive soils would be expected to occur.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p>SECTION IV.F GEOLOGY AND SOILS</p> | | |
| <p><u>Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone</u></p> <p>The project site does not lie within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. No known active or potentially active faults cross the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not be expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault.</p> <p><u>Seismic Ground Shaking</u></p> <p>As with all properties in the seismically active Southern California region, the project site is susceptible to ground shaking during a seismic event. Potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are present throughout Southern California and would be of comparable intensity at the project site as it would be for large parts of the City and the region. The proposed homes and infrastructure that comprise the project would be designed in accordance with the Municipal Code, the requirements of the Department of Building and Safety, and the recommendations of the consulting</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less Than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>geotechnical engineers. Compliance with these requirements would reduce seismic risks to an acceptable level.</p> <p><u>Seismic-related Ground Failure and Liquefaction</u></p> <p>The project site is not within an area considered subject to liquefaction or seismic settlement as delineated by the State of California Seismic Hazard Maps, or the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element; nor were soils prone to seismically induced settlement observed within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not be expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving liquefaction or other seismic-related ground failure.</p> <p>Landslides</p> <p>The project site does not show evidence of ancient or recent bedrock landslides. Also, no recent surficial slope failures or slumps were observed by the consulting geotechnical engineers within the proposed project area on the property. A slope stability analysis was performed for the ascending slopes. Gross stability analysis indicates that the bedrock slopes are stable. Therefore construction of the proposed project would not be expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p><u>Substantial Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil</u></p> <p>The graded and natural areas of the proposed project would be subject to erosion, sedimentation during, and following the stripping of existing vegetation and grading. The Grading Code, as well as the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act regulations, requires that erosion be controlled and minimized through the use of Best Management Practices, and appropriate flood and storm drainage control systems. Compliance with those codes and regulations will reduce soil erosion and loss of topsoil to acceptable levels. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | |
| <p><u>Geologic Unit or Soil that is Unstable</u></p> <p>According to the Preliminary Geologic and Soils Engineering Investigation, some surficial erosion/surficial slope failures may occur during inclement weather at the project site. In order to mitigate this possible occurrence, the Preliminary Geologic and Soils Engineering Investigation recommends that all slopes should be planted and maintained. In particular, the report recommends deep-rooted shrubs should be planted in staggered rows that do not exceed 10 feet on center over the slope face.</p> <p>Land subsidence is the gradual sinking or downward warping of the earth's surface due to a variety of possible circumstances and or activities that include mining, and the removal of oil or groundwater. No potential land subsidence-related circumstances and or activities are suspected to occur on the project site, nor have they in the past. No potential for land subsidence</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>exists and, as such, no impact is expected to occur.</p> <p>Expansive Soils</p> <p>According to the project’s Preliminary Geologic and Soils Engineering Investigation, expansive soils were not encountered on the project site. Therefore, no impact from expansive soils would be expected to occur.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | |
| SECTION IV.G HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS | | |
| <p><u>Underground Storage Tanks (USTs)</u></p> <p>As part of the Phase II ESA, soil samples were taken by a hollow-stem auger drill to test for soil contamination caused by the UST. Three soil samples were taken at and around the site of the former UST, to depths ranging between 10 to 30 feet. The soil samples were analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons. All three soil sample did not contain detectable amounts of petroleum hydrocarbons. Therefore no further remediation measures are required and the site of the former UST would not cause any significant impacts</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p><u>Pesticides</u></p> <p>As part of the Phase II ESA, soil samples were taken by a hand auger drill to test for soil contamination caused by the use of pesticides. Four soil samples were taken in the areas identified by the Phase I ESA to have potential for pesticide contamination. Another four samples were taken at random locations around the golf course. Soil samples were taken to depths between one to three feet. All eight soil samples were tested for</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|---|
| <p>organochloride pesticides using the EPA method 8081A. The soil samples collected did not contain concentration of organochloride pesticides that exceeded the U.S. EPA Region 9 preliminary remedial goals for residential or commercial soil. Based upon the chemical analytical results no further soil assessment or remediation for pesticides is recommended for the project site. Therefore impacts related to historical use of pesticides on the project site are less than significant.</p> <p><u>Petroleum Hydrocarbon Surface Staining</u></p> <p>Petroleum hydrocarbon surface staining was observed at the area north of the maintenance shed utilized as the prayer and tractor parking. As the staining was considered an REC the Phase II ESA sought further testing to evaluate whether or not soil contamination had occurred.</p> <p>A total of three soil samples, ranging from a depth of one to three feet, were taken from two locations in the vicinity of the maintenance area where surface staining was observed and one of the soil samples contained detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons. This sample was taken approximately eight feet south of the northern-most boundary of the maintenance area, in an area of surface staining, north of the maintenance shed used by the golf course to store a diesel fuel powered tractor</p> <p><u>Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs)</u></p> <p>An asbestos containing materials (ACM) survey was not preformed on the project site. However, based upon visual observation, pipeline sections being stored in the golf course maintenance area may contain asbestos. In addition, due to the age of construction of the some of the buildings on the</p> | <p><u>Contaminated Soils</u></p> <p>G-1 It is recommended that the visibly stained soils present in the tractor parking area be excavated and properly disposed at a regulated disposal facility. Upon completion of the removal of these soils, soil samples should be collected to verify that no significant concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons remain present in the soil at this location.</p> <p><u>Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs)</u></p> <p>G-2 Prior to the issuance of the demolition/renovation permits, the applicant shall provide a letter to the Department of Building and Safety from a qualified asbestos abatement consultant that no ACMs are present in the buildings. If ACMs are found to be present, they shall be abated in compliance with the</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>project site, there exists a potential for asbestos containing materials to be present at the project site. Prior to demolition, a comprehensive asbestos survey should be conducted. This activity is required by the USEPA National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulation and the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) Rule 1403. Bulk samples of all materials which are suspected of containing asbestos shall be collected and analyzed for asbestos content. Asbestos removal is stringently controlled by Federal Regulations and SCAQMD Rule 1403.</p> | <p>South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1403, as well as other state and federal regulations. Specific requirements of Rule 1403 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of a thorough survey of the affected facility prior to issuance of permits for any demolition or renovation activity, including inspection, identification, and quantification of all friable and certain non-friable asbestos-containing materials. • Surveys which include collection and analyses of representative asbestos building material samples, and quantification of these materials for asbestos abatement purposes prior to or during demolition/renovation. • Notification of the SCAQMD of the intent to demolish or renovate any facility at least ten days prior to commencing with the activity. • Removal of all asbestos-containing materials prior to any demolition or renovation activity that would break up, dislodge, or similarly disturb the material. • Use of legally required procedures when removing asbestos-containing materials. • Placement of all collected asbestos-containing materials in leak-tight containers or wrapping. • Disposal of asbestos-containing materials as required by applicable regulations. | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| <p><u>Lead-Based Paints (LBPs)</u></p> <p>A lead-based paint survey was not conducted for the project site. However, given the age of some of the existing structures on the project site, lead based paint is conservatively assumed to be present, and the safe handling of such material is required to prevent adverse impacts. The demolitions of buildings containing lead based paint are subject to a comprehensive set of California regulations. Construction workers are protected pursuant to Construction Safety Orders Section 1532.1 of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations. Lead-contaminated debris and other wastes must be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable provisions of the California Health and Safety Code. With compliance with all applicable rules and regulations, hazardous materials impacts relative to exposure to lead-based paint would be less than significant.</p> <p><u>Operational Impacts of the Proposed Project</u></p> <p>The proposed project consists of single-family homes. Therefore, there would be no use, storage, or transportation of significant amounts of hazardous materials. Minor amounts of hazardous materials may be used by future residents, including motor oil, grease, paints and solvents. Potential impacts associated with the use of such hazardous materials would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels through compliance with the California Health and Safety Code and the LAMC. In addition, as discussed in Section IV.O.3 (Solid Waste), residents of the City may participate in City and County-sponsored household hazardous waste pick-</p> | <p><u>Lead-Based Paint (LBP)</u></p> <p>G-3 Prior to issuance of permits for any demolition/renovation activity involving a particular structure, a lead-based paint assessment of each existing structure shall be conducted. Lead-based paint found in any buildings shall be removed and disposed of as a hazardous waste in accordance with all applicable regulations. Such regulations that would be followed during demolition include Construction Safety Orders 1532.1 (pertaining to lead) from Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, and lead exposure guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| <p>up days that are held in various locations throughout the City and County.</p> <p>The closest existing or proposed school to the project site is located approximately 2.4 miles away (see Section IV.L.3 (Schools)). Due to this distance, the proposed project would not emit or handle hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with hazardous materials because of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed project would not routinely transport, use or dispose of hazardous materials; • The proposed project would not result in reasonably foreseeable conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; • The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; and • The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, with the exception of the UST listed on the HAZMAT and CA FID UST. However, impacts associated with the UST have been discussed above and are less | | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| than significant. | | |
| SECTION IV.H HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY | | |
| <p><u>Storm Water Runoff</u></p> <p>The proposed project will be required to submit site drainage plans to the City Engineer and other responsible agencies for review and approval prior to development of any drainage improvements. For the reasons discussed below, with the implementation of the approved drainage plans, no significant long-term operational impact from storm water runoff would be expected. Therefore, mitigation measures are not required under CEQA. Notwithstanding the above, the measures listed in the adjacent column are recommended to reduce further the project’s less-than-significant impacts from storm water runoff</p> <p><u>Alteration of Drainage Patterns/Soil Erosion/Siltation on- or off-site</u></p> <p>Project site development would result in minor alterations of drainage patterns, due to the construction of a storm drain system. However, no substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern would occur. All site runoff would continue to flow to the storm drain in La Tuna Canyon Road or to the Verdugo Wash, in approximately the same locations as it does currently. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to alteration of existing drainage patterns.</p> <p>The graded and natural areas of the proposed project will be subject to erosion and sedimentation during and following grading of the</p> | <p><u>Storm Water Runoff</u></p> <p>H-1 Post-development runoff rates shall not exceed the calculated runoff rates for the project site in its pre-development condition.</p> <p>H-2 Building pads shall have sufficient height above the curb to drain toward the street on a slope of two percent. Pad drainage may be conveyed to the street via side lot swales, as required.</p> <p>H-3 Permanent drainage and debris control facilities shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. As proposed, such facilities shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground storm drains with capacity for a 50-year frequency storm. • Underground stormwater storage tanks sized in accordance with the recommendations of the project’s Drainage Analysis as approved by the City Engineer/Department of Building and Safety <p>H-4 Where the tributary area is deemed sufficient by the City Engineer and approved by the decision-maker, paved drainage terraces shall be provided along terraces, at the top of cuts, and behind retaining structures.</p> <p>H-5 Slopes shall be graded so that runoff of surface water is minimized.</p> <p>H-6 Semi-permeable pavement shall be utilized for hardscape areas.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>development areas. The Grading Code, as well as the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act regulations, requires that erosion be controlled and minimized through the use of Best Management Practices, and appropriate flood and storm drainage control systems. The proposed project's includes the provision of the underground runoff storage tanks and debris basins. The storage tanks will permit the release of runoff at a rate that does not exceed that generated by the project site in its existing condition, while the debris basins will reduce the quantity of sediment conveyed offsite. Thus the project would not increase the potential for downstream erosion or sedimentation. Therefore, the project's impacts with respect to erosion and/or siltation on-or off-site would be less than significant.</p> <p>Alteration of Drainage Patterns/Increased Runoff/Potential Flooding</p> <p>The proposed project would result in minor alterations of drainage patterns, due to the construction of a storm drain system. However, no substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern would occur. All site runoff would continue to flow to the storm drain in La Tuna Canyon Road or to the Verdugo Wash, in approximately the same locations as it does currently. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to alteration of existing drainage patterns.</p> <p>Through the use of on-site storm water storage, the proposed project will return post development runoff rates to pre-development levels. Therefore, the proposed project will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site.</p> | <p>H-7 Project shall adhere to applicable provisions of the LAMC, Flood Hazard Management Specific Plan and the recommendations of the City Engineer/Department of Building and Safety.</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>Project impacts with respect to flooding will be less than significant.</p> <p>Water Runoff Exceeding Capacity of Existing or Planned Drainage</p> <p>The design of the project’s on-site storm water storage system assumes that the existing storm drainage system serving the project site was designed to only convey the storm runoff from existing conditions. To handle the increase in on-site runoff due to site development, the project design provides for the storage of runoff in excess of existing conditions during periods of peak flow and the slow release of the excess runoff at a rate that will not exceed the design capacity of the existing storm drainage system. Therefore, the proposed project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage system and impacts in this regard will be less than significant.</p> | | |
| <p><u>100 Year Flood Dangers</u></p> <p>The project would not place any housing or within a designated 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, no impact would occur with respect to 100-year flood hazard areas.</p> <p>Additionally, the project would not place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, no impact would occur with respect to 100-year flood hazard areas.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p><u>Flooding Dangers</u></p> <p>There are no levees or dams upstream from the project site. Therefore, the</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, no impact due to flooding caused by a dam or levee failure would occur.</p> <p><u>Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow?</u></p> <p>A tsunami is a sea wave caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. Tsunami can cause catastrophic damage to shallow and or exposed coastlines. The project site is located approximately 40 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean, and is at an elevation sufficiently above sea level to preclude affects of tsunami. Therefore, the potential for tsunami to affect the project site is considered non-existent.</p> <p>Seiches are changes or oscillations of water levels within a confined body of water due to fluctuations in the atmosphere, tidal currents, or earthquakes. The effect of this phenomenon is a “standing wave” that would occur in a body of water that would occur when influenced by the external stimulus. No lakes, reservoirs, or other large confined bodies of water are in close proximity of the project site. Therefore, the potential for seiches to affect the project is considered non-existent.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p>Water Quality</p> <p>Because the proposed project is a residential development, rather than an industrial one, the quality of its runoff would not be expected to be contaminated with the types of industrial pollutants that currently cause most of the groundwater quality problems in the San Fernando</p> | <p>H-8 Newly-excavated sites tend to contribute significant amounts of sediments and toxic materials to the drainage systems. The following steps shall be taken to minimize this process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where feasible, phase construction to limit activity during the wettest | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>Groundwater Basin. Rather, the quality of its runoff would be comparable to that of other residential uses in the area. Furthermore, existing federal, state and local water quality control programs, with which the project is required to comply, are specifically designed to ensure that new projects will not result in a violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. For example, the installation and regular maintenance of the BMPs required by the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit, including a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, would ensure that construction-related contamination of surface runoff would be retained and treated onsite before it is released to the public storm drainage system. Similarly, Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 64.70 <i>et seq.</i>, provides for the installation and regular maintenance of the BMPs to control stormwater and urban runoff pollution from activities associated with the long term occupancy of hillside developments. Therefore, the project would not be expected to result in a violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.</p> <p>While mitigation measures are not required under CEQA with respect to the project’s less-than-significant water quality-related impacts, the mitigation measures listed in the adjacent column are recommended to reduce further those impacts.</p> | <p>months of the year (i.e., December, January and February).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stabilize exposed surfaces immediately after construction is complete, and ensure that permanent stabilization is successful, through implementation of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimization of stripped areas; • Use of straw bale filters and sand bagging; • Temporary seeding and mulching of all stripped areas; • Conservation cultivation practices on steep slopes; • Traffic control on construction sites; • Berms and crushed stone on construction roads; • Reduction of effective slope length in critical areas with benches or terraces; and • Slopes shall be planted with protective vegetation and a suitable watering system (in conformance with City requirements) installed as soon as practical after completion of grading. • Use of accepted materials storage procedures, spill prevention and other “housekeeping” practices to prevent runoff contamination by toxic chemicals such as paints, solvents, pesticides, metals from building materials, or fuels. <p>H-9 The project developer shall be responsible for obtaining the necessary NPDES Construction Permit for the project site from the Regional Water Resources Control Board, Wastewater Division. The project developer</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| | <p>shall obtain a Notice of Intent (NOI) for compliance with the State’s NPDES General Construction Permit prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Construction Permit NOI shall include a SWPPP to address construction sediment and erosion control. The project developer would also be required to address long-term monitoring and the implementation of BMPs to the “maximum extent practicable”. Maximum extent practicable means to the maximum extent possible, taking into account the latest available technology and economic feasibility.</p> <p>H-10 Temporary erosion control measures, such as landscaping, berms, etc., shall be implemented following grading to minimize sedimentation impacts to onsite drainages. Available measures include introduction of rapid developing, soil-anchoring groundcover (of native plant species), and strategic placement of runoff-detaining structures. These runoff-detaining structures and all remaining construction sediment and debris shall be removed at the time of project completion.</p> <p>H-11 Cleaning of wastes and debris from all project area debris retention and water detention basins shall be completed by the homeowners’ association(s) on a quarterly basis (or more frequently if reasonably required). Special importance shall be given to the cleaning of debris retention and water detention basins prior to the first rainstorm of the year, in order to reduce “first flush” effects on the area watershed and to prevent unnecessary sediment and waste load transport.</p> <p>H-12 The project developer and homeowners’ association(s) shall work with the City to make residents aware of used motor oil recycling facilities and household hazardous waste drop-off centers in the area. Availability of</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>centers can reduce the amount of toxic contaminants found in urban runoff.</p> <p>H-13 Signage shall be installed on all project storm drain inlets to read: "NO DUMPING OF WASTE-DRAINS TO OCEAN," or other similar signage consistent with forthcoming City policies.</p> <p>H-14 Reducing pesticide and fertilizer use at the source can remove these pollutants from urban runoff. The project developer and homeowners' association(s) shall adopt Integrated Pest Management (IPM) programs for use on their own public grounds in addition to promoting their use to project residents.</p> <p>H-15 "Pooper-scooper" regulations shall be included in CC&Rs to require proper disposal of animal waste and to prevent additional nutrient loading of storm drains.</p> | |
| SECTION IV.I LAND USE AND PLANNING | | |
| <p><u>Community Division</u></p> <p>Although the proposed project would be more densely developed than the residential areas to the north and east, the proposed project involves residential uses and open space. There are currently no community services or public services⁸ on the project site, and there are no existing roadways through the project site that are used by the adjacent residential communities to the north and east. Therefore, the proposed residential uses</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

⁸ Community and public services include schools, libraries, recreational facilities, neighborhood retail uses and other community-serving land uses.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>would not introduce a new use to the area and would not divide the residential communities to the north and east. Moreover, there would be an open space buffer between the residential uses to the north and the project site and the land uses to the east of the project site are currently separated from the project site by Tujunga Canyon Boulevard. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide any established communities.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Compatibility with Adjacent Land Uses</u></p> <p>The project site is located at a transitional point between the rural/equestrian La Tuna Canyon community to the west, the traditional single-family neighborhoods to the north and northeast, and the mixed uses (including some multi-family housing) along Tujunga Canyon Road and Honolulu Avenue to the east. From a functional perspective, the proposed homes would be most compatible with the multiple-family housing to the east and the least compatible with the existing community in La Tuna Canyon. For the La Tuna Canyon community there would be the perception of encroaching urbanization and the loss of the community's rural/equestrian character. The inclusion of approximately 29.71 acres of hillside open space and the difference in elevation between the proposed homes and the existing single-family homes to the north would help to alleviate compatibility issues between these two communities.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <p><u>Consistency with Land Use Plans, Policies and Regulations</u></p> <p>The proposed project is partially or entirely consistent with the provisions and requirements of the applicable regional and local plans and regulations that currently govern development of the project site and surrounding areas.</p> <p><u>Regional Plans</u></p> <p>Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide: The RCPG does not include any policies which are generally applicable to the proposed project. According to SCAG, the proposed project is not regionally significant per SCAG Intergovernmental Review Criteria and CEQA.</p> <p>Air Quality Management Plan: The proposed project is consistent with the AQMP as demonstrated in Section IV.C, Air Quality.</p> <p>Congestion Management Plan: The proposed project is consistent with the CMP as identified in Section IV.P, Transportation and Circulation.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p><u>Local Plans</u></p> <p>City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element: The proposed project would be partially consistent with the General Plan Framework's goals and policies regarding preserving existing residential neighborhoods and consistent with the goals and policies regarding providing housing opportunities within the city.</p> <p>Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan: The proposed project would</p> | <p>I-1 Approximately 35.15 acres of the project site shall be set aside in perpetuity in a conservation easement, open to the general public, thereby preserving the land as natural open space and preventing future development.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| <p>represent a less dense than the maximum development potential permitted by the Community Plan. Although the proposed project would result in the removal of a recreational use, the Community Plan designates the site for residential uses; therefore, under CEQA, the proposed uses are consistent with the Community Plan land use designation. Additionally, the Community Plan includes other goals, objectives and policies that are generally applicable to the proposed project, the proposed project can be found to be partially consistent with the applicable policies .</p> <p>San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan: The proposed project was designed to comply with the regulations of the Specific Plan. The proposed project meets the spirit and intent of the Specific Plan by confining development to the existing developed areas of the golf course. Native vegetation will be used in the landscape design, building heights will be below the maximum permitted height and no development will occur along any prominent ridgelines. In addition to the compliance with hillside preservation measures, the project will also provide additional landscaping along La Tuna Canyon to enhance the character of the scenic corridor.</p> <p>Zoning Code: As the project site is currently limited to the density permitted by the RD5 zone per Footnote No. 20 on the land use map, the vesting zone change to RD5 does not represent an actual change to the development potential of the site. The vesting zone change would essentially be implementing the land use designation of the Community Plan, which is the purpose of the zoning ordinance. Therefore the development of the 229 units and the zone change would be within the</p> | | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>development potential that currently exists on the site and would achieve land use-zoning compatibility on the site and not result in any significant impacts to existing conditions.</p> <p>The proposed project’s land use impacts as defined by CEQA and discussed above and below would be less than significant. However, as the proposed project will result in less development than is permitted for the site, a mitigation measure is proposed to ensure no future development will occur and that the existing undeveloped hillsides will remain undeveloped.</p> | | |
| SECTION IV.J NOISE | | |
| <p><u>Construction Noise</u></p> <p>Temporary construction noise levels could periodically exceed 75 dBA CNEL at the closest homes in the vicinity of the project site. As the existing noise levels at these homes average approximately 64.1 dBA CNEL due to traffic, this represents a potentially significant impact.</p> | <p><i>Construction Noise</i></p> <p>J-1 The project shall comply with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 41.40 which restricts construction and demolition activities to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday.</p> <p>J-2 Construction and demolition activities shall be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels.</p> <p>J-3 The use of those pieces of construction equipment or construction methods with the greatest peak noise generation potential shall be minimized to the extent feasible. Examples include the use of drills, jackhammers, and pile drivers.</p> <p>J-4 Noise construction activities whose specific location on the site may be</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling) shall be conducted as far as possible from the nearest noise-sensitive land uses, and natural and/or manmade barriers (e.g., intervening construction trailers) shall be used to screen propagation of noise from such activities towards these land uses to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>J-5 Equipment warm-up areas, water tanks, and equipment storage areas shall be located as far as possible from the surrounding residential uses..</p> <p>J-6 The project contractor shall use power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices.</p> <p>J-7 Flexible sound control curtains shall be placed around drilling apparatuses and drill rigs used within the project site, if sensitive receptors are located at, or within 50 feet.</p> | |
| <p><u>Construction Vibration</u></p> <p>Vibration levels would be approximately 75.5 VdB at the closest portions of the single-family residences. However, overall, the single-family residences would not be exposed to vibration levels that exceed FTA's threshold of 80 VdB for buildings where people would normally sleep⁹. This would result in less than significant impact.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

⁹ Pile driving is not an anticipated activity which would be required in order to develop the proposed project.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|
| <p><u>Operational Noise</u></p> <p>Off-Site Vehicular Noise</p> <p>Off-site locations in the project vicinity would experience a slight increase in noise resulting from the additional traffic generated by the proposed project. The proposed project would increase local noise levels by a maximum of 0.5 dBA CNEL for La Tuna Canyon Road; west of Tujunga Canyon Boulevard. However, several of the analyzed roadway segments would not experience an increase in roadway noise as a result of the proposed project. As the increase in local noise levels at all of the analyzed roadway segments resulting from implementation of the proposed project would not exceed the thresholds in the <u>L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide</u>, they would not represent a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>HVAC Systems</p> <p>Upon buildout of the proposed project, new sources of noise would include stationary sources, such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC). The HVAC systems that would be installed for the proposed project would typically result in noise levels that average between 40 and 50 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet from the equipment. The 24-hour CNEL noise levels are about 6.7 dBA greater than 24-hour L_{eq} measurements. As such, the HVAC equipment associated with the proposed residences could generate noise levels that average between 47 to 57 dBA CNEL at 50 feet from the source when the equipment is operating continuously over 24-hour period. These noise levels would not exceed the City's exterior noise level standard of 60 dBA CNEL for the nearby single-family residences. Therefore, this</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| impact would be less than significant. | | |
| SECTION IV.K POPULATON AND HOUSING | | |
| <p><u>Direct Growth</u></p> <p>The proposed project includes the construction of only 229 single-family homes, a relatively small residential project that would be occupied by approximately 577 people, which on its face does not constitute substantial population growth. The projected population associated with the proposed project would also be consistent with area-wide population and housing forecasts. Specifically, the proposed project represents approximately six percent of the forecasted population growth and less than six percent of the forecasted housing growth in the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan area.</p> <p>The proposed project is also consistent with the projected housing in the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan. The Community Plans permit 9 to 18 dwelling unit per net acre under the Low Medium I Density Residential land use designation, which is the existing land use designation for the approximately 28 acres of the project site to be developed with the residential units. The land use designations for the balance of the project site is Minimum Residential which permits 0 to 1 dwelling units per net acre. The housing projections in the Community Plans are based on the midpoint in the range of dwelling units permitted under each residential land use designation, thus the projected housing in the Community Plans with respect to land with a Low Medium II Residential land use designation is based on 13.5 dwelling units per acre. Therefore the development of 229 townhouses would require approximately 17 net acres</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <p>of land (based on a midpoint density of 13.5 units per acre). The Community Plans projects approximately 393 homes (28 acres x 13.5 d.u/ac and 30 acres x .5 d.u/ac) on the project site. In contrast, the proposed project includes only 229 homes on the 58-acre project site, which translates to approximately 3.94 dwelling units per net acre (229 ÷ 58). Therefore, the proposed project is within the City's growth projections. As a result, development of the proposed project would not directly induce substantial population growth and impacts relating to population and housing would be less than significant.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Indirect Growth</u></p> <p>The proposed project would extend roadways and other infrastructure (e.g., water facilities, sewer facilities, electricity transmission lines, natural gas lines, etc.) to and within the project). However, the proposed roadways and other infrastructure would not induce growth because they would only serve project residents. In addition, over 50 percent of the project site would be preserved as open space and would not be available for future development. As a result, development of the proposed project would not indirectly induce substantial population growth and impacts relating to population and housing would be less than significant.</p> | No mitigation measures required. | Less than Significant |
| <p><u>Population or Housing Displacement</u></p> <p>The project site does not currently contain any housing or people. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not displace housing or people and no impacts would occur.</p> | No mitigation measures required. | No Impact |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| SECTION IV.L PUBLIC SERVICES | | |
| 1. FIRE PROTECTION | | |
| <p>Construction</p> <p>While the proposed project’s construction-related activities would increase the potential for starting a wildfire, construction is not considered to be a high-risk activity and the LAFD is equipped and prepared to deal with such fires should they occur. During demolition, the fire department access will remain clear and unobstructed. Project construction would not be expected to tax fire fighting and emergency services to the extent that there would be a need for new or expanded fire facilities, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the LAFD. Therefore, construction-related impacts to fire protection and medical emergency services would be less than significant.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p>Fire Flows</p> <p>The Water Operations Division of the DWP would perform a fire flow study at the time of permit review in order to ascertain whether further water system or site-specific improvements would be necessary. Hydrants, water lines, and water tanks would be installed per Fire Code requirements and would be based upon the specific land uses of the proposed project. Therefore, with respect to fire flows, fire protection would be adequate.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p>Response Distance</p> <p>The response distance from these fire stations does not meet LAMC recommendations, and therefore, the project site’s proximity to three well-</p> | <p>L.1-1 Sprinkler systems shall be provided in each structure in accordance with Section 57.09.07 of the LAMC.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>equipped fire stations, fire protection response would be considered inadequate with respect to response distance and impacts would be potentially significant.</p> | <p>L.1-2 At least two different ingress/egress roads shall be provided for each area that will accommodate major fire apparatus and provide for major evacuation during emergency situations.</p> <p>L.1-3 Adequate off-site public and on-site private fire hydrants may be required, with their number and location to be determined after the LAFD's review of the plot plan.</p> <p>L.1-4 The project developer shall have irrigated and managed greenbelts around the perimeter of all structures for a distance of 100 feet, which shall be considered as a buffer between the brush and the proposed project.</p> <p>L.1-5 All landscaping shall use indigenous fire-resistant plants and materials, based on the LAFD's list of such plants.</p> <p>L.1-6 All homes shall have Class A noncombustible roofs (non-wood).</p> <p>L.1-7 The brush in the area adjacent to the proposed development shall be cleared or thinned periodically by the homeowners' association(s) under supervision of the LAFD in order to reduce the risk of brush fires spreading to the homes.</p> <p>L.1-8 Construction of public or private roadways in the proposed development shall not exceed 15 percent in grade.</p> <p>L.1-9 Private development shall conform to the standard street dimensions shown on City Department of Public Works Standard Plan S-470-0.</p> <p>L.1-10 Because the project is located in a VHFHSZ, it shall comply with requirements in accordance with LAMC 57.25.01, which include: a.</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>boxed-in eaves; b. single pane, double thickness (minimum 1/8 inch thickness) or insulated windows; c. non-wood siding; d. exposed wooden members shall be two inches nominal thickness; and e. noncombustible finishes; and f. vertical vents with ¼ inch non-combustible corrosion-resistant metal mesh..</p> <p>L.1-11 No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road or designated fire lane.</p> <p>L.1-12 Fire lanes, where provided, and dead ending streets shall terminate in a cul-de-sac or other approved turning area. No dead ending street or fire lane shall be greater than 700 feet in length or secondary access shall be provided.</p> <p>L.1-13 All access roads, including fire lanes, shall be maintained in an unobstructed manner, removal of obstructions shall be at the owner's expense. The entrance to all fire lanes or private driveways shall be posted with a sign no less than three square feet in area in accordance with Section 57.09.05 of the LAMC.</p> <p>L.1-14 Fire lane width shall not be less than 20 feet. When a fire lane must accommodate the operation of LAFD aerial ladder apparatus or where fire hydrants are installed, those portions shall not be less than 28 feet in width.</p> <p>L.1-15 Definitive plans and specifications shall be submitted to the LAFD and requirements for necessary permits satisfied prior to commencement of construction. Plans shall include the availability and location of fire</p> | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>Emergency Access</p> <p>Traffic impacts during operation of the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on any nearby roadways or intersections, which could thereby impede emergency access. The proposed project would not involve any other activities during its operational phase that could impede public access or travel upon public rights-of-way or would interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Thus, project implementation would not require the construction or expansion of fire stations or other fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>suppressant materials onsite.</p> <p>L.1-16 All residential units adjacent to fuel modification area shall store onsite class A chemical fire inhibitor/retardant gel and/or barricade foams to protect from wildfires. The availability and location of fire suppressant materials onsite shall be the responsibility of the HOA. Documentation of foams shall be provided to Department of Building and Safety prior to Certificate of Occupancy.</p> <p>L.1-17 Equip automatic gates with approved emergency key operated switches that override all command functions so the gate can be opened by emergency personnel.</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>Fire Hazards</p> <p>The project site is in a VHFHSZ. To protect against wildfires, several acres surrounding the site will be subject to modification due to the City’s fuel modification requirements. In compliance with the Fire Code, onsite fire hydrants would be sited within 1,000 feet of all buildings as measured along any route that would be potentially used for emergency access. Furthermore, the LAFD’s standard conditions with respect to emergency access are included as recommended mitigation measures below to ensure that there would be sufficient emergency access to the project site. Also, the LAFD has reviewed preliminary plans for the proposed project and would again review the plans prior to approval of the vesting tract map. This would ensure that adequate fire protection facilities would be provided, particularly in light of the project site’s location in a VHFHSZ, and that new or expanded fire protection facilities would not be necessary.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p>LAFD Review</p> <p>The LAFD has preliminarily reviewed the proposed project and has requested a number of conditions of approval. These are presented below as recommended mitigation measures. Additional LAFD review would occur during the vesting tract map stage, prior to any building construction. The incorporation of the LAFD’s requirements would ensure that the proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the LAFD. Therefore, the proposed project’s operational-related impacts to fire protection and emergency</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|
| <p>services would be less than significant.</p> | | |
| <p>2. POLICE PROTECTION</p> <p>Construction</p> <p>Construction sites can be sources of attractive nuisances, providing hazards, and inviting theft and vandalism. Therefore, when not properly secured, construction sites can become a distraction for local law enforcement from more pressing matters that require their attention. Temporary fencing will be installed around the construction site to keep out the curious. Deployment of roving security guards may also be employed to prevent problems from developing. These precautions reduce the need for local law enforcement at the construction site.</p> <p>Due to the topography in the project area, site access is limited to La Tuna Canyon Road and Tujunga Canyon Boulevard. Most construction-related traffic (i.e., commuting construction workers and truck deliveries) is anticipated to be predominantly freeway-oriented on Interstate-210. Although minor traffic delays may occur during construction, particularly during utilities and street improvements, impacts to police response times would be minimal and temporary. Therefore, the proposed project's construction-related impacts to police protection services would be less than significant.</p> <p>Operation</p> <p>The proposed project includes significant crime prevention design features. The proposed project would minimize public access and be buffered by</p> | <p>Construction</p> <p>L.2-1 During construction activities, the project developer shall ensure that all onsite areas of active development, material and equipment storage, and vehicle staging, that are adjacent to existing public roadways, be secured to prevent trespass</p> <p>Operation</p> <p>L.2-2 The project developer shall submit a plot plan for the proposed</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>Interstate 210 and the steep hillsides and drainages that surround them. With these design features, the level of police protection required for the proposed project would be substantially reduced in comparison with a typical subdivision.</p> <p>In addition to those crime prevention design features, mitigation measures are recommended to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times and other performance objectives of the LAPD. These mitigation measures are not required under CEQA because, as discussed above, the proposed project should not create the need for new or expanded police facilities. However, they are recommended to reduce further the effects of the proposed project on police protection services.</p> | <p>development to the LAPD’s Crime Prevention Section for review and comment. Security features subsequently recommended by the LAPD shall be implemented, to the extent feasible.</p> <p>L.2-3 Upon completion of the project, the project developer shall provide the Foothill Area Commanding Officer with a diagram of the project. The diagram shall include access routes, addresses, and any other information that might facilitate prompt and efficient police response.</p> <p>L.2-4 The project developer shall give the Foothill Area Commanding Officer access codes and/or keys to lock boxes to gated portions of the project site.</p> <p>L.2-5 The project homeowners’ association(s) shall retain a single alarm and security patrol company to: patrol the site and correct false alarms expeditiously.</p> <p>L.2-6 The project homeowners’ association(s) shall ensure that clearly identifiable address indicators are provided for all homes and other buildings.</p> | |
| <p>3. SCHOOLS</p> <p>The proposed project would not generate enough students to exceed the capacities of the schools serving the project site to necessitate the construction of new or physically altered school facilities. Therefore, impacts on schools would be less than significant. Furthermore, the project applicant would be required to pay a school fee of \$4.18 per square foot of new residential development to the LAUSD in compliance with SB 50, notwithstanding the less-than-significant impact on school facilities. This</p> | <p>L.3-1 The applicant will pay all applicable mandatory school impact fees to LAUSD to offset the impact of additional student enrollment at schools serving the project area.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| fee provides full and complete mitigation of any potential school impacts. | | |
| <p>4. LIBRARIES</p> <p>The project’s demand for library facilities was calculated using the State of California standards, which are 0.5 square feet of facility space per resident. This was the standard used in the City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework EIR. Based on these standards, the project would generate an additional library need of approximately 335.5 (671 x 0.5) square feet of space. The 335.5 square feet of additional space is the approximate equivalent of an 18.5’ x 18.5’ room, the construction of which would not be expected to result in any significant environmental impacts. In addition, some of the additional impact would be lessened with the use of the La Crescenta Library nearby. Finally, the payment of mitigation fees by the project developer would be used for staff, library materials, and other needs like funding a new or expanded facility. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>L.4-1 The project applicant shall pay a mitigation fee of \$200 per capita based on the projected population of the development to the Los Angeles Public Library to offset the impact of additional library facility demand in the project are</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| SECTION IV.M RECREATION | | |
| <p>Based on the parkland per population ratio of four acres per 1,000 persons, the 577 new residents¹⁰ of the proposed project would generate a demand of an additional 2.3 acres of new parkland. No onsite parkland is proposed and no onsite recreational facilities would be provided as amenities for the</p> | <p>M-1 The applicant shall be required to comply with one or more of the following: 1) dedicate two acres of neighborhood parkland and two acres of community parkland per 1,000 residents, 2) pay in-lieu fees for any land dedication requirement shortfall, or 3) provide on-site improvements</p> | <p>Significant</p> |

¹⁰ Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan, Average Household Sizes (Owner Households) = 2.52 persons per unit x 229 units = 577 persons

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>new residents. The surrounding community is currently underserved by parks and recreational facilities and this additional demand for public recreational facilities generated by the proposed project would impact existing parks and recreational facilities.¹¹</p> <p>Although additional parks and recreational opportunities are provided by non-City parks (i.e., Angeles National Forest, La Tuna Canyon Park, and Verdugo Mountains State Park), without onsite active recreational opportunities, there would be a local deficiency of active recreational opportunities for children and youth at the project site. While the development would set aside approximately 30.3 acres of open space, this area is fairly steep (with slope gradients of 15% and more) and it is covered by dense native vegetation. Hence, this open space dedication is not suitable for recreational purposes and does not address the local deficiency of active recreational facilities.</p> <p>The project developer would be required to pay Quimby fees to the City which would assist in funding capital improvement projects, upgrades to existing recreational facilities, and acquisition and development of new park and recreation facilities in the greater project vicinity. However, according to the LADRP, payment of Quimby Fees would not eliminate the</p> | <p>equivalent in value of the in-lieu fees, or any portion thereof as required by the Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 17.12.</p> | |

¹¹ Written correspondence from Michael Shull, Superintendent, Planning and Development, Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, February 15, 2008.

¹² Ibid.

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>proposed project's impact on parks and recreational facilities.¹²</p> <p>Furthermore, the payment of Quimby Fees to fund new nearby facilities would not mitigate the loss of the Verdugo Hills Golf Course for the community.</p> | | |
| <p>SECTION IV.N TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</p> | | |
| <p>Project Related Traffic</p> <p>There would be direct project impacts at two of the ten study intersections directly affected by traffic generated by the proposed project:</p> <p><i>Intersection No. 7 - Lowell Avenue/Honolulu Avenue</i></p> <p>The traffic generated by the proposed project would create a significant impact this intersections, based on both the City of Los Angeles and City of Glendale thresholds for significance.</p> | <p>N-1 <u>Intersection No. 7: Lowell Avenue/Honolulu Avenue</u></p> <p>The recommended mitigation measure consists of the restriping of the west leg of the intersection to provide one combination through/right-turn lane and one exclusive right-turn only lane for the eastbound approach on Honolulu Avenue. The resultant lane configuration at the eastbound approach will be one left-turn lane, one through lane, one combination through/right-turn lane and one right-turn only lane. This improvement measure may require removal of two to three curbside parking spaces on the west side of Lowell Avenue and the south side of Honolulu Avenue near the intersection. The recommended mitigation measure is anticipated to reduce the forecast project-related traffic impact at the subject study intersection during the AM peak hour to less than significant levels. The improvement is expected to improve operations to 0.785 (LOS C) from 0.980 (LOS E) using the CMA methodology and to 0.884 (LOS D) from 1.039 (LOS F) using the ICU methodology. The concept improvement plan of the recommended measure for the Lowell Avenue/Honolulu Avenue</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>Intersection No. 9 - Pennsylvania Ave./Foothill Avenue</p> <p>The traffic generated by the proposed project would create a significant impact at this study intersections based on the County of Los Angeles thresholds for significance.</p> | <p>intersection is contained in Appendix D of the Traffic Impact Study.</p> <p>N-2 <u>Intersection No. 9: Pennsylvania Avenue/Foothill Boulevard</u> The recommended cumulative mitigation measure consists of restriping the eastbound approach on Foothill Boulevard at Pennsylvania Avenue for one right-turn only lane. The resultant eastbound approach lane configuration would provide one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn only lane. To accommodate the proposed right-turn lane, the existing roadway striping would need to be adjusted as needed. Appropriate “Buses Exempt” signage for this approach may be necessary to permit bus loading and progression on the south side of Foothill Boulevard through the intersection.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |
| <p>Vehicle Storage Analysis</p> <p>The storage lengths needed to accommodate peak inbound arrival traffic conditions at the driveways are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easterly Driveway - The storage length needed to accommodate peak inbound arrival conditions at the easterly driveway is 59 feet. The proposed storage length at the easterly driveway is 60 feet. • Westerly Driveway - The storage length needed to accommodate peak inbound arrival conditions at the westerly driveway is 39 feet. The proposed storage length at the westerly driveway is 60 feet. | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>Congestion Management Plan Transportation Impact Assessment</p> <p>The CMP TIA guidelines require that freeway monitoring locations must be examined if the proposed project will add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during either the AM or PM weekday peak periods. The proposed project will not add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours at any CMP freeway monitoring locations. Therefore, no further review of potential impacts to freeway monitoring locations that are part of the CMP highway system is required.</p> <p>The CMP TIA guidelines require that intersection monitoring locations must be examined if the proposed project will add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak periods. The project will not add 50 or more trips during the AM or PM peak hours at the nearest CMP monitoring location listed above. Therefore, no further review of potential impacts to intersection monitoring locations that are part of the CMP highway system is required.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures not required.</p> | <p>No impact</p> |
| <p>Public Transit</p> <p>Three bus transit lines and routes are provided adjacent to or in close proximity to the project site that provide service for an average (i.e., average of the directional number of buses during the peak hours) of approximately 14 buses during the AM peak hour and roughly 10 buses during the PM peak hour. Based on calculated AM and PM peak hour transit trips, this would correspond to no more than one additional transit rider per bus. It is anticipated that the existing transit service in the project area will adequately accommodate the net increase of project-generated transit trips. Thus, given the low number of generated transit trips per bus, no project impacts on existing or future transit services in the project area are expected to occur as a</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| result of the proposed project. | | |
| SECTION IV.O UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS | | |
| <p>1. WASTEWATER</p> <p>The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) enforces wastewater treatment and discharge requirements for properties in the project area. The project site is not served by a private onsite wastewater treatment system, but instead conveys wastewater via municipal sewage infrastructure to the local treatment plant. Treatment plants in the City of Los Angeles are subject to the State’s wastewater treatment requirements. Wastewater from the project site would therefore be treated according to the wastewater treatment requirements by the LARWQCB. Therefore, project impacts related to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements would be less than significant.</p> <p>The existing sewer lines in the immediate project vicinity would likely have the capacity to handle the wastewater generated from the proposed project, based on the estimated flow in the area.¹³ The design capacities of the sewer lines are at most 38% full and would be able to accommodate approximately twice their current flow. Since there are existing sewer lines adjacent to and nearby the project site, likely with sufficient capacity to handle the flows from the proposed project, no offsite sewer line improvements are anticipated, other than the proposed project’s</p> | <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

¹³ Brent Lorscheider, Acting Division Manager, City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, January 23, 2008.

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>connection. The HTP has a remaining capacity of 75 mgd and the proposed project’s flow of 74,798 gpd can be accommodated as this represents about 0.1 percent.¹⁴ The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the proposed project’s impact on sewer systems would be less than significant</p> <p>Although no significant sewer impacts have been identified, in order to comply with the City’s water conservation and sewer allocation ordinances, the proposed project’s new homes shall be equipped with water conservation devices (i.e. showerheads, toilets, faucets, etc.). The standard City sewage generate rate used to estimate the proposed project’s future sewage generation reflect these latest water conservation measures.</p> | | |
| <p>2. WATER SUPPLY</p> <p>Due to statewide drought conditions, there is an ongoing need for water conservation. The LADWP recommends that water should be conserved at all times, because efficient use of water allows increased water for use in dry years and makes water available for beneficial environmental uses. As such, the proposed project proposes to comply with Title 24 requirements.</p> | <p>O.2.-1 The project developer shall ensure that the landscape irrigation system be designed, installed, and tested to provide uniform irrigation coverage. Sprinkler head patterns shall be adjusted to minimize over spray onto walkways and streets.</p> <p>O.2.-2 The project developer shall install either a “smart sprinkler” system to</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

¹⁴ 74,798 / 75 million x 100% = 0.1%

¹⁵ Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Year 2000 Urban Water Management Plan, 2000.

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>The LADWP has stated that water requirements for any project that is consistent with the City’s General Plan have been taken into account in the planned growth in water demand and that sufficient supplies are available to accommodate the proposed project. Further, the LADWP has indicated in its Urban Water Management Plan that it will provide an adequate water supply to meet current and future growth until at least 2020.¹⁵ Finally, the LADWP has stated that there are no known water service problems in the area and that the treatment plant could adequately handle the proposed project.¹⁶ Therefore, impacts to water supply would be less than significant.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on water supply, the implementation of mitigation measures are recommended to reduce further the proposed project’s impacts:</p> | <p>provide irrigation for the landscaped areas or, at a minimum, set automatic irrigation timers to water landscaping during early morning or late evening hours to reduce water losses from evaporation. Irrigation run times for all zones shall be adjusted seasonally, reducing water times and frequency in the cooler months (fall, winter, spring). Sprinkler run times shall be adjusted to avoid water runoff, especially when irrigating sloped property.</p> <p>O.2.-3 The project developer shall select and use drought tolerant, low water consuming plant varieties to reduce irrigation water consumption. Mulch shall be used to the extent feasible in all landscape areas.</p> <p>O.2.-4 The project developer shall install low-flow faucet aerators on all sink faucets.</p> <p>O.2.-5 The availability of recycled water shall be investigated as a source to irrigate large landscaped areas. Confirmation of availability or lack thereof shall be made at the discretion of LADWP prior to issuance of building permit.</p> <p>O.2.-6 The project applicant shall incorporate air conditioning systems that utilize evaporative cooling (i.e., employ cooling towers) into the project.</p> <p>O.2-7 The following LADWP requirements for water conservation devices and measures for new development in the City of Los Angeles shall be</p> | |

¹⁶ Written correspondence with Charles Holloway, Manager of Environmental Assessment, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, March 26, 2008.

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High efficiency toilets (1.28 gallons per flush or less, includes dual flush) • Restroom faucet flow rate of 1.5 gallons per minute or less • Showerhead flow rate of 2.0 gallons per minute or less • Limit of one showerhead per shower stall • High efficiency clothes washers (water factor of 6.0 or less) • High efficiency dishwashers (Energy Star rated) • Cooling towers must be operated at a minimum of 5.5 cycles of concentration • Strict prohibition of single-pass cooling. Note: Single-pass cooling refers to the use of potable water to extract heat from process equipment (e.g. vacuum pump, ice machine) by passing the water through the equipment and discharging the heated water to the sanitary wastewater system • Metering: 1) All dwelling units/commercial spaces require individual metering and billing for water use, and 2) all irrigated landscapes of 5,000 square feet or more require separate metering or submetering | |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Compliance with all City of Los Angeles SUSMP requirements, and encouraging implementations of Best Management Practices that have stormwater recharge or reuse benefits | |
| <p>3. SOLID WASTE</p> <p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>Construction activities generate a variety of scraps and wastes, with the majority of recyclables being wood waste, drywall, metal, paper, and cardboard. Based on a construction generation rate of 4.38 pounds of waste for every square foot of new residential construction,¹⁷ the construction of the proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 2,168,100 pounds (1,084 tons) of solid waste over the construction period.¹⁸ Recycling of construction-related waste materials in compliance with AB 939 would substantially reduce this waste stream that would otherwise go to a landfill. Therefore, approximately 1,084,050 pounds (542 tons) of construction waste¹⁹ would be disposed of in the landfills.</p> | <p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>O.3-1 The construction contractor shall only contract for waste disposal services with a company that recycles construction-related wastes.</p> <p>O.3-2 To facilitate the onsite separation and recycling of construction related wastes, the construction contractor should provide temporary waste separation bins onsite during construction.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

¹⁷ USEPA Report No. EPA530-98-010, *Characterization of Building Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States*, July 1998, page A-1.

¹⁸ Based on approximately 495,000 square feet of residential uses (137 units x 1,800 sf + 92 units x 2,700 sf).

¹⁹ (2,168,100 pounds of solid waste generated by the proposed project)/2 per AB 939.

²⁰ S.A.F.E Centers Hazardous Materials drop-off location website: http://www.lacity.org/SAN/solid_resources/special/hhw/safe_centers/index.htm, May 30, 2008.

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>The remaining combined daily intake of the Sunshine Canyon and Chiquita Canyon Landfill is 5,619 tons per day. As such, they would have adequate capacity to accommodate the construction waste of 542 tons generated by the proposed project over its entire construction period, which is slated to last 24 months. Therefore, a less than significant impact associated with construction waste would occur.</p> <p><u>Operation</u></p> <p>Although landfill capacity in the City is limited and any addition to the overall waste stream would reduce the City’s overall landfill capacity, the Sunshine Canyon Landfill has sufficient remaining capacity for its current solid waste intake and the proposed project’s intake for the foreseeable future. Furthermore, the City is currently exploring plans to construct or purchase additional solid waste facilities, which would increase total landfill capacity in the City. Although other landfills in Los Angeles County are near capacity, potential capacity may become available through expansion of the Bradley Landfill and/or Puente Hills Landfill, conversion of waste-to-energy and through the use of waste-by-rail to landfills outside of Los Angeles County (e.g., the proposed Eagle Mountain Landfill in Riverside County). As the long-term solid waste that would be generated by the proposed project could be accommodated at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill without causing the landfill to exceed its permitted daily capacity in the foreseeable future, the proposed project’s long term impact on solid waste facilities is considered less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed project may also generate a variety of common household hazardous wastes that could adversely affect existing hazardous waste</p> | <p><u>Operation</u></p> <p>O.3-3 The project developer shall make information published by the City regarding the curbside recycling program, as well as onsite composting methods for yard waste, available to purchasers of dwelling units at the time of sale.</p> <p>O.3-4 Recycling bins shall be provided at appropriate locations to promote recycling of paper, metal, glass, and other recyclable material. The proposed project shall comply with all applicable adopted recycling and waste diversion policies of the City of Los Angeles.</p> | <p>Less than Significant</p> |

**Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures | Level of Impact After Mitigation |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| management facilities in both the City and County. These wastes may be disposed of by the residents at any of the hazardous materials pickup sites offered by the City and County. ²⁰ | | |