Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning

Project title: Project No. 2019-003283, Minor Coastal Development Permit No. RPPL2019005771, Variance No. RPPL2019005776, and Environmental Plan No. RPPL2021000702

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Contact Person and phone number: Shawn Skeries, Principal Regional Planner, Coastal Development Services; Office: (213) 974-0051; Direct: (213) 893-7042; sskeries@planning.lacounty.gov

Project sponsor's name and address: George Ghazarian, 18433 Hatteras Street, Tarzana, CA 91356

Project location: 2140 Stunt Road, Calabasas, CA 91302
APN: 4455-041-001 *USGS Quad*: Malibu Beach

Gross Acreage: Two Acres

Community/Area wide Plan designation: RL20 (Rural Lands- One dwelling unit/20 acres max.)

Zoning: R-C-20 (Rural Coastal- 20-acre minimum required lot area), within the Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Zone

Description of project: The project includes the construction of a new 2,365 square-foot, two-story, single-family residence with detached 360 square-foot garage, new Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS), new access driveway through the adjacent parcel to the east (APN 4455-009-020), fire department turnaround, hardscaping and landscaping, associated irrigation and fuel modification activities, and a total of 1,746 cubic yards of grading consisting of 725 cubic yards of cut, 682 cubic yards of over-excavation, and 339 cubic yards of fill. 386 cubic yards of cut will be exported offsite to suitable site or landfill for proper disposal. The landscape plan includes the use of drought tolerant native species and irrigation within fuel modification zones A and B. The fuel modification plan includes Zone A and B clearance, radiating from the residence a total distance of 100 feet and will be maintained as specified in the approve fuel modification plan. The required fuel modification will result in encroachments into the protected zone of two native Laurel Sumac trees through raising the canopy and thinning of crown for fire safety requirements. Mitigation trees are required for the tree impacts are included in the project scope through the use of a native tree mitigation plan.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site is situated in the Santa Monica Mountains Coastal Zone at an approximate elevation of 1,000 to 1,4000 feet above mean sea level. The project site is located on a 2-acre parcel with relatively flat topography in the southern portion with steeply sloping topography in the northern portion. The existing site conditions include a mixture of disturbed conditions and both native and non-native vegetation. The driveway access would extend from Stunt Road through existing access easements along the existing unpaved access road. There are low-density single-family residences in the surrounding area along with vacant property containing native and non-native vegetation. The project site is located in H3 and H2 habitat as defined in the Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program and has been reviewed by the Environmental Review Board (ERB).

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Yes. The County notified all California Native American Tribes that previously requested formal notification. One California Native American tribe requested consultation on the project. The County completed confidential consultation with the tribe on May 13, 2021 and an additional consultation on October 21, 2021. The discussion on determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources is further detailed in Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Public Agency	*Approval Required*
Los Angeles County	Minor Coastal Development Permit*, building permit, grading permit The project is located within the Santa Monica Local Coastal Program (LCP) boundaries. The Santa Monica Mountains LCP consists of the Land Use Plan (LUP), which contains land use policies, and more specific implementing actions in the Local Implementation Program (LIP). With regard to the Santa Monica Mountains LCP, the site is located in the R-C-20 (Rural-Coastal-20 acre-minimum lot size) Coastal Zone. The Santa Monica Mountains LCP divides the Coastal Zone into three habitat categories: H1, H2, and H3. H1 habitat and H2 habitat. H1 and H2 are areas in which plant and animal life, or their habitats, are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and development. H3 habitat consists of disturbed or isolated habitat areas that provide some important biological functions, but do not rise to a level of a H1 or H2. The proposed construction footprint is located within H2 habitat with County Fire Department required fuel modification encroaching into H2 and H3 habitat. Because the required fuel modification encroaches into H2 Habitat and because grading exceeds 50 cubic yards, a Minor CDP is required. Due to the proximity of the site to the LCP designated Scenic Resources, the height of the proposed residence is limited to an 18-foot maximum as required by Santa Monica Mountains LCP (Policy CO-136).

Major projects in the area:

Project/Case No.	*Description and Status*
Project No. 2019-00639, Case No. RPPL2019001142	Coastal Development Permit for restoration of unpermitted native tree and vegetation removal, and grading. (APN 4455-019-004). Pending.

Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None

Regional Water Quality Control Board:

- ☒ Los Angeles Region
- ☐ Lahontan Region

- ☒ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☐ LAFCO

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☒ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area

Regional Significance

- ☐ None
- ☐ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☒ Santa Monica Mtns. Area

Trustee Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- ☐ State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- ☐ State Lands Commission
- ☐ University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ Department of Public Works
- ☒ Fire Department
  - Forestry, Environmental Division
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
  - Health Hazmat
- ☒ Parks and Recreation

- ☒ Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Public Services
☐ Agriculture/Forestry	☐ Hazards/Hazardous Materials	☐ Recreation
☐ Air Quality	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Transportation
☒ Biological Resources	☐ Land Use/Planning	☒ Tribal Cultural Resources
☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities/Services
☐ Energy	☒ Noise	☒ Wildfire
☒ Geology/Soils	☐ Population/Housing	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Shawn Skeries — April 9, 2024

Signature (Prepared by) — Date

Signature (Approved by) — Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, General Plan EIR, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.

1. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is in the vicinity and visible from LCP designated Scenic Resources, Mulholland Highway- a Scenic Route, and Stokes Ridge Trail. The project is set back on an interior parcel from Stunt Road and is on the lower elevation areas of the parcel, helping to obscure the views from Scenic Resources. The project is conditioned to a maximum height of 18 feet and required to use colors that are earth tone colors compatible with the surroundings, in order to reduce visual impacts. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse effect on Scenic Resources and the impacts would be less than significant.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding, hiking, or multi-use trail?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is partially visible from Stoke Ridge Trail. The project is set back on an interior parcel from Stunt Road and is on the lower elevation areas of the parcel, helping to obscure the views from the trail. The project is conditioned to a maximum height of 18 feet and required to use colors that are earth tone colors compatible with the surroundings, in order to reduce visual impacts. Therefore, the Project would not have an adverse effect on trails and the impacts would be less than significant.

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is in the vicinity of a Scenic Route, a trail, and rock outcroppings. However, the project conditions limit the maximum height to 18 feet and require the use of earth tone colors, and non-reflective or shiny materials. There are no designated historic buildings in the vicinity. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse effect on scenic resources and the impacts would be less than significant.

d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would be located in an area of low-density existing residences of similar scale and character. Existing vegetation surrounding the project site and the mountainous topography would restrict public visibility of project site. The project design conforms to an 18-foot maximum height limitation to minimize the impact of the residence on the existing visual quality of the site. The project site contains hillsides exceeding a 25 percent grade and the project is required to comply with the Hillside Management standards of the LIP. These standards help to reduce the project visual impact,

minimizing grading to hillside resources and protecting hillsides. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact with regard to degrading the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features.

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. The rural environmental setting provides sufficient distance of at least 100 feet between the project site and the nearest residence, such that there would be no significant shadow impact to neighboring uses. The proposed building exterior would consist of non-reflective surfaces as required by the LIP so the project would not create a new source of substantial glare. In terms of nighttime views, the project is also required to comply with the outdoor lighting requirement of the LIP, which require downward facing and fully shielded lights. The one residence lighting proposed would not create a new source of substantial light. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact to creating a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Official State Scenic Highways are designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). According to Caltrans, "[t]he stated intent (Streets and Highway Code Section 260) of the California Scenic Highway Program is to protect and enhance California's natural beauty and to protect the social and economic values provided by the State's scenic resources" (State of California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist3/departments/mtce/scenic.htm, accessed July 7, 2015). While there are numerous designated Scenic Highways across the state, the following have been designated in Los Angeles County: Angeles Crest Highway (Route 2) from just north of Interstate 210 to the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County Line, two segments of Mulholland Highway from Pacific Coast Highway to Kanan Dume Road and from west of Cornell road to east of Las Virgenes Road, and Malibu Canyon-Las Virgenes Highway from Pacific Coast Highway to Lost Hills Road.

In addition to scenic highways, unincorporated Los Angeles County identifies ridgelines of significant aesthetic value that are to be preserved in their current state. This preservation is accomplished by limiting the type and amount of development near them. These "Significant Ridgelines" ("Major Ridgelines" on Santa Catalina Island) are designated by the General Plan or applicable Area/Community Plan, Local Coastal Program, or Community Standards District.

Riding and hiking trails have been designated throughout unincorporated Los Angeles County. At present, there are officially adopted trails in the Antelope Valley, the Santa Clarita Valley, and the Santa Monica Mountains designated by the General Plan or applicable Area/Community Plan and Local Coastal Program.

The LIP contains hillside management standards in County Code Section 22.44.1350 which are designed to protect designated hillsides from incompatible development. The standards are intended to protect hillside resources, minimize grading, etc., and focuses on design to minimize such impacts. A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed project does not protect or avoid hillside resources to the extent feasible, minimize grading, or otherwise does not meet the required burden of proof and LUP policies related to hillside development.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The project is located within the Santa Monica Mountains in the R-C-20 Zone (Rural Coastal, 20-acre minimum required lot area). The site is on a partially disturbed site with a mixture of native and non-native vegetation, with similar private residences in the vicinity. The project is not on or near Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Los Angeles County Important Farmlands Map 2016). Therefore, the project would not convert farmland land to non-agricultural use

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Resource Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. There are no agricultural uses on or surrounding the project area and it is not zoned for agricultural use. The site is not located in a General Plan-designated Agricultural Resource Area and is not in conflict with a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project will have no impact to lands with these designations.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The project has no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The project site is not located in a National Forest area. Therefore, the project will have no impact to forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. The project site is not in a designated forest and does not have forest land. Therefore, the project would not create an impact resulting in the loss or conversion of forest land.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact. Areas surrounding the project contain similar residences and landscaped areas but no farmland or forest land. Therefore, the project would not have an impact on farmland or forest land.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) produces maps and statistical data that are used for analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources. Agricultural land is rated according to soil quality and irrigation status; the best quality land is called *Prime Farmland*. The maps are updated every two years with the use of a computer mapping system, aerial imagery, public review, and field reconnaissance. FMMP produces *Important Farmland Maps*, which are a hybrid of resource quality (soils) and land use information.

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965--commonly referred to as the Williamson Act--enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. Local governments receive an annual subvention of forgone property tax revenues from the state via the Open Space Subvention Act of 1971. The only Williamson Act contract lands in the County are located on Catalina Island and held by the Catalina Island Conservancy as set asides for open space and recreational purposes. Therefore, there are no agricultural Williamson Act contracts in the remainder of the unincorporated County.

Agricultural Resource Areas (ARAs) are a County identification tool that indicates land where commercial agriculture is taking place and/or is believed to have a future potential based on the presence of prime agricultural soils, compatible adjacent land uses, and existing County land use policy. In addition to ARAs, the County has two agricultural zones: A-1 (Light Agriculture) and A-2 (Heavy Agriculture).

California Public Resources Code section 12220(g) defines forest land as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." California Public Resources Code section 4526 defines timberland as land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the State Board of forestry and Fire Protection as experimental forest land that is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Commercial species shall be determined by the State Board of Forestry and fire Protection for each district after consultation with the respective forest district communities. California Public Resources Code section 51104(g) defines "Timberland production zones" or "TPZ" as an area which has been zoned and is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses.

The County contains important and prime farmland, and the Angeles National Forest and a portion of the Los Padres National forest are also located in the County. The County does not have any zone that is strictly used for forest uses or timberland production. However, the Angeles National Forest, and a portion of the Los Padres National forest are located in the County, and the Watershed Zone allows for any use owned and maintained by the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, and any authorized leased use designated to be part of the Forest Service overall recreational plan of development, including logging. In addition, Los Angeles County has been mapped by the CalFire's FRAP to identify the different categories of land cover capable of being sustained therein, including forests, woodlands, wetlands, and shrubs, for example.

3. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact. In 1970, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identified six "criteria" air pollutants they found to be the most harmful to human health and welfare. These include:

- Ozone (O_3);
- Particulate Matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$);
- Carbon Monoxide (CO);
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2);
- Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2); and,
- Lead (Pb).

The Federal government and the State of California have established air quality standards designed to protect public health from these criteria pollutants. Among the federally identified criteria pollutants, the levels of ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide in Los Angeles County continually exceed federal and state health standards. In response to the region's poor air quality, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) & the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) were created. The SCAQMD and the AVAQMD are responsible for monitoring air quality as well as planning, implementing, and enforcing programs designed to attain and maintain state and federal ambient air quality standards in the region.

The SCAQMD implements a wide range of programs and regulations, most notably, the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The SCAQMD jurisdiction covers approximately 10,743 square-miles and includes all of Los Angeles County except for the Antelope Valley, which is covered by the Antelope AVAQMD. According to SCAQMD, if a project does not conform to a general plan, then it is not within SCAG's population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) projections, which are the foundation for the AQMP. By not conforming to a general plan, it refers to very large-scale projects, or projects that require a plan amendment, zone change, and specific plans, or potential subdivisions that were not accounted for by land use plans and their environmental documents. Therefore, that level of development exceeds what was considered in the last AQMP and would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an air quality plan. However, this general rule does not preclude that certain projects that are outside of these parameters do not warrant an air quality study due to their use or size.

The proposed project would conform to the land use requirements of the Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program as the project is a non-urban land use (single-family residence) and is allowed with a CDP in the Rural Lands land use category. As a result, any potential emission from the project are accounted for in the South Coast AQMP and are unlikely to have a significant impact. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 during construction, regarding fugitive dust. This rule aims to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of anthropogenic fugitive dust

sources. The project will comply with Rule 403 by applying the best available method which is watering the soil during construction to minimize air pollutants released during the movement of soil. Given the residential land use type, the small scale of the project, and best available control methods to prevent significant fugitive dust levels, the project would have a less than significant impact on implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impact. "Non-attainment" describes any region that does not meet (or that contributes to ambient air quality in a nearby area that does not meet) the national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for a specific pollutant. In Los Angeles County, the levels of ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide continually exceed the Federal and California Ambient Air Quality Standards and the County is considered in "Non-Attainment" for these pollutants. The proposed project would conform to the land use requirements of the Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program as the project is a non-urban land use (single-family residence) and is allowed with a CDP in the Rural Lands land use category. As a result, any potential emission from the project is accounted for in the South Coast AQMP and are unlikely to have a significant impact. The proposed project is not of a large enough scale to otherwise have a significant effect on existing air quality standards.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors are those susceptible to respiratory distress, such as, but not limited to, asthmatics, the elderly, young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise. Uses where sensitive receptors may be found include playgrounds, schools, senior citizen centers, hospitals, day-care facilities and residential areas, or other uses that are more susceptible to poor air quality, such as residential neighborhoods. The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The project site is adjacent to residential and open space uses. During construction, a total of 1,746 cubic yards of grading will occur and a total of approximately 17,217 square-feet of pavement will be installed for the required access driveway. Such activity is not expected to release substantial emissions to those living or working in the vicinity.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impact. Based on compliance with SCAQMD rules, including Rule 1113, and due to the small-scale of the project and its distance from sensitive receptors, the resulting construction impacts associated with objectionable odors would be less than significant. Operational impacts from the proposed single-family residence would not include use of large quantities of objectionable odor-producing substances. Operational impacts would be less than significant. AQMD Rule 402 states "A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to

odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals." A less than significant impact would occur because the proposed project would generate low level, intermittent odors, primarily related to temporary construction impacts and minimal maintenance of the single-family residence on an ongoing basis.

General Plan MMRP measure AQ-4 requires an odor management plan if it is determined that a project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property line. Facilities listed as to have the potential to generate nuisance odors include but are not limited to:

- Wastewater treatment plants,
- Composting, green waste, or recycling facilities,
- Fiberglass manufacturing facilities,
- Painting/coating operations,
- Large-capacity coffee roasters,
- Food-processing facilities,
- Landfills, waste transfer stations,
- Chemical manufacturing facilities.

The proposed project is a single-family residence and does not meet the facility types above that would require an odor management plan. Based on compliance with SCAQMD rules, including Rule 1113, and due to the small-scale of the project and its distance from sensitive receptors, the resulting construction impacts associated with objectionable odors would be less than significant. Operational impacts from the proposed single-family residence would not include use of large quantities of objectionable odor-producing substances. Operational impacts would be less than significant.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The air pollutants that are regulated by the Federal and California Clean Air Acts fall under three categories, each of which are monitored and regulated:

- Criteria air pollutants.
- Toxic air contaminants (TACs); and,
- Global warming and ozone-depleting gases.

In 1970, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identified six "criteria" pollutants they found to be the most harmful to human health and welfare. They are:

- Ozone (O_3).
- Particulate Matter (PM).
- Carbon Monoxide (CO).
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2).
- Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2); and,
- Lead (Pb).

The Federal government and the State of California have established air quality standards designed to protect public health from these criteria pollutants. Among the federally identified criteria pollutants, the levels of ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide in Los Angeles County continually exceed federal and state health standards and the County is considered a non-attainment area for these pollutants.

In response to the region's poor air quality, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) &

the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) were created. The SCAQMD and the AVAQMD are responsible for monitoring air quality as well as planning, implementing, and enforcing programs designed to attain and maintain state and federal ambient air quality standards in the region. The SCAQMD implements a wide range of programs and regulations, most notably, the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The SCAQMD jurisdiction covers approximately 10,743 square-miles and includes all of Los Angeles County except for the Antelope Valley, which is covered by the Antelope AVAQMD.

Sensitive receptors are uses such as playgrounds, schools, senior citizen centers, hospitals or other uses that would be more highly impacted by poor air quality. AQMD Rule 402, which states "A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals."

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following impact analysis is based on:

- the Biological Assessment Report (Biological Assessment) for 2140 Stunt Road, prepared by ESA, April 2019, revised January 2021;
- the Native Tree Survey Report (Tree Survey) for 2140 Stunt Road, prepared by ESA, April 2019, revised January 2021; and
- the Native Tree Mitigation Plan (Tree Mitigation Plan) for 2140 Stunt Road, prepared by ESA, May 2020, revised January 2021.

These reports are attached in Appendix [A], Biological Reports, as Appendix [A-1], [A-2], and [A-3], respectively. The Biological Assessment provides an overview of the biological resources observed on-site, as well as any that have the potential to occur within or adjacent to the study area. In addition, the Biological Assessment includes recommendations for avoiding or minimizing impacts to sensitive biological resources prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activities. Special-status species considered in the Biological Assessment were determined through a review of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) Rarefind 5 application for sensitive "elements" reported within the 6 United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute quadrangle maps surrounding the project site including Malibu Beach, Thousand Oaks, Calabasas, Canoga Park, Topanga, and Point Dume.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Project development would be sited predominately within disturbed habitats on the southern edge of the project site, and to a lesser extent within intact habitats adjacent to sites of historic and on-going disturbance related to existing neighboring development. In accordance with County regulations, on-site fuel modification and off-site brush thinning may extend up to 200' from habitable structures and would be maintained as stipulated in County Fire Department Fuel Modification Guidelines (LAFD 2011).

A review of the CNDDB and the CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants revealed numerous special-status plant and animal species recorded within the USGS 6-quadrangle search area containing the project site, listed in Appendix E of the Biological Assessment.

Prior to field surveys, nineteen special-status plant species were determined to have potential to occur within the study area, including western spleenwort (*Asplenium vespertinum*), Malibu baccharis (*Baccharis malibuensis*), Brewer's calandrinia (*Calandrinia breweri*), southern tarplant (*Centromadia parryi* ssp. *australis*), island mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *blancheae*), San Fernando Valley spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *fernandina*), Parry's spineflower (*C. p.* ssp. *parryi*), Santa Monica dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *ovatifolia*), many-stemmed dudleya (*D. multicaulis*), Conejo buckwheat (*Eriogonum crocatum*), Santa Susana tarplant (*Deinandra minthornii*), white-veined monardella (*Monardella hypoleuca* ssp. *hypoleuca*), Ojai navarretia (*Navarretia ojaiensis*), Lyon's pentachaeta (*Pentachaeta lyonii*), Hubby's phacelia (*Phacelia hubbyi*), Catalina mariposa lily (*Calochortus catalinae*), slender mariposa lily (*C. clavatus* ssp. *gracilis*), Plummer's mariposa lily (*C. plummerae*), and chaparral nolina (*Nolina cismontana*), Based on the results of four focused rare plant surveys, it was determined that all of the above-listed special-status plant species are absent from the study area.

Special-status animals species observed on site include San Diegan tiger [coastal western] whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri*), southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*), oak titmouse (*Baeolophus inornatus*), and California towhee (*Melozone crissalis*). These were observed utilizing habitat within the study area during surveys conducted in preparation of the Biological Assessment. Eighteen additional wildlife species were determined to have a moderate to high potential to occur within the study area, including Gertsch's socalchemmis spider (*Socalchemmis gertschi*), Santa Monica shieldback katydid (*Aglaothorax longipennis*), crotch bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*), Santa Monica grasshopper (*Trimerotropis occidentiloides*), San Diegan [southern California] legless lizard (*Anniella stebbinsi*), San Diego mountain kingsnake (*Lampropeltis zonata pulchra*) [currently subsumed along with other cis-montane southern California subspecies into Coast mountain kingsnake (*Lampropeltis multifasciata*)], Blainville's [coast] horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*), greater roadrunner (*Geococcyx californianus*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), greater western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*), western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*), and San Diego desert woodrat (*Neotoma lepida intermedia*).

California towhee, greater roadrunner, loggerhead shrike, oak titmouse, and southern California rufous-crowned sparrow may utilize all habitats within the study area for foraging and breeding purposes. Locally sensitive turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*) was observed soaring over the project site but would not breed on site due to a lack of suitable nesting substrate. Woodrat middens observed within a laurel sumac shrub to

the south of the project site are likely associated with big-eared woodrat (*Neotoma macrotis*), but within the study area, and especially within rock outcrops, middens may be occupied by San Diego desert woodrat.

Given the surrounding level of development and the amount of remaining suitable habitat in the surrounding area, the habitat loss associated with construction of the project would not significantly impact a population of any of these species. However, direct loss or injury to individuals would be a potentially significant, but mitigable impact. While the bats are capable of escaping harm, they could potentially roost in tree cavities or in tree foliage at the project site. Similarly, ground and vegetation disturbing activities, if conducted during the nesting bird season (February 1 – August 31), would have the potential to result in removal or disturbance to habitat that could contain active bird nests. Project activities that result in the loss of bird nests, eggs, and young, would be in violation of one or more of California Fish and Game Code sections 3503 (any bird nest), 3503.5 (birds-of-prey), or 3511 (fully protected birds). Furthermore, removal or destruction of one or more active nests of any other birds listed by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA), whether nest damage was due to vegetation removal or to other construction activities, would be considered a violation of the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code Section 3511.

Potential short-term, construction-related, or temporary direct impacts to special-status wildlife species could primarily result from clearing, trampling, or grading outside of the building footprint, as well as vehicle access during construction. Impacts to special-status species resulting from project development would constitute a potentially significant impact. Therefore, the following Mitigation Measures are proposed to reduce potential impacts to special-status species to less than significant:

MM BIO-1: Biological monitor—Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the County Planning. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g., avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to County Planning at their request.

Prior to project implementation, a Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) shall be prepared by the Biological Monitor and presented to construction crews regarding all sensitive resources with the potential to occur on-site during construction activities. The WEAP training shall concentrate on the proper identification of sensitive resources while in the field; suggested strategies in avoiding impact to sensitive resources; proper reporting methods for field crews in the event that sensitive resources are observed during construction activities; and proper site hygiene, including inspection of equipment for wildlife and proper trash collection and disposal.

During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to

stop specific grading or construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with County Planning. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status wildlife within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals leave on their own or can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status species during construction activities. Any special-status species occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

MM BIO-2: Breeding Birds—Proposed project activities (including, but not limited to, staging and disturbances to native and nonnative vegetation, structures, and substrates) should occur outside of the avian breeding season which generally runs from February 1 – August 31 (as early as January 1 for some raptors) to avoid take of birds or their eggs. Take means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill (Fish and Game Code Section 86), and includes take of eggs or young resulting from disturbances which cause abandonment of active nests. Depending on the avian species present, a qualified biologist may determine that a change in the breeding season dates is warranted.

If avoidance of the avian breeding season is not feasible, a qualified biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys shall conduct weekly bird surveys beginning thirty days prior to the initiation of project activities, to detect protected native birds occurring in suitable nesting habitat that is to be disturbed and (as access to adjacent areas allows) any other such habitat within 500 feet of the disturbance area. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of project activities. If a protected native bird is found, the project proponent may delay all project activities within 300 feet of on- and off-site suitable nesting habitat (within 500 feet for suitable raptor nesting habitat) until August 31. Alternatively, the qualified biologist may continue the surveys in order to locate any nests. If an active nest is located, project activities within 300 feet of the nest (within 500 feet for raptor nests) or as determined by a qualified biological monitor, must be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. Flagging, stakes, or construction fencing shall be used to demarcate the inside boundary of the buffer of 300 feet (or 500 feet) between the project activities and the nest. Project personnel, including all contractors working on site, shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. The project proponent shall provide County Planning the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

If the biological monitor determines that a narrower buffer between the project activities and observed active nests is warranted, he/she shall submit a written explanation as to why (e.g., species-specific information; ambient conditions and birds' habituation to them; and the terrain, vegetation, and birds' lines of sight between the project activities and the nest and foraging areas) to County Planning and, upon request, the CDFW. Based on the submitted information, County Planning (and the CDFW, if the CDFW requests) will determine whether to allow a narrower buffer.

The biological monitor shall be present on site during all grubbing and clearing of vegetation to ensure that these activities remain within the project footprint (i.e., outside the demarcated buffer) and that the flagging/stakes/fencing is being maintained, and to minimize the likelihood that active nests are abandoned or fail due to project activities. The biological monitor shall send weekly monitoring reports to County

Planning during the grubbing and clearing of vegetation, and shall notify County Planning immediately if project activities damage active avian nests.

MM BIO-3: Low-mobility reptiles—Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, drift fence or other barrier impermeable to reptiles shall be erected around the construction area and pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles. Surveys shall be conducted by installing an array of pit-fall traps, coverboards, or other devices as determined to be appropriate by the biological monitor on the ground prior to the commencement of construction. Pit-fall traps, if used, must be checked daily. Coverboards shall be installed no less than 4 weeks prior to construction and checked at least weekly. Pit-fall traps shall be covered during periods when daily checking is not possible (weekends, holidays, in the event of during construction delays, etc.). Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

MM BIO-4: Bats—To avoid the direct loss of bats that could result from disturbance to trees or structures that may provide maternity roost habitat (e.g., in cavities or under loose bark) or structures that contain a hibernating bat colony, the following steps shall be taken:

- To the extent feasible, demolition or disturbance to suitable bat roosting habitat shall be scheduled outside of the maternity roosting season (October 1 – February 28).
- If trees must be encroached during the maternity season (March 1 – September 30), or structures must be removed at any time of the year, a qualified bat specialist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to identify those trees or structures proposed for disturbance that could provide hibernacula or nursery colony roosting habitat for bats.
- Each tree or structure identified as potentially supporting an active maternity roost and each structure potentially supporting a hibernating colony shall be closely inspected by the bat specialist no greater than 7 days prior to tree disturbance to determine more precisely the presence or absence of roosting bats.
- If bats are not detected, but the bat specialist determines that roosting bats may be present at any time of year, it is preferable to bring down trees or structures in a controlled manner using heavy machinery. In order to ensure the optimum warning for any roosting bats that may still be present, the trees or structures shall be nudged lightly two to three times, with a pause of approximately 30 seconds between each nudge to allow bats to become active. Trees or structures may then be pushed to the ground slowly under the supervision of a bat specialist. Felled trees shall remain in place until they are inspected by a bat specialist. Trees that are known to be bat roosts shall not be cut or mulched immediately. A period of at least 48 hours shall elapse prior to such operations to allow bats to escape. Bats shall be allowed to escape prior to demolition of structures. This may be accomplished by placing one-way exclusionary devices into areas where bats are entering a structure that allow bats to exit but not enter the structure.
- Maternity season lasts from March 1 – September 30. Trees or structures determined to be maternity roosts shall be left in place until the end of the maternity season. A structure containing a hibernating colony shall be left in place until a qualified biologist determines that the bats are no longer hibernating.

The bat specialist shall document all demolition monitoring activities and prepare a summary report to the County upon completion of tree disturbance or structure demolition activities. If Townsend's big-eared bat is detected during pre-construction surveys, all construction-related activity shall be halted immediately and CDFW shall be notified. Work may only resume subsequent to CDFW approval.

Bat Relocation—If confirmed occupied or formerly occupied bat roosting habitat is destroyed, artificial bat roosts of comparable size and quality shall be constructed and maintained at a suitable undisturbed area. The design and location of the artificial bat roosts shall be determined by the bat specialist in consultation with CDFW.

In exceptional circumstances, such as when roosts cannot be avoided and bats cannot be evicted by non-invasive means, it may be necessary to capture and transfer the bats to appropriate natural or artificial bat roosting habitat in the surrounding area. Bats raising young or hibernating shall not be captured and relocated. Capture and relocation shall be performed by the bat specialist in coordination with CDFW, and shall be subject to approval by County Planning and CDFW.

A monitoring plan shall be prepared for the replacement roosts, which shall include performance standards for the use of the replacement roosts by the displaced species, as well as provisions to prevent harassment, predation, and disease of relocated bats.

Annual reports detailing the success of roost replacement and bat relocation shall be prepared and submitted to County Planning and CDFW for five years following relocation or until performance standards are met, whichever period is longer.

MM BIO-5: Trenches and Holes Management

- The contractor shall cover or backfill all trenches, holes, and open water sources (e.g., water buffalos, water tanks, and slurry dumpsters) the same calendar day they are opened, where practicable. These areas shall be covered to prevent wildlife from becoming trapped or drowning.
- If trenches or holes cannot be closed the same day they are made, covers shall be firmly secured at ground level in such a way that small wildlife cannot slip beneath. At sites that require the presence of a biological monitor, trench covers shall be approved by the monitor. If covers cannot be provided, escape ramps shall be placed in all trenches and holes.
- Open trenches shall be inspected regularly throughout the day and prior to filling to remove any trapped wildlife (e.g., small mammals, reptiles, amphibians) and to check for the presence of protected wildlife species at Project sites that require the presence of a biological monitor.
- If a state or federal listed wildlife species is present in the trench, the on-site Biological Monitor shall contact CDFW or USFWS immediately, ensure the protected species is not in immediate danger, and wait for instruction by CDFW or USFWS.
- Covered trenches and holes at sites where biological monitors are present are to be inspected by the monitor at the end of the work day and prior to initiating construction activities the next day.
- In locating trenches or holes, disturbance to natural vegetation, including plant root systems shall be minimized.

MM BIO-6: Woodrats—Any woodrat middens observed during preconstruction surveys, shall be assumed to be occupied by San Diego desert woodrat. Each occupied midden requiring removal shall be dismantled

by hand under the supervision of the biologist, prior to the commencement of project activities. If young are encountered during the dismantling process, the material shall be returned in place and the midden remain unmolested for 2 to 3 weeks in order to give the young enough time to mature and disperse on their own accord. After 2 to 3 weeks, the dismantling of the midden may begin again. Material shall be moved to suitable adjacent areas (native scrub habitat at least 500 feet away) that are expected to remain undisturbed in perpetuity.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Sensitive natural communities and habitats are defined by the CDFW as those natural communities that have a reduced range or are imperiled as a result of residential and commercial development, agriculture, energy production and mining, or an influx of invasive and other problematic species. Natural communities are evaluated using NatureServe's Heritage Methodology, which is based on the knowledge of range and distribution of specific vegetation types and the proportion of occurrences that are of good ecological integrity. Evaluation is done at both global (natural range within and outside of California [G]) and subnational (state level for California [S]) status ranks, each ranked from 1 ("critically imperiled" or very rare and threatened) to 5 (demonstrably secure). Natural communities and habitats with state ranks of S1 – S3 are considered Sensitive Natural Communities and may require review when evaluating environmental impacts. Sensitive natural communities are not present within the study area.

Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program

As described in Section 22.44.1800 et seq. of the LCP, various habitat categories are described as sensitive and require protection in the face of new development within the coastal zone. Certain habitats are designated as Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs), described as H1, H2, and H2 High Scrutiny habitat types; these take priority for protection during the development process under the guidelines of the LCP. Habitats that would otherwise fall into the aforementioned designations if they had not been altered through approved developments or modifications (i.e., fuel-modification / brush-thinning) are categorized as H3 habitat (not SERA).

As part of the LCP process, the County has generated a preliminary map depicting SERA based on available vegetation and habitat data within the plan area. Based on the results of the biological assessment, this preliminary mapping was confirmed as accurate or modified to reflect variations observed in the field. Habitat categories as defined in the LCP are described below, and whether they are present within the study area is discussed.

Habitats deemed to be of the highest biological significance include alluvial scrub, coastal bluff scrub, dunes, wetland, native grassland and scrub (high concentration of native grasses or forbs), riparian, native oak, sycamore, walnut and bay woodlands, and rock outcrop habitat types. Sandstone rock outcrops were mapped

in the chamise-laurel sumac shrubland within the northwest corner of the study area. This feature qualifies as H1 habitat as described in Section 22.44.1800 et seq. of the LCP. None of this habitat type is located within the project development footprint; however, it does extend slightly into the northwest corner of the Project Site. This feature will not be directly impacted as a result of construction activities or fuel-modification / brush-thinning.

H2 habitat includes "Habitats of high biological significance, rarity, and sensitivity that are important for the ecological vitality and diversity of the Santa Monica Mediterranean Ecosystem" (LCP 2014). H2 habitat generally describes contiguous native vegetation communities that facilitate wildlife dispersal and migration, and support the persistence and growth of native plant populations. The chamise-laurel sumac shrubland and portions of the "disturbed" chamise-laurel sumac shrubland (outside of neighboring fuel-modification / brush-thinning zones), present within the study area are categorized as H2 habitat. H2 habitat extends into the project site, development footprint, fuel-modification Zones A and B, and potential off-site brush-thinning areas.

H2 High Scrutiny habitat is characterized as extra sensitive H2 habitat; that which supports species listed by the federal and state government as Rare, Threatened, or Endangered; CNPS "1B" and "2" listed plant species; California Species of Special Concern (SSC); or is designated as a "sensitive" natural community by the CDFW. H2 High Scrutiny habitat was not identified within the study area.

H3 habitat is that which would likely otherwise be designated as SERA; however, due to lawful historic or past disturbance, it has been fragmented or heavily altered, reducing its capability to support native plant and wildlife populations. The "disturbed" chamise-laurel sumac shrubland (within neighboring fuel-modification and brush-thinning zones) and the developed land use are characterized as H3 habitat. H3 habitat extends within the project site, development footprint and fuel-modification Zones A and B.

Habitat mapped as H1 is generally afforded a 100-foot buffer to avoid indirect impact to the resource; the sandstone rock outcrops are afforded such a buffer, all of which is H2. This buffer extends into the study area and Project Site; however, it will not be encroached as a result of project activities.

Table 1—SERA within the Study Area (Field Surveyed) indicates the total acreage of each habitat category mapped within the study area during the biological assessment, including those areas that will be impacted by the project activities.

Table 1—SERA within the Study Area (Field Surveyed)

Habitat Categories	Total within Study Area [acres]	Total within Project Site [acres]	Total within Development Footprint [acres]	Total within Potential 200-foot Fuel-modification / Brush-thinning Zone [acres]	
				Zone A [0 – 30']	Zone B [30 – 70']
H1	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
H2	4.63	2.00	0.15	0.19	0.89
H3	2.92	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.02
Total H1/2/3	7.90	2.00	0.35	0.19	0.91
H1 100' buffer (all H2)	1.62	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00

The sandstone rock outcrops will not be directly impacted as a result of project development. Construction within the development footprint is expected to remove 0.15 acre of H2 habitat. Up to 0.19 acre may be impacted as a result of fuel modification within Zone A and up to 0.89 acre may be impacted as a result of fuel-modification / brush-thinning within Zone B. The H1 100' buffer (all of which is H2) will not be encroached as a result of project activities. Construction within the development footprint is expected to remove 0.20 acre of H3 habitat. Up to 0.02 acre of H3 may also be impacted as a result of fuel-modification within Zone B. While some of this area comprises native vegetation (i.e., "disturbed" chamise-laurel sumac shrubland), it appears to have already undergone some degree of brush thinning or degradation due to proximity to neighboring development, and the County will not require compensation for impacts to this habitat type.

The Resource Conservation Program was developed to address and compensate for unavoidable impacts to H1 and H2 habitats. Pursuant to Section 22.44.1950 et seq. of the LCP, the following In-Lieu Fee has been established temporarily for permitted impacts to these habitat types: $15,500 per acre for an approved building site area, driveway/access roads and turnaround areas, and any required irrigated fuel modification zones or off-site brush clearance areas, and $3,900 per acre for non-irrigated fuel modification areas. Calculation of payment of In-Lieu Fees and verification of the proposed impacts to H2 habitat will be determined after approval of final project design: Up to 0.15 acre as a result of project construction (development footprint), up to 0.19 acre within fuel modification Zone A, and up to 0.89 acre within fuel-modification / brush-thinning Zone B.

The County will also require that native shrubs and trees within this area be preserved to the degree feasible when implementing brush thinning activities in order to minimize degradation of habitat values within required fuel-modification zones. The Biological Resources Description and Recommendations for the project, presented to the Environmental Review Board at their meeting of July 19, 2021, included recommendations regarding fuel-modification practices which are presented here as mitigation measures **MM BIO-7** and **MM BIO-8**.

Project landscaping has the potential to introduce invasive non-native species to the development footprint and thereby to surrounding natural habitat areas. The Biological Resources Description and Recommendations for the project, presented to the Environmental Review Board at their meeting of July 19, 2021, included recommendations regarding landscaping which are presented here as mitigation measure **MM BIO-9**.

MM BIO-7: Fuel Modification

- Retain as many non-sprouting species as possible. These usually have a single trunk. Do not cut off the trunk in pruning, as this kills the plant.
- Choose multiple-trunked, resprouting species for removal over non-sprouters. The remaining multi-trunked shrubs should be pruned in a staggered, clumped pattern on an alternating schedule, allowing 2 – 3 years between prunings for any one clump. Re-sprouting species can be pruned to near ground level.

- It is recommended that locally-indigenous plants thinned for fuel modification be chipped and used as native plant mulch. SMM native plant mulch is not widely available in stores, but is an excellent addition to the landscape to retain soil moisture and reduce growth of invasive weeds.
- Disking and indiscriminate clearing is not allowed in any Fuel Modification Zone.
- For trees to have fuel ladders removed: prune lower branches up to 1/3 of tree height or up to 6 ft. maximum for trees 18 ft. and taller, per County fire requirements. Consult with County Planning or Foresters before pruning protected oaks or native trees.
- Include provisions for irrigation, both permanent for Zones A and B, and temporary for establishment of native plants in Zone C and outside of Fuel Modification Zones.

MM BIO-8: Initial Fuel Modification—The site shall only be fuel-modified after the construction phase of the proposed project has been completed or as otherwise directed by the Fire Department.

- A qualified biologist shall implement **MM BIO-2** before fuel modification occurs.
- A qualified biologist shall be present during initial fuel modification activities and shall stake the limits of fuel modification and flag any areas or plants to be excluded from fuel modifications.
- The stakes shall remain in place until after fuel modification activities have been completed.
- A qualified biologist shall be present during initial fuel modification activities to ensure that no protected trees or special-status species are damaged by the fuel modification activities.

MM BIO-9: Landscaping—Prior to issuance of a grading permit, prepare a landscaping plan for review and approval by the Department of Regional Planning. The landscaping plan shall clearly identify all existing trees (native and non-native) by species (common and scientific names), show trunk diameters, and indicate whether the tree will be removed or retained. Species considered invasive should be removed. All laurel sumac saplings on site to remain as replacements for the two that will be removed from APN 4455-041-002 shall also be depicted. If additional landscaping is to be proposed for fuel-modification Zones A and B, it shall consist of only locally-indigenous native species within Zone B. Non-invasive non-natives are allowable in Zone A.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States or California, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

A formal jurisdictional determination was not performed within the study area; however, the potential presence of drainage features was examined during field work for the Biological Assessment. Drainage features considered jurisdictional with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), CDFW, and the California Coastal Commission were not observed within the study area; therefore, no impact to such resources would occur with development of the project and are not discussed further in this IS/MND.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

The Santa Monica Mountains, and Western Transverse Ranges as a whole, have historically provided a vital connection between the coast and Sierra Nevada Ranges of northern and central California and the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountain Ranges in the southern portion of the state. In the face of ongoing commercial, industrial, and residential development pressures occurring throughout the state of California, the foothills and mountainous topography of these ranges provide necessary patches of undeveloped habitat for many species of flora and fauna that is becoming increasingly absent throughout the valleys and inland basins. In addition to providing contiguous upland habitat for various terrestrial wildlife species, the canyons and waterways traversing through the Santa Monica Mountains and surrounding ranges provide invaluable habitat to various aquatic species as well.

The northern portion of the project is contiguous with unfenced natural open space. Properties to the south and east are fenced. Wildlife, including various bird, mammal, and reptile species, are expected to use the intact native habitat within and to the north of the study area for foraging or perhaps breeding purposes; however, this area does not function as a "pinch point" or migration corridor, and would not likely be used as such. The majority of natural habitat on site would remain undisturbed by proposed construction activities, and remaining undisturbed habitats would be contiguous with natural, unfenced, habitats to the north of the Project Site.

Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program

The Local Implementation Program (LIP) of the SMMLCP contains development standards addressing vegetation management and landscaping; exterior lighting; and fences, gates, and walls (Sections 22.44.1240, 1270, and 1310, respectively). Each of these set of standards were developed in order to minimize or avoid impacts on wildlife behavior and continued use of undeveloped habitats adjacent to permitted development. The Project will be subject to these standards, thereby, minimizing project-level impacts on wildlife movement to a less than significant level.

Nesting Birds

Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 C.F.R. Section10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA). Implementation of **MM BIO-2** would reduce impacts on nesting birds to less than significant by requiring a pre-construction nesting bird survey if project activities are conducted during the nesting bird season (typically February 1 to August 31). If project activities are

conducted outside the nesting bird season, the potential impact and pre-construction nesting bird survey requirement can be avoided.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or other unique native woodlands (juniper, Joshua, southern California black walnut, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

Pursuant to Section 22.44.1870 of the LCP (LCP 2014), all new developments shall be sited and designed to preserve, oak, walnut, sycamore bay, or other individual native trees to the maximum extent feasible. Native trees that were surveyed include those that have at least one trunk measuring a total of 6 inches or more in diameter or a combination of any two trunks measuring a total of 8 inches or more DBH. There are no protected trees on site, and no woodland vegetation of any type, including oak, juniper, Joshua, or southern California black walnut, etc. is present on site. Two laurel sumac shrubs meeting protected size criteria, were observed to the south of the project site, within the potential off-site brush-thinning zone. Due to the possibility that these may be removed or severely pruned, mitigation measure **MM BIO-9** includes provisions for the nurturing of on-site laurel sumac shrubs to compensate for the possible removal of these tree-sized individuals.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.174), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.102), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program: In 1976, the California legislature enacted the California Coastal Act intended to manage the development of resources throughout coastal regions of the state. Individual Local Coastal Plans (LCPs) have been developed for various jurisdictions under the guidance of the California Coastal Commission to regulate development within the coastal zone. The Santa Monica Mountains LCP (SMMLCP) specifically refers to and regulates all development within the Santa Monica Mountains west of the city of Los Angeles, east of Ventura County, and south of the coastal zone boundary, excluding the city of Malibu. The SMMLCP provides protection for various natural resources as part of the development process, including but not limited to native vegetation communities, native trees of a specified size and species, various sensitive plant and wildlife species identified by the CNPS and CDFW, riparian corridors, etc.

The proposed project is subject to the requirements of the SMMLCP, and as such was heard by the Los Angeles County Environmental Review Board, which reviews projects within the SMM Coastal Zone for consistency with the SMMLCP. The ERB found that the project is consistent with the biological resource protection policies and development standards of the Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program and Local Implementation Program after incorporation of Staff and ERB recommendations, which are included in the Biological Resources Description and Recommendations, Ghazarian Single-Family Residence, 2019-002964-(3), presented to ERB at its meeting of July 19, 2021. These recommendations are presented above as mitigation measures **MM BIO 7 – MM BIO-9**, along with the following mitigation measures **MM BIO-10 – MM BIO-16**:

MM BIO-10: Permanent Runoff Control/Drainage Plan—The Applicant shall provide a grading plan and drainage report, including proposed site design and source control best management practices to minimize post-construction runoff and infiltrate at minimum the first 0.75-inches of stormwater. This plan should show all proposed drainage improvements, such as locations of infiltration basins, measures to convey runoff from impervious surfaces into permeable areas of the property (i.e., raingardens or bioswales) in a non-erosive manner, measures to maximize the ability of native substrates to retain and infiltrate runoff, and placement of cisterns or rain barrels for stormwater capture.

MM BIO-11: Glass—Glass should be least reflective or have frit patterns that will promote energy conservation and prevent bird strikes caused by the bird mistaking a reflection of habitat for available flight space, per §22.44.1320.

MM BIO-12: Lighting—Lighting should carefully follow provisions of §22.44.1270 for exterior lighting. Avoid trespass of light into the night sky and onto natural areas both on and off the project parcels.

MM BIO-13: Staking of Grading Limits—The Applicant's contractor shall delineate the proposed grading limits of the building site or the extents of the proposed development area, whichever is greater, the driveway, and the extents of the fuel modification zones before any of the measures outlined below are implemented. The contractor shall not remove any native vegetation during staking and shall set the stakes so that they are clearly visible. The locations of the stakes within the fuel modification zones shall be recorded using GPS and provided to the project biologist.

MM BIO-14: Temporary wildlife fencing—Temporary wildlife fencing shall be utilized to reduce the potential for wildlife being harmed by or moving into the work site. The project proponent's contractor shall delineate the grading limits/approved development area and shall fence the area in its entirety with green screen before beginning removal of any vegetation, as follows:

- To install the screen, laborers will remove a 5-foot strip of vegetation at the limits of the grading limits/development area using hand-held tools to allow wildlife, including special status species, a chance to escape and reduce the potential of them being crushed by heavy machinery.
- The green screen shall be partially buried, or fitted with silt fence that is partially buried, in a manner that reduces the potential for wildlife moving back in.
- Laborers installing the fence shall remain within the cut areas and any paths leading to it.
- A biologist shall monitor fence installation so that they can capture and relocate wildlife as necessary, and to ensure that no protected trees or special status plants are impacted during installation.

- The biologist must hold a CDFW Scientific Collectors Permit authorizing handling of invertebrates, reptiles, amphibians, and mammals.
- A gated entrance shall allow ingress and egress. The gates shall remain open until after the project biologist conducts a pre-construction survey and shall be closed only after vegetation is cleared from within the fenced area.

MM BIO-15: Pre-Construction Biological Resources Survey & Site Clearance—A pre-construction biological resources survey shall be conducted within the area that is screened and within areas adjacent the driveway the day after screening.

- The project proponent's contractor shall plan to remove vegetation from within the screened area no more than 1 day after completion of the Pre-Construction Biological Resources Survey.
- Laborers shall use hand-held tools to remove the vegetation. Using hand-held tools will allow wildlife, including special-status species, a chance to escape and reduce the potential of them being crushed by heavy machinery.
- A biologist shall monitor vegetation removal so that they can capture and relocate wildlife as necessary.
- The biologist must hold a CDFW Scientific Collectors Permit authorizing handling of invertebrates, reptiles, amphibians, and mammals.

MM BIO-16: Initial Grubbing & Grading—Initial grubbing and grading shall occur 3 – 7 days after vegetation has been cleared from the proposed development area/grading limits. The delay between vegetation clearance and the grubbing and grading activities will allow wildlife, including special-status species, a chance to escape and reduce the potential of them being crushed by heavy machinery.

- A biologist shall monitor initial grading and grubbing so that they can capture and relocate wildlife as necessary.
- The biologist must hold a CDFW Scientific Collectors Permit authorizing handling of invertebrates, reptiles, amphibians, and mammals.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

The Project is not located within an area subject to the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the project would result in no conflicts with any such plans.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

CEQA provides protections to resources that have yet to be officially designated but meet the criteria identified in the CEQA Guidelines:

- Any on-site structure is at least 45-50 years old; and,
- Any structure on the project site that is eligible for historic protection pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(a). These criteria include:
    - Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
    - Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
    - Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
    - Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

There are no structures on-site and the site itself has not been designated. As a result, the proposed project would not cause a significant impact. The project footprint does not contain historical resources. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated to causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant

SCCIC and NAHC Record Searches: On March 24, 2021, Envicom submitted a request to the SCCIC to conduct a search of their database for cultural resources located within the Subject Property, and within the surrounding study area (defined as the Subject Property, plus a 0.25-mile buffer area) for regional cultural resource context. The record search included a request for all complete site records for cultural resources within or adjacent to the subject property and easement, as well as copies of all cultural resource technical reports that intersected with all or part of the Project location.

Envicom received the cultural resource records search results from the SCCIC on April 19, 2021. The SCCIC record search found no previously identified cultural resources located within or adjacent to the Project area; but identified one (1) cultural resource within the 0.25-mile surrounding Project study area. This cultural

resource did not indicate any cultural resource issues of relevance for the Project due to the distance and nature of the cultural resource.

The SCCIC further identified that no cultural resource reports have involved the Project property or easement. However, eight (8) cultural resource reports were identified as being within all or part of the 0.25-mile study area. Examination of this report did not indicate any cultural resource issues of relevance to the Project. All relevant cultural resource reports provided by the SCCIC are summarized in Appendix B.

Though the single cultural resource, P-19-000153, is a large prehistoric Native American site with burials, the site is located at the extreme edge of the Project study area, and no other prehistoric sites are shown in the area. The Project region, therefore, should not be considered as being sensitive for prehistoric or older cultural resources.

The results from the 2021 NAHC record search were received on April 6, 2021, with negative findings. If the Lead/Permitting Agency for the Project is required to perform an Assembly Bill (AB)-52 or permitting process, the NAHC letter should be made a part of the Native American consultation record. Envicom did not contact Native American groups on the NAHC list, as communications with Tribal Group representatives is the responsibility of the Lead/Permitting Agency, if required for this Project.

Any findings from the SCCIC as to the physical location of cultural resources, except for public knowledge-built environment resources, is considered confidential by state law and are, therefore, not included in this report. Copies of the request letter to the SCCIC, NAHC, and NHM are included in Appendix B, as are the response letters from the NAHC and NHM. The Principal Author's resume is provided in Appendix C.

The research above did not find any evidence of a significant of archaeological resource. Therefore, less than significant impacts will occur.

MM CULTURAL-1: In the event that archaeological resources are encountered during the construction process, the proposed project would be required to halt all development activities, contact the South-Central Coastal Information Center and inform them of the encounter. Subsequently, the applicant should retain the services of a certified archaeological resource specialist. Only the specialist will be able to tell the contractor when development activities can recommence.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

Paleontological Resource Assessment: The Envicom survey did not identify fossil resources in any of the large sandstone rocks or boulders found on the surface of the Project property. The terrain also appeared to be covered with new alluvial material, of which the boulders could be considered as deposited elements within the newer alluvial strata. Examination of the 1993 Thomas W. Dibblee Jr. geological rock unit map for the area, which is based on the Malibu Beach Quadrangle, confirmed that the Project property is dominated by recent alluvial material (Qa) found over the older non-fossil bearing Conejo Volcanic Formation (Tcvb) (Figure 11). However, the Middle Topanga Formation (Ttus) is located in the northern part of the Project property, which may be fossil bearing. This formation, however, is not intended to be impacted by the Project, and monitoring is, therefore, not recommended. It is likely that the large, intact sandstone boulders and rocks

discussed above originally were part of the Topanga Formation. Again, no fossil material was observed in any of this displaced material.

The research above did not find any evidence of the project directly or indirectly destroying a unique paleontological resource on site or unique geologic feature. Therefore, no impacts will occur.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impact.
Due to the level of past disturbance on-site, it is not anticipated that human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, would be encountered during earth removal or disturbance activities. If human remains are found, those remains would require proper treatment, in accordance with applicable laws. California Public Resources Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 through 7055 describe the general provisions for human remains. Specifically, Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 describes the requirements if any human remains are accidentally discovered during excavation of a site. As required by State law, the requirements and procedures set forth in Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code would be implemented, including notification of the County Coroner, notification of the Native American Heritage Commission and consultation with the individual identified by the Native American Heritage Commission to be the most likely descendant. If human remains are found during excavation, excavation must stop near the find and any area that is reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent remains until the County coroner has been called out, and the remains have been investigated and appropriate recommendations have been made for the treatment and disposition of the remains. Following compliance with existing State regulations, which detail the appropriate actions necessary in the event human remains are encountered, impacts concerning disturbance of human remains would be less than significant.

MM CULTURAL-2: In the event that human remains are encountered on the project site, the proposed project would be required to halt all development activities and contact the Los Angeles County Coroner. If it is determined that the human remains are of Native American descent, the Native American Heritage Commission should be contacted, who will in turn contact the likely descendants. They will be informed of the encounter and in consultation with the property owner, a decision will be made on how to proceed. Only after this decision and all necessary actions occur can development activities recommence.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The findings indicate that the proposed project would not have a significant impact on historical or archaeological resources. The CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) Guidelines Section 15064.5 states that the project would have less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated to causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

A search was conducted for historical and archaeological resources within a 0.25-mile buffer zone of the project site, and no previously identified cultural resources were located within or adjacent to the project area. The single cultural resource found, P-19-000153, is a large prehistoric Native American site with burials, but it is located at the extreme edge of the project study area and no other prehistoric sites are shown in the area. Therefore, the project region should not be considered as being sensitive for prehistoric or older cultural resources. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) record search was also conducted, and it had negative findings. No contact was made with any Native American groups as communications with them is the responsibility of the Lead/Permitting Agency, if required for the project.

6. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact.

Title 31 of the Los Angeles County Code of Ordinances, the Green Building Standards Code, adopts by reference the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). CALGreen is issued by the California Building Standards Commission on a three-year cycle. The current CALGreen is the 2019 Code, which took effect on January 1, 2020. The project would comply with the Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance and no adverse impact would occur. Further, there are no inherently wasteful land uses proposed on the project site.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewal energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would comply with following state standards: Renewables Portfolio Standard, Appliance Efficiency Regulations, Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 6: Energy Efficiency Standards for Buildings. The project would not obstruct these plans or codes, and impacts would be less than significant.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

The subject property is not located within a California Earthquake Fault Zone and no known active faults cross the site. However, regional geologic mapping by Dibblee (1993) and Yerkes et al (1980) indicates that a fault is located approximately 500 feet to the north of the subject property. It should be noted that faults are common in this area of the Santa Monica Mountains and based on the findings of the update engineering geologic study, the mapped fault is not interpreted to be an active tectonic feature.

Due to the fact that the subject property is not located within a California Earthquake Fault Zone, the performing of a detailed surface fault rupture hazard evaluation in order to conclusively determine the surface fault rupture hazard for the project area is not required. However, regardless of the project exemption for a detailed surface fault rupture hazard evaluation, LP did perform a general seismic hazard evaluation of the site in consideration of the proposed project as part of our update engineering geologic study of the subject property.

Based on the findings of the engineering geologic study the subject property is not located within a State-designated Earthquake Fault Zone and no known active faults traverse the site. Thus, LP considers the possibility of surface fault rupture within the subject property to be extremely low. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Estimating the potential ground shaking at a particular site requires knowledge of the faults surrounding the site, the magnitude of earthquakes that each fault can generate, and the attenuation or magnification of ground acceleration that may occur as seismic waves propagate from an earthquake hypocenter to a site. Mathematical attenuation relationships are typically used to model how the amplitudes of ground motions decrease with distance from the hypocenter.

Our ground shaking hazard analysis of the site utilized available computer databases, software, and published resources made available by the California Geological Survey (CGS) and United States Geological Survey (USGS) to perform a historical and probabilistic evaluation of ground motion. In addition, the recommended 2016 California Building Code (CBC) structural Seismic Design Criteria is provided with respect to the proposed project.

It should be noted that the probabilistic and design level ground accelerations discussed herein are approximations based on available fault data and currently utilized attenuation relationships which may not account for the possibility of the amplification of ground motion due to the location and orientation of the causative earthquake fault as well as local topographic, geologic, and groundwater conditions. Also, it is possible that unknown active faults (namely "blind thrust faults"), not accounted for in the ground shaking hazard analysis, underlie the Southern California region which are capable of producing large earthquakes. Specifically, the 1994 Northridge (Mw 6.7) earthquake occurred on a previously unrecognized fault. Upon further investigation, it was discovered that the seismic hazard from blind thrust faults in the southern California region may be very high. Specifically, the ground shaking hazard caused by an earthquake along a blind thrust fault is greater than that from a strike-slip fault of the same magnitude because the low angle of dip of the thrust fault places the fault plane at shallow depths underlying a larger area. Also, the ground motion generated by movement along a blind thrust fault is more vertical than horizontal. These faults are believed to be undetected under much of the Los Angeles Basin. It follows that there is also a possibility of strong ground motion within the site should an earthquake occur due to movement along an unknown fault.

The ground motion typically required for the design of structures is a peak ground acceleration (PGA) that has a 2% (minimum) probability of being exceeded in 50 years which corresponds to a 2475-year average return period. However, in certain circumstances engineering analysis and design is based on a ground motion that has a 10% (minimum) probability of being exceeded in 50 years which corresponds to a 475-year average return period. In order to estimate these ground motions, a probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) was performed for the site by obtaining ground motion data presented by the California Geological Survey (CGS).

Based on inputting the latitude and longitude of the subject property into the CGS's Ground Motion Interpolator application of the CGS' s current probabilistic seismic hazards assessment model (revised 2008), and after assuming a shear wave velocity of the underlying earth materials (270 mis for valley floor sites or 560 mis for sites underlain by near-surface bedrock) the subject property is within an area having an estimated PGA of 0.830 g with a 2% probability of being exceeded in 50 years. Utilizing the same assumptions, the subject property is within an area having an estimated PGA of 0.414 g with a 10% probability of being exceeded in 50 years.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No Impact

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act of 1990 directs the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (now referred to as the California Geological Survey - CGS) to delineate Seismic Hazard Zones. The purpose of the Act is to reduce the threat to public health and safety and to minimize the loss of life and property by identifying and mitigating seismic hazards including liquefaction, earthquake-induced land sliding, and ground shaking. Cities, counties, and state agencies are directed to use the Seismic Hazard Zone maps developed by CGS in their land-use planning and permitting processes.

The Act requires that site-specific geotechnical investigations be performed prior to permitting most urban development projects located within the Seismic Hazard Zones. They must withhold development permits for a site within a zone until the geologic and soil conditions of the project site are investigated and appropriate mitigation measures, if any, are incorporated into development plans. The Act also requires sellers (and their agents) of real property within a mapped hazard zone to disclose at the time of sale that the property lies within such a zone. Evaluation and mitigation of seismic hazards are to be conducted under guidelines adopted by the California State Mining and Geology Board.

The designated liquefaction hazard zones are described as: "Areas where historic occurrence of liquefaction, or local geological, geotechnical and groundwater conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacements such that mitigation as defined in the Public Resources Code Section 2693(c) would be required." The subject property is not located within a liquefaction hazard zone as designated by the CGS. Due to the level of groundwater within the subject property, underlying geologic conditions, distance to potentially active and/or active faults, and estimated duration of strong ground shaking, there is no potential for liquefaction of the materials underlying the project area of the site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

iv) Landslides? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Incorporated

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act of 1990 directs the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (now referred to as the California Geological Survey - CGS) to delineate Seismic Hazard Zones. The purpose of the Act is to reduce the threat to public health and safety and to minimize the loss of life and property by identifying and mitigating seismic hazards including liquefaction, earthquake-induced land sliding, and ground shaking. Cities, counties, and state agencies are directed to use the Seismic Hazard Zone maps developed by CGS in their land-use planning and permitting processes. The Act requires that site-specific geotechnical investigations be performed prior to permitting most urban development projects located within the Seismic Hazard Zones. They must withhold development permits for a site within a zone until the geologic and soil conditions of the project site are investigated and appropriate mitigation measures, if any, are incorporated into development plans. The Act also requires sellers (and their agents) of real property within a mapped hazard zone to disclose at the time of sale that the property lies within such a zone. Evaluation and mitigation of seismic hazards are to be conducted under guidelines adopted by the California State Mining and Geology Board. The designated earthquake-induced landslide hazard zones are described as: "Areas where previous occurrence of landslide movement, or local topographic, geological, geotechnical and subsurface water conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacements such that mitigation as defined in the Public Resources Code Section 2693(c) would be required." The subject property is located within an earthquake-induced landslide hazard zone as designated by the CGS.

A quantitative determination of the seismically-induced land sliding potential within the project area shall be performed (if deemed necessary or required) by the Project Geotechnical Engineer. Therefore, mitigation measure GEO-1 shall be implemented in order to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

MM GEO-1: A qualified Geotechnical Engineering firm will be retained by the Applicant to conduct further studies to characterize the potential for slope instability during the design-level geotechnical study for the project. Further geotechnical exploration including subsurface drilling within one or more existing slopes shall be performed to adequately address global stability.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

A Project would normally have significant sedimentation or erosion impact if it would: (a) constitute a geologic hazard to other properties by causing or accelerating instability from erosion; or (b) accelerate natural processes of wind and water erosion and sedimentation, resulting in sediment runoff or deposition which would not be contained or controlled on-site. The Geotechnical Investigation Report indicated that soils on the Project Site and vicinity consist mainly of interbedded layers of silty sand (SM) and poorly graded sands (SP) with occasionally sandy silt (ML). The upper four to five feet of soils were found to be relatively loose, non-uniform and of low relative compaction. The Geotechnical Investigation Report provides specific recommendations for re-compaction of the upper five to six feet of soil on the Project Site. Construction associated with the Project area would occur in accordance with all rules and regulations of the County of Los Angeles. This would include the regulations contained within the County Municipal Code (Excavation and Grading), which establish regulation for the control of excavation, grading and earthwork construction, including fills and embankments, and for the control of grading site runoff, including erosion, sediments and construction related pollutants. In addition, construction associated with future development would be required to comply with the requirements of the Municipal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Permit and would implement City grading permit regulations that include compliance with erosion control measures, including grading and dust control measures. Specifically, construction associated with future development Projects would be required to have erosion control plans approved by the County of Los Angeles Engineering Division, as well as Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP). As part of these requirements, Best Management Practices (BMP's) would be implemented during construction activities to reduce soil erosion to the maximum extent possible. Given that the Project would be subject to County Municipal Code and NPDES requirements for erosion control grading and soil remediation, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. These requirements, when combined with standard County requirements for grading, will reduce impacts from soils to a level of less than significant.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impacts.

The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to geology and soils in regard to being located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project. There is no oil field activity at the project site or immediately adjacent areas of the project, that could lead to local subsidence, which in turn, could manifest as cracks and areas of ground settlement. Compliance with County Grading Application Requirements, the County Building Code, and the design to the structure to minimize other hazards; are sufficient to avoid significant impacts related to proposed development that may be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be required.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2022), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

Expansive soils are typically a problem in arid climates, as the variation in moisture content will cause a volume change in the soil. Expansive soil tends to be active near the ground surface, where greater moisture variations can easily occur, however, the actual depth varies with the specific soil and environmental differences. During inclement weather or excessive landscaping, moisture will infiltrate the soil and cause the soil to expand. When drying occurs, the loss of moisture content will cause soil to shrink, and extreme dryness may cause shrinkage (desiccation) cracks to develop, thus promoting moisture variations at greater depths. Expansion and contraction of soils can cause pavement, concrete slabs-on-grade, foundations, and overlying structures to fracture. To reduce the effect of expansive soil on surface structures, foundation systems are typically deepened, or their rigidity is increased. Slabs-on-grade and foundations are reinforced to increase their resistance to differential movement. When planning for site improvements, it is recommended the landscape theme take into consideration maintaining uniform moisture conditions around isolated structures and concrete slabs-on-grade. Expansion tests presented in in accordance with ASTM Standard 4829 "Expansion Index Test" indicate the future certified compacted fill and site bedrock have a low expansion index of E.I. equal to 21-50. Accordingly, the foundations for the proposed project shall be designed for a low soil condition, with an expansion index range of 21-50. Therefore, less then significant impacts will occur.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Public sewers are not available to service the subject site, and as such, the Project will be serviced by an onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS) designed by the project sanitation consultant. The approximate location and configuration of the proposed project is shown on the Update Geotechnical Map and Cross-sections, included in Appendix D. The project sanitation consultant will perform percolation tests throughout the project site to confirm the soil is suitable for an OWTS. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.104)? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impact

Locally, the subject property is described as a vacant hillside lot, which is situated on a south/southeast-facing slope, at the northern margin of an alluvial valley. The project area of the site is situated at the toe of the south/southeast-facing slope. Total physical relief within the subject property is on the order of 150 feet. However, the south/southeast-facing slope ascends an additional 100 feet to the top of the ridge located to the north/northwest. Slope gradients within the site vary from nearly horizontal in the project area of the site to as steep as 1.5(h):1(v) on the ascending slope. The existing topographic conditions of the subject property are presented on the Geologic Map (Plate 1), which utilizes the provided topographic survey as a base. The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to geology and soils in regard to conflicts with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or hillside design standards in the County General Plan. The Los Angeles County Hillside Management Ordinance applies to areas greater than 25 percent slope. The project area consists of slopes greater than 25 percent. As a result, proposed project development in these areas would be subject to the requirements and design standards of the Hillside Management Ordinance and hillside design standards in the Conservation and Natural Resources Element of the General Plan. Specifically, sensitive hillside design measures (2.1 through 2.12) would be applicable to the development. Further, the Hillside Management Ordinance requires that all new development in areas over 25 percent slope obtain a CUP as part of the entitlement process. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in conflicts with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or the hillside design standards in the Conservation and Natural Resources Element of the County General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

Global climate change is not confined to a particular project area and is generally accepted as the consequence of global industrialization over the last 200 years. A typical project, even a very large one, does not generate enough greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on its own to influence global climate change significantly; hence, the issue of global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact. The State of California, through its governor and legislature, has established a comprehensive framework for the substantial reduction of GHG emissions over the next 40-plus years. This will occur primarily through the implementation of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), and AB 197, which will address GHG emissions on a statewide, cumulative basis.

A GHG Emissions Analysis completed for the proposed project provides the following information and conclusions regarding potential GHG emissions generated by this project on the environment. Global climate change is primarily considered a cumulative impact but must also be evaluated on a project-level under CEQA. A project participates in this potential impact through its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of GHG emissions. GHGs are gases that absorb infrared radiation in the atmosphere. Principal GHGs regulated under state and federal law and regulations include carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), and nitrous oxide (N2O). GHG emissions are measured in metric tons of CO2 equivalent (MT CO2e), which account for weighted global warming potential (GWP) factors for CH4 and N2O.

Project-Generated Construction and Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The threshold applied to assess the potential for the project to generate GHG emissions either directly or indirectly that may have a significant impact on the environment was the SCAQMD draft interim threshold of 10,000 MT CO2e per year. Pursuant to SCAQMD recommendation, construction emissions were amortized over a 30-year project lifetime, so that GHG reduction measures will address construction GHG emissions as part of the operational GHG reduction strategies (SCAQMD 2008). Construction of the project would result in GHG emissions primarily associated with use of off-road construction equipment, rock popping, on-road hauling and vendor (material delivery) trucks, and worker vehicles. Total project generated GHG emissions during construction were estimated to be minimal during the construction period. Estimated project-generated construction emissions amortized over 30 years would be approximately 22 MT CO2e per year. The project would generate operational GHG emissions from area sources (landscape maintenance), energy sources (natural gas and electricity), mobile sources, solid waste, and water supply and wastewater treatment. Overall, the project GHG emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD CO2e threshold per year, and project-generated GHG emissions would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

The GHG Emissions Analysis provides the following information and conclusion regarding a potential conflict with any GHG plan policy or adopted regulation for purposes of reducing greenhouse gasses.

In 2015 the County adopted a Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP). However, the County has not established a significance threshold under the County's CCAP, but the CCAP noted that projects that demonstrate consistency with the goals, strategies, actions, and emission reduction targets contained in the County's CCAP would have a less-than-significant impact on climate change. Development of the project site would be consistent with the County's CCAP climate action strategies and not result in a conflict with the adopted CCAP; support the SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS by not exceeding the forecasted employment; and demonstrate consistency with the Scoping Plan. Additionally, the project would not interfere with implementation of the GHG reduction goals for 2030 or 2050, because the project would not exceed the SCAQMD's recommended draft interim threshold of 10,000 MT CO2e per year. Therefore, the project would not impede the state's trajectory toward the statewide GHG reduction goals for 2030 or 2050. This impact would be less than significant. The County's CCAP includes 26 local community actions to reduce GHG emissions from the County's community activities are grouped into five strategy areas, listed as follows. Following each strategy area, a qualitative analysis as to how each strategy relates to the proposed project is provided (Dudek, 12/2019). The proposed project would become operational outside of the applicable timeline to tier from the County's CCAP; therefore, consistency with the County's plan was not utilized to determine significance of GHG impacts, and this discussion is provided for disclosure purposes.

- **Green Building and Energy**. The proposed project would be designed to meet the standards for Cal Green and Title 24 at the time of construction. By meeting the standards, the project would be consistent with the Green Building and Energy strategies of the CCAP.
- **Land Use and Transportation.** Per the parking requirements of Cal Green, a percentage of the total number of parking stalls would include electrical vehicle charging stations.
- **Water Conservation and Wastewater.** The project would comply with Title 24 and would be consistent with the current zoning

The County has taken steps to address climate change impacts at a local level. In 2015, the County adopted a CCAP. The purpose of the County's CCAP is to guide the development, enhancement, and implementation of actions that would reduce the County's GHG emissions by 11% below existing levels below 2010 baseline emission levels by 2020. Actions to be taken to achieve this goal are outlined in the County's CCAP. The project's consistency with the County's climate action strategy goals were discussed previously and the project was determined to not result in a conflict with the adopted CCAP. SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS is a regional growth-management strategy that targets per capita GHG reduction from passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks in the Southern California region. The 2016 RTP/SCS incorporates local land use projections and circulation networks in city and county general plans. The proposed project site is zoned for commercial use within the Antelope Valley Area Plan of the County General Plan. The project would be consistent with the current zoning.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

The construction and operation phases of the proposed single-family project would use limited amounts of hazardous materials, potentially including products such as fuels, based lubricants, sanitizers and disinfectants, and greases; pesticides and fertilizers; paints and other coatings. Project operations would involve the routine use of relatively small amounts of ordinary publicly available cleaning and maintenance products, typical of single-family residential land uses. Because the amounts of these materials would be small, the project could have a less than significant impact with regard to creating a significant hazard through the transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project and future uses will be subject to LA County, State and Federal requirements for transportation of potential hazardous materials, which will result in a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact:

Beyond the issues identified and addressed in Section 9.a, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment. The proposed project and future uses will be subject to LA County, State and Federal requirements for transportation of potential hazardous materials, which will result in a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant.

The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts in regard to emitting hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses. There are no schools or hospitals within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, the

proposed project would not pose a significant hazard to the students and faculty of the schools or to hospital personnel or patients. During construction phase and during the operations, hazardous material storage, and disposal would be made in accordance with existing regulations found in the Toxic Substance Control Act, hazardous Material Transportation Act, Resource Conservation Act, Certified Unified Program Agency, and California Accidental Release Prevention Program. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts in regard to emitting hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses, and no mitigation would be required.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts in regard to being located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment. A review of the CalEPA EnviroStor database indicates that there are no listed hazardous waste sites identified in the project vicinity. The closest hazardous materials site is the Prisma Artists Lofts Hazardous Waste Site, located more than 15 miles away from the project site. If onsite contamination is identified, a project will be required to remediate the site prior to construction and implementation of the proposed use. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts in regard to being located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and mitigation would not be required.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact.

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan and would thus have no impact regarding potential safety hazards or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area The distance to the nearest private airstrip is approximately 14 miles for the Santa Monica Municipal Airport and the distance to the nearest public airports are approximately 20 miles for the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and 18 miles for the Bob Hope Airport. The proposed project would not be located within the airport influence area or either airport. Therefore, there would be no impact, and mitigation would not be required.

f) Substantially impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

A Project would normally have a significant impact to hazards and hazardous materials if: (a) the Project involved possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Proposed Project would not cause permanent alterations to vehicular circulation routes and patterns, impede public access, or travel upon public rights-of-way. Immediate evacuation routes within public streets in the vicinity of the Proposed Project Site include Stunt Road to the south and Mulholland Highway to the west. Plans would be provided to the Los Angeles County Fire Department for review and comment. Review by applicable public agencies would ensure implementation of the Proposed Project would not interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be expected to interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and a less than significant impact would occur.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:				
i) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is in the Santa Monica Mountains and a Very High Fire Hazard area. The proposed project will follow the fire regulations in place to ensure that adequate infrastructure, such as the ability to deliver peak load water supplies and access to necessary disaster routes in new development projects, older communities with aging and substandard infrastructure may face greater risks from exposure to fires. The fire flow allow availability has been assessed by the Los Virginius Municipal Water District confirming a fire hydrant adjacent to the access road to the proposed development. The proposed project would be required to comply with all of the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Code, which sets requirements for developments in areas with inadequate water supply or pressure for sufficient firefighting activities. The requirements may include upgrading the nearby infrastructure, providing an on-site fire suppression system, or providing an on-site water tank. Compliance with these requirements would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Furthermore, there are no potentially-hazardous uses in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

h) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project does not utilize any materials or substances that are likely to cause a fire hazard, therefore no impacts would occur.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The proposed single-family project is not expected to have significant impacts on the environment or public health and safety. Hazardous materials are defined as any material that poses a significant present or future hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment. These materials are commonly stored and used by a variety of businesses and are commonly encountered during construction activities. The California Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC) is responsible for classifying hazardous materials in the state of California and for overseeing the cleanup of disposal and industrial sites that have resulted in contamination of soil and groundwater. The Envirostar database lists properties regulated by DTSC where extensive investigation and/or cleanup actions are planned or have been completed. No hazardous materials sites or properties are located on the project site.

The project is also not expected to create significant hazards to the public or the environment in terms of reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment. Additionally, there are no schools or hospitals within one-quarter mile of the project site, thus there will not be a significant hazard to students, faculty, hospital personnel or patients. Projects in close proximity to airports are within the jurisdiction of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) which considers the compatibility of the proposed project with the nearby airport. The Office of Emergency Management is responsible for organizing and directing the preparedness efforts of the Emergency Management Organization of Los Angeles County and it strengthens short and long-term emergency response and recovery capability, and identifies emergency procedures and emergency management routes in the County.

The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment if the site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5. A review of the CalEPA EnviroStor database indicates that there are no listed hazardous waste sites identified in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to have less than significant impact and comply with all the hazardous materials regulations and emergency management and airport proximity regulations.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact:

A Project would normally have a significant impact on surface water quality if discharges associated with the Project would create pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code (CWC) or that cause regulatory standards to be violated, as defined in the applicable National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit or Water Quality Control Plan (WQCP) for the receiving body of water. A significant impact may occur if a project would discharge water which does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems. Significant impacts would also occur if a Project does not comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) through its nine Regional Boards.

Three general sources of potential short-term, construction-related stormwater pollution associated with the Proposed Project include: 1) the handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials containing pollutants; 2) the maintenance and operation of construction equipment; and 3) earth moving activities which, when not controlled, may generate soil erosion via storm runoff or mechanical equipment. The County requires that all Projects be designed and constructed in accordance with the stormwater pollution control requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. Furthermore, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant will be required to file a Notice of Intent with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board to comply with the applicable National Pollution Discharge Elimination (NPDES) requirements as specified within the Conditions of Approval for the Project. Given that this development would be subject to County Ordinances and NPDES requirements for erosion control grading and soil remediation, development of the Proposed Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and there would be a less than significant impact.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

A Project would normally have a significant impact on groundwater level if it would change potable water levels sufficiently to: (a) reduce the ability of a water utility to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies, conjunctive use purposes, storage of imported water, summer/winter peaking, or respond to

emergencies and drought; (b) reduce yields of adjacent wells or well fields (public or private); (c) adversely change the rate or direction of flow of groundwater; or (d) result in demonstrable and sustained reduction in groundwater recharge capacity.

The Project Site is located within the boundaries of Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Construction of the Project would require service from Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, which has not indicated that water supplies are unavailable to support the Project. Furthermore, measures associated with minimizing water usage will be applied to the Proposed Project, including water efficient landscape requirements and compliance with Title 24 Building Code requirements for efficient appliances and fixtures. This is consistent with current Los Angeles County Ordinances. With the implementation of the applicable codes, impacts to groundwater would be reduced to a less than significant level.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

A Project would normally have a significant impact on surface water hydrology if it would result in a permanent, adverse change to the movement of surface water sufficient to produce a substantial change in the current or direction of water flow. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the County, and no streams or river courses are located on or within the Project vicinity. The Project Site does not contain a stream or river. The proposed development will not have any negative effects on the existing hydrologic condition of the Project Site and any downstream facilities. In addition, in accordance with the latest Los Angeles County Hydrology Manual, flows greater than 85 percent of the existing pre-developed peak flow conditions will be retained onsite. Therefore, development of this Project will not result in a potential for a significant adverse impact associated with the alteration of the existing drainage pattern.

d) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact:

Pursuant to the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch.12.84), the proposed single family home project is considered new development and is subject to the County's LID Standards Manual. The project site and surrounding area are subject to the LID Ordinance, and the proposed project is located in or directly adjacent to or potentially discharging directly to a sensitive environmental area (SEA) as defined in Section 22.08.190 of Title 22 of the LID Development Standards.

The proposed project will create 1,150 square feet of impervious surface area and will discharge stormwater runoff that is likely to impact a sensitive biological species or habitat. In accordance with the County's LID Standards Manual, the project's stormwater management design incorporates an infiltration basin, which will be designed for mitigated low flow, and treatment for the required LID volumes in order to meet the County's LID and stormwater quality requirements. Furthermore, the stormwater management infrastructure will be designed to convey runoff away from the adjacent SEA and other sensitive areas.

Based on the information provided, it is determined that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to Hydrology in regard to conflicting with the Los Angeles County LID Ordinance. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required for this project.

e) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g., high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impacts:

Pursuant to the regulations set forth by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health for Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS), the proposed single family home project is subject to the standards for development of onsite wastewater treatment. The project is located in an area with known geological limitations or in close proximity to surface waters, including but not limited to streams, lakes and drainage courses.

An OWTS site plan has been designed for the proposed project, which includes an assessment of potential impacts to nearby water bodies, water courses, and drainage courses. Any identified impacts should be addressed in accordance with the regulations set forth by the RWQCB and the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health for OWTS. If the project site is located in a Waters of the United States, the project will obtain the required National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

The proposed project includes the addition of amenities such as restrooms. The design of the restrooms will demonstrate compliance with the standards of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health for OWTS. Based on the information provided, it is determined that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts with regards to the use of OWTS in areas with known geological limitations or in close proximity to surface waters. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required for this project.

f) In flood hazard , tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact:

Tsunami

Due to the elevation of the subject property and distance from the coast, it is LP's opinion that there is no threat of inundation and damage to the site should a tsunami develop and collide with the west coast. In addition, the local Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning prepared by the CGS indicates that the subject property is located outside the currently estimated zone of potential tsunami run-up and inundation. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

Seiche Zones

Due to the fact that the subject property is not located adjacent to a lake or reservoir, there is no threat of inundation and damage to the site from a seiche. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

Release of Pollutants During Flooding

The area is located outside of the special flood hazard areas subject to inundation by the one percent annual chance of flood (100-year floodplain), and no floodplain management regulations are required. Therefore, there is very low potential for floods to occur and the project site be inundated, so as to cause release of pollutants. In addition, the stormwater management that would be implemented in compliance with the NPDES permit and the infrastructure that is proposed for detention and infiltration of runoff waters will further reduce the release of hazardous materials contribution offsite, from potential flooding. Therefore, impacts from mudflow are considered less than significant.

g) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact

A Project would result in a significant impact if it has the potential to conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Per Los Angeles County requirements, the overflows from the proposed BMP must connect either to a catch basin or to a storm drain main. As part of the development, landscaping will be added which will reduce the overall imperviousness and thereby lower the site's overall runoff. Additionally, the Project Site will no longer convey runoff via sheet flow, but rather via non-erosive means to a proposed detention basin.

In accordance with the latest LA County Hydrology Manual, flows greater than 85% of the existing pre-developed peak flow conditions will be retained onsite. While there is a significant increase in the amount of runoff volume, there should be no negative impacts on the storm drain system since the peak flow of the proposed development is 15 percent lower than the existing condition. Furthermore, the County requires that all Projects be designed and constructed in accordance with the stormwater pollution control requirements.

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant is required to file a Notice of Intent to comply with the applicable National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. Based upon the proposed stormwater drainage system and given that the Proposed Project would be subject to County Ordinances and NPDES requirements for erosion control grading and soil remediation, the Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and there will be a less than significant impact.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any County land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project would be sufficiently large enough or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community. The determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis considering the following factors: (a) the extent of the area that would be impacted, the nature and degree of impacts, and the types of land uses within that area; (b) the extent to which existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses would be disrupted, divided or isolated, and the duration of the disruptions; and (c) the number, degree, and type of secondary impacts to surrounding land uses that could result from implementation of the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project Site is situated within a rural area of the City, in accordance with the existing physical configuration of properties in the vicinity of the Project Site. The proposed development will not result in a separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types. The Project Site is currently unoccupied, and the proposal is to develop the land within the RL20 (Rural Lands- One dwelling unit/20 acres max.) Zone, as a single-family residential development. This proposed use is consistent with the existing land uses in the surrounding area, which are primarily composed of single-family residential properties. The implementation of the Proposed Project will not alter the existing physical configuration of the community, and no negative impact is anticipated as a result of this development.

c) Conflict with the goals and policies of the General Plan related to Hillside Management Areas or Significant Ecological Areas?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

The Proposed Project Site is situated within a rural coastal region of the County, and is in compliance with the General Plan and zoning designations currently applicable to the Project Site. Pursuant to the R-C-20 (Rural Coastal) zone regulations and the General Plan land use designation of RL20 – Rural Lands, the Project Site is designated for the construction of a single-family residence. The proposed development will not result in any adverse environmental effects, and the regulations and designations of the General Plan and zoning

ordinance are put in place to prevent or mitigate potential issues. The Project Site, as defined by the R-C-20 (Rural Coastal) zone regulations, is currently zoned to permit the construction of a single-family residence, and the proposed development is consistent with this zoning designation and the General Plan. The project site is currently zoned as R-C-20 (Rural Coastal) and has a General Plan Land Use designation of RL20 – Rural Lands. The plans for the Proposed Project have been reviewed and found to be consistent with the requirements of the General Plan land use designation Therefore, development of the Project will not conflict with any plan, policy or regulation and there will be no impacts.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impacts:

The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) was adopted by the State of California to promote the production and preservation of mineral resources, alleviate or reduce any detrimental effects on the environment, and safeguard public health and safety.

The proposed project is situated within the Santa Monica Mountains, an area which, as per the Department of Regional Planning's determination dated May, 2014, does not contain any mineral resources of commercial significance. Consequently, the proposed project would not have any impact on mineral resources

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impacts:

The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) was adopted by the State of California to promote the production and preservation of mineral resources, alleviate or reduce any detrimental effects on the environment, and safeguard public health and safety.

The proposed project is situated within the Santa Monica Mountains, an area which, as per the Department of Regional Planning's determination dated May, 2014, does not contain any mineral resources of commercial significance. Consequently, the proposed project would not have any impact on mineral resources

13. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project would generate excess noise that would cause the ambient noise environment at the Project Site to exceed noise level standards set forth in the PMC. Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels during both construction and operation, as discussed in further detail below.

The increased noise from construction activities would be temporary and limited by the LACMC Section 8.28.030 that restricts construction activity on Sunday and any other time between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. Based upon compliance with the requirements of the Municipal Code, short-term construction noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Therefore, impacts associated with the exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards contained within the General Plan will be less than significant. The construction of the Proposed residential use would generate short term noise impacts. Construction activities have a short and temporary duration, lasting from a few days to a period of several months. Groundborne noise and other types of construction related noise impacts would typically occur during the initial site preparation, which can create the highest levels of noise. Generally, site preparation has the shortest duration of all construction phases. Activities that occur during this phase include earthmoving and soils compaction. High groundborne noise levels can occur during this phase due to haul trucks, backhoes, and other heavy-duty construction equipment. Construction activities have the potential to expose adjacent land uses to noise levels between 70 and 90 decibels at 50 feet from the noise source. The degree of noise impact would be dependent upon the distance between the construction activity and the noise receptor. With compliance of the Municipal Code and Mitigation Measure NOI-1, short-term construction noise impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

MM N-1: Restricts construction activity on Sunday and any other time between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Incorporated

Proposed Project may have a potential for generating low levels of groundborne vibration as a result of the excavation and earthwork activities. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that

propagate through the ground and decrease in intensity with distance from the source. The impacts of such vibrations can vary from imperceptible effects at the lowest levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight damage of buildings at the highest levels. Therefore, the construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could have an adverse impact on sensitive structures, such as building damage.

The impacts of construction vibrations include human annoyance and building damage. Human annoyance occurs when construction vibrations rise significantly above the threshold of human perception for extended periods of time. Building damage can be cosmetic or structural. Buildings that are not particularly fragile would not experience any cosmetic damage (e.g., plaster cracks) at distances beyond 25 feet. This distance can vary substantially depending on the soil composition and underground geological layer between vibration source and receiver. The nearest single-family residence to the Project Site is located approximately 220 feet to the south of the Proposed Project. This distance provides a buffer that would minimize the potential for vibration-related impacts on the nearest residence. Therefore, Mitigation Measure N-1 has been proposed to address the potential impacts of groundborne vibrations, and the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Proposed Project, if located within an airport land use plan, may have a significant impact on noise levels. However, it has been determined that the Project Site is not situated within an airport land use plan and is located at a distance of 14 miles from the nearest airport, and not within two miles of a private airstrip or public use airport. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would not expose individuals to excessive noise levels associated with airport uses as it is not located within proximity of a public airport, public use airport, airport land use plan area, or any other similar facility.

As a result of the aforementioned factors, it can be inferred that the potential impact of the Proposed Project on airport land use and noise levels would be insignificant. The Proposed Project would not introduce substantial new sources of noise or substantially add to existing sources of noise within or in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, any impacts from exposure to airport noise would be considered less than significant and would not pose a significant impact to the surrounding area.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

The Proposed Project, which is the construction of a single-family home in a suburban area, is expected to have minimal impact on the surrounding area. The proposed project will not bring in any new developments such as additional businesses or infrastructure, and will not cause any substantial growth in the area that would not have otherwise occurred.

The location of the Project Site is not within a designated area for new development or growth and the construction of the single-family home will not change the existing residential density in the area. Additionally, the proposed project is not expected to have any impact on the existing infrastructure and services in the surrounding area.

Based on the above factors, it can be concluded that the impact of the Proposed Project on population growth and the surrounding area would be considered insignificant. The proposed project will not have any significant impact on the environment and will not have any long-term negative effects on the area. Therefore, the project would have no impact. There

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

The Proposed Project, being the construction of a single-family home in a suburban area, is not expected to have a significant impact on the displacement of existing housing units. The Project Site is currently vacant and has not been previously developed.

The Proposed Project, which is limited to the construction of a single-family home, will not require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Project Site is not situated in an area where displacement of existing housing is anticipated to occur, and the construction of the single-family home will not change the existing residential density in the area.

Based on the above factors, it can be concluded that the impact of the Proposed Project on the displacement of existing housing units and the surrounding area would be considered insignificant. The Proposed Project will not have any significant impact on the environment and will not have any long-term negative effects on the area.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Proposed Project, being the construction of a single-family home, would not normally have a significant impact on fire protection. The nearest fire station, Station 67, is located at 25801 Piuma Rd. Calabasas, CA 91302, and is less than 3 miles from the Project Site. The Applicant is also required to comply with all standards including public and private fire hydrants which provide water pressure and durations as specified by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Therefore, this does not constitute the potential for a significant adverse impact to fire protection.

Sheriff protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact

The proposed project, being the construction of a single-family home in an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County, would not have a significant impact on the ability of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department to provide adequate service. Standard conditions of approval, developed by the Public Safety Office in conjunction with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, will be applied to the project, requiring adequate lighting, maintenance of landscaping and other security measures. Based on the implementation of these identified standards and conditions, it is determined that the impacts to police protection would not be significant.

Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project, being the construction of a single-family home in Los Angeles County, is expected to have minimal impact on public services such as schools. The project area is serviced by an existing public high schools, existing public middle schools, five existing public elementary schools, and private schools all located within a 25-mile radius of the project site. The project is not expected to induce substantial population growth.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in creating capacity or service level problems, or resulting in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios for school services, and no mitigation would be required..

Parks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No Impact

The Proposed Project, being the construction of a single-family home in Los Angeles County, is not expected to have a significant impact on recreation and park services. The project would not generate an increased demand in recreational and park facilities, due to the construction of a single-family home. The project would not include substantial population growth through residential development. The proposed project would not increase demand on the surrounding area and surrounding recreation and park facilities. In addition, residents of the Proposed Project would not likely use the local park facilities due to the property's large acreage. Development of the Project Site is not anticipated to increase the City's population and demand for parks and recreational programs. Therefore, it can be determined that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts on recreation and park services, and no mitigation would be required.

Libraries? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No Impact

The proposed project, being the construction of a single-family home in Los Angeles County, will not have a significant impact on library services. The project would not generate an increased demand in library facilities due to the construction of a single-family home and would not include substantial population growth through residential development. The proposed project would not increase demand on the surrounding area and surrounding library facilities. The development of the Project Site is not anticipated to increase the City's population and demand for library services. Based on the aforementioned factors, it can be concluded that the impacts of the proposed project on library services would be considered less than significant.

Other public facilities? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Proposed Project, being the construction of a single-family home, is not expected to have a significant impact on other public services and facilities. The project would not generate substantial employment or population growth that could generate a demand for other public facilities. The review of the project indicates that this development will not create any unique public facilities which require extensive maintenance. The property owner will maintain all landscaping and on-site facilities. The Project will be assessed for drainage, sewer is provided by an Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS), and traffic impact will have minimal impacts due to the project being for a single-family residence. Therefore, it can be determined that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to other public services and facilities.

16. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

For the purpose of this IS/MND, a significant impact may occur if the Project would include substantial employment or population growth, which would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. The Proposed Project proposes a single-family residential development. The Proposed Project would contribute to minor population growth in the area, but it would also provide on-site open space for the proposed residential use. As such, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in a substantial increase in the use of recreation and park facilities. As discussed in previous sections, there are sufficient park facilities in the vicinity of the Proposed Project such that there would not be an undue amount of increased burden on the regional parks.

b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

Upon review of the Proposed Project, it has been determined that the project does not entail the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. As such, it is not expected to result in any adverse physical effects on the environment in relation to the usage of existing neighborhood and regional recreational programs. The Project includes provisions for on-site open space for the proposed residential uses and being a single-family development, it is expected to have less than significant impact. The Proposed Project area has sufficient recreational programs to support the expansion of one single family residence. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impacts.

A review of the information in the recently completed Countywide Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment, which includes a complete inventory of parks and open spaces in Los Angeles County, has determined that the proposed development, being a small project, would not interfere with regional open space connectivity.

The project, which is located on private land in the Santa Monica Mountains, is positioned behind properties fronting the main road and as such, there are no local public trails on or adjacent to the project site that would be removed or disturbed by the proposed development. Furthermore, a review of the broad landscape of open space resources in the area around the project site has found no significant impacts to the regional open space connectivity.

17. TRANSPORTATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact.

According to the Circulation Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan 2035, the project will not conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance circulation system including transit or roadways. There are no bicycle or pedestrian facilities identified for this area. No impacts would occur.

b) Would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact.

The project does not include the subdivision of land. The project will meet all development standards of the County and zoning. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

Roadway improvements and intersections of driveways with public roadways, constructed as part of the project would comply with applicable County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works standards for roadway profiles (street sections). The standard plan check review and approval process will ensure that all County safety-related requirements are addressed. This impact would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact.

The proposed project shall be subject to review and approval by the local fire department prior to commencement of construction. Such review shall include, but not be limited to, examination of the plans and design of the project, as well as any potential impact on emergency access. On-site inspections shall be conducted by the fire department to ensure compliance with all applicable fire safety regulations and requirements. Any deficiencies identified during the review process shall be promptly addressed and rectified to the satisfaction of the fire department prior to the issuance of any approvals or permits. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact:

While the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) search of the Sacred Lands File did not identify the presence of Native American cultural resources at the project site, Assembly Bill (AB) 52 requires lead agencies to consult with California Native American Tribes that request such consultation prior to the agency's

release of a Notice of Intent (NOI) of Mitigated Negative Declaration. A significant impact would occur if a project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 that is determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant. Therefore, the project will conduct consultation with NAHC and Native American Representatives and Mitigation Measure (MM) CULT-1 and CULT-2 are proposed; to reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level:

MM CULT-1. Archaeological and Historic Resources - Avoidance and Monitoring. Completion of a Worker Education and Awareness Program for all personnel who will be engaged in ground-disturbing activities shall be required prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities. This shall include training that provides an overview of cultural resources that might potentially be found and the appropriate procedures to follow if cultural resources are identified. This requirement extends to any new staff prior to engaging in ground disturbing activities.

Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation (County Parks), shall review the construction plans to ensure that any known cultural resources sites are required to be avoided, and have been marked as "off-limits" areas for construction and construction staging. In addition, County Parks shall require monitoring of all ground disturbing activities by a qualified archaeologist within 100 feet of a known extant unique archaeological resources, significant historical resources, or tribal cultural resource. In addition, consultation shall be undertaken with the Most Likely Descendants designated by Native American heritage Commission to determine if a Native American monitor shall also be present during all or a portion of the ground-disturbing activities.

In the event that previously unknown unique archaeological resources, significant historical resources, or tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction, the resources shall either be left in situ or avoided through realignment of the trail, or the resources shall be salvaged, recorded and reposited consistent with the provisions of a Phase III data recovery program consistent with the provisions of a Cultural Resources Management Plan.

MM CULT-2. Pre-Construction Surveys. (A) Where the 'Area of Potential Effect' has been subject to a Phase I Walkover Survey within two years of the proposed activity and no unique archaeological resources, significant cultural resources, or tribal cultural resources are known from the Area of Potential Effect, work shall proceed per the provisions detailed in MM CULT-1. (B). Where all or a portion of the Area of Potential Effect has not been surveyed for cultural resources within two years of a proposed ground-disturbing activity, a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of Interior's professional qualification standards for archaeology and shall conduct a Phase I Walkover Survey to ascertain the presence or absence of unique archaeological and/or significant historic resources, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

If the survey determines no unique archaeological resources or significant historical resources, including potential tribal cultural, then the work shall proceed consistent with the provisions of MM CULT-1.
If the survey determines potential unique archaeological resources or significant historical resources, including potential tribal cultural resources, then one of two courses of action shall be employed:

Where avoidance is feasible, the trail alignments shall be realigned to avoid the potentially significant resource, and the work shall then proceed consistent with the provisions of MM CULT-1. The new alignment will be surveyed by a qualified archaeologist. An archaeological monitor shall be present during ground-disturbing activities. In addition, consultation shall be undertaken with the Most Likely Descendants designated by Native American Heritage Commission to determine if a Native American monitor shall also be present during all or a portion of the ground-disturbing activities.

Where avoidance is not feasible, a Phase II evaluation of the cultural resources shall be undertaken to determine the significance of the cultural resource. If the Phase II investigation identifies a unique/eligible cultural resource within the area proposed for ground-disturbing work, the County shall determine whether to avoid the resource through redesign or to proceed with a Phase III data recovery program consistent with the provisions of a Cultural Resource Management Plan. The work shall then proceed consistent with the provisions of MM CULT-1.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact

The project would increase demand for water, wastewater treatment, storm water draining, electric power, telecommunication and potentially natural gas services through the construction of the proposed single-family development. The project is proximate to existing electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities and is currently served by these services. The provision of stormwater drainage facilities will be included in the project design, in compliance with County requirements based on the County's stormwater design manual and low impact development (LID) ordinance. There are no expected obstacles to the design of County-compliant facilities for the project. As such, the issue of stormwater infrastructure is not an issue and therefore there will be no impact to stormwater facilities.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Impact.

There is sufficient water to serve this project and for the foreseeable future, including through normal and potential upcoming dry periods. No impact to area water supplies will result from the implementation of this project.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the	☐	☐	☐	☒

project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

No Impact.

Wastewater facilities are not available for use by this project site. The project proposes a private wastewater system to serve the project. The wastewater system's design shall be subject to review and approval by the Los County Department of Public Health prior to any land disturbance/grading or building permit issuance.

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less Than Significant Impact

Waste Management provides solid waste collection in the project vicinity. It is anticipated that nearby Landfill would serve the proposed project. The landfill has a remaining capacity of 56,864,241 tons or 53,645,510 cubic yards. The landfill is scheduled to operate until July 25, 2047, unless its capacity is reached earlier. The project would generate increased solid waste through the development of the single-family project. The residential use at this site is consistent with the zoning, which is included in the calculations for capacity purposes. The project will generate solid waste at a level that will be at a less than significant level that can be managed and accepted by the nearby landfill.

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Solid waste reduction is implemented in the County, compliant with AB 939 and the County of Los Angeles Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), which require implementation of programs to divert, through source reduction, recycling, and composting 25 percent of the solid waste from landfills and incineration to achieve a 50 percent reduction in solid waste by 2000. Further, the project would comply with Chapter 20.87, Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling and Reuse, of the County Zoning Code for 50 percent recycling during construction. The residential project would need to comply with the 2019 CALGreen requirement to either no less than 65 percent diversion or no more than 2 pounds per square foot disposal. of construction and demolition waste for non- residential construction. The project would comply with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, which requires each "development project" to provide an adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials. No additional federal regulations beyond these standards would be required. The project must be designed to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

20. WILDFIRE

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

In support of the analysis of this section, online web resources accessed included the Los Angeles County's Fire Hazard Severity Zone mapping and the California Fire Severity Zone mapping dataset. The project site is within and adjacent to an area designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) and is also recognized by the State of California as a State Responsibility Area (SRA). These FHSZs define the application of various mitigation strategies to reduce risk associated with wildland fires. It should be noted that CAL FIRE is currently remapping FHSZS within SRAs and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ); to provide updated map zones, based on new data, science, and technology.

The project site would not require any road closures during construction. All project plans would be submitted for approval to the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Therefore, the project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The impact would be less than significant.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

As indicated earlier, the project site is situated within and adjacent to an area designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). Potential for slope failure such as landslides and debris flows, is possible because of denuded slopes, if a fire were to occur in the area. Based on these conditions, the risk from wildfire, exposure of occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire and uncontrolled spread of a wildfire is considered potentially significant. Therefore, the following mitigation measures (MMs) are proposed that would reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level.

MM WF-1: Fire Hazard Mitigation Designs
The proposed structure would be designed to meet hazardous fire area building code requirements. All fire access roads would be capable of supporting a 75,000- pound load, and all access roads would-be built-in conformance with applicable California Fire Code and the Los Angeles County Fire Department (Fire Department) requirements, ensuring that the project would have adequate emergency access. The conceptual design plans shall be submitted to the Fire Department for approval.

MM WF-2: Landscape Plan, Fuel Management

A landscape plan with Fuel Modification Zones (FMZs) shall be developed and shall incorporate an effective "defensible space" around proposed structure. The plans shall conform to Los Angeles County Fire Department (Fire Department) Regulations. Conceptual Design plans shall be submitted to the Fire Department for approval. In addition, the project shall comply with the Fire Department's Brush Management Regulations.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

There are no proposed structures such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities that are proposed as part of the project. As identified in 19(a) and 19 (b), the project design will be subject to precautionary design measures, which will be submitted to the Fire Department for review and approval. Further, the Fuel Modification Plans for the project will also be submitted to the Fire Department. Implementation of MMs WF-1 and WF-2 is expected to reduce potential impacts to less than significant impacts.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Less Than Significant Impact.

Refer to responses 20 (a) - 20 (d). Implementation of Mitigation Measures WF-1 and WF-2 with project design considerations, implementation and management of fuel modification, landscaping to reduce fire risk, potential; would reduce potential risk to people and structures from wildfire; to a less than significant level.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☐